



Governor's Office of Planning & Research

Elected Officials

Mayor

Bruce Lathrop, District 4

Mayor Pro-Tem

Richard G. Barakat, District 3

Councilmember

Richard T. Hale, Jr., District 1

Councilmember

D. Montgomery Lewis, District 2

Councilmember

Elizabeth Bruny, District 5

Staff

City Manager

Kevin Kearney

City Clerk

Claudia Saldana

Management Analyst

Sophia Musa

City Attorney

Cary Reisman

Building Inspector

Mark Handler

City Engineer

David Gilbertson

City Planner

Jim Kasama

Finance Director

Suresh Malkani

April 18, 2023

Apr 20 2023

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

RE: Response to Comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the City of Bradbury 2021-2029 6th Cycle Housing Element Update and Zoning Amendments Project, SCH #2023020514

The City of Bradbury (City) received comments from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) dated March 24, 2023 on the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the City of Bradbury 2021-2029 6th Cycle Housing Element Update and Zoning Amendments Project, SCH #2023020514. Responses are provided below. The CDFW comment letter including bracketing and numbering corresponding to the responses below is included as Attachment 1.

1. Introductory comments are noted. The comment does not raise a specific issue relating to the adequacy or accuracy of the Draft MND; no response is required.
2. The comment summarizes the City's Housing Element Update. The comment does not raise a specific issue relating to the adequacy or accuracy of the Draft MND; no response is required.
3. An introduction to comments related to biological resources are noted. Responses to individual comments follow.
4. This comment raises concern that the proposed activity will cause impacts to oak woodlands, specifically that it would involve "removal of two individual oak trees and encroach upon 10 other oak trees through branch and root pruning". However, this impact would not occur and is not stated as such in the MND. It is unclear how this impact assumption was made. Section 4.4, Biological Resources, response e. of the Initial

Study Checklist documents the presence of oak trees on the City Hall site, but explains that the site contains sufficient developed area to accommodate the multi-family residential development and emergency shelter. Any future development on the City Hall site would occur within the existing developed footprint. Furthermore, any future development on the site would be subject to the City's Oak Tree Preservation and Protection Ordinance. The Bradbury Code of Ordinances, Title IX, Part VI, Chapter 118 includes the Tree Preservation and Protection regulations for the City. The regulations define native trees and significant trees as follows:

- Native tree means any woody plant species indigenous to the desert, foothills, or canyons of southern California prior to the California Mission Period, provided that the plant has an expected mature trunk size of six inches diameter at breast height (DBH) and has an expected mature height of 15 feet or higher. Giant sequoias (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*), redwoods (*Sequoiadendron sempervirens*), dawn redwoods (*Metasequoia glyptostroboides*), evergreen native oaks (such as *Quercus agrifolia*, *Quercus engelmannii*), deciduous oaks (such as *Quercus lobata* and *Quercus kelloggii*) are to be regarded as important native trees even though they have been planted by man, introduced (or possibly reintroduced) into the southern California foothill and canyon environments.
- Prominent tree means a woody perennial plant with a trunk DBH of six inches or more, and having an expected mature height of 15 feet or higher.
- Significant tree means any non-native or exotic tree with a trunk DBH of six inches or more, and having an expected mature height of 15 feet or higher, and known to survive in the southern California environment.

The MND identifies an area of coast live oak woodland located along the northern property line of the City Hall site (see Figure 5). The location of individual coast live oaks with a trunk diameter greater than six inches at breast height is shown on Figure 6. These individual oak trees would be considered native trees, prominent trees and significant trees pursuant to the City's Tree Preservation and Protection Ordinance. As detailed in Section 9.118.060 of the ordinance, removal of native and/or prominent trees is prohibited unless it meets certain criteria as follows:

Removal of native trees and/or prominent trees. No prominent tree, native tree or any other tree defined in Section 9.118.030 and/or which is of a desirable genus and species shall be removed without first obtaining a permit to do so. The City Manager shall issue such permits only after the presentation of photographs and/or drawings showing that the prominent tree is a significant health or fire hazard or has become an extremely severe detriment to the view of the mountains or valley from house sites. A 14-day waiting period is created hereby,

during which time appeals to any decisions, restrictions or conditions made by the City Manager on the permit may be submitted in writing to the Planning Commission. Should an appeal be filed, the 14-day holding period is extended automatically until the next Planning Commission meeting for which the item can be placed on the agenda.

Since there are no view impacts resulting from the existing oak trees, the only reason they would be removed is if they were creating a significant health or fire hazard. In summary, impacts to oak trees as a result of the Housing Element Update are not anticipated as development is assumed to occur within the existing developed footprint of the City Hall site. Furthermore, as stated throughout the MND, the City's 6th Cycle Housing Element (2021-2029) is a policy document that establishes programs to further the goal of meeting projected housing needs pursuant to the regional housing needs allocation. The project is the adoption of the City's Housing Element and associated Zoning Amendment. The project does not include any development plans that could result in environmental impacts related to oak trees or oak woodland within the City Hall site. Future development would be required to submit building plans demonstrating consistency with the City's Tree Preservation and Protection Ordinance and other relevant regulations to ensure avoidance of indirect impacts including stormwater and grading regulations that require erosion control and water quality best management practices. Additionally, future development would be required to implement General Plan policies including the conservation of oak woodlands (Conservation Policy 8).

5. As detailed in response #4, the project would avoid impacts to oak trees; therefore, mitigation measures are not warranted. No impacts to the critical root zone are anticipated as any future development would occur within lands that are currently developed and paved in the existing condition. The oak tree canopy and root zone of the oak trees present on the City Hall site are already impacted by pavement and development would not expand existing developed areas. Existing oak trees on-site may already be compromised by development within the root protection zone. Nonetheless, the redevelopment at the City Hall site would not require removal of existing oak trees and the project would result in no net loss of oak trees or oak woodlands beyond the existing condition.
6. This comment documents the biological value and functions associated with oak woodlands. Consistent with the City's Tree Preservation and Protection Ordinance and City General Conservation Policy 8, the City agrees that oak woodland provides important biological values and functions. The comment notes that, "Due to the historic and on-going loss of this ecologically important vegetation community, oak trees and woodlands are protected by local and State ordinances." As detailed in these responses, the City would comply with their local ordinance, the Tree Preservation and Protection Ordinance to ensure protection to oak trees. The comment also refers to state ordinances protecting oak woodlands but does not provide any specific references to these protections. The City is aware of Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21083.4 which requires counties to address conversion of oak woodlands and implementation of mitigation. However, this would not

apply to the City of Bradbury as an incorporated City. Furthermore, it is noted that PRC Section 21083.4(d)(2) includes an exemption for affordable housing projects, which would be applicable to development at the City Hall site. The City acknowledges that oak woodlands are considered a CDFW sensitive vegetation community and accordingly has identified the existing developed portions of the City Hall site as a potential development area for affordable housing and emergency shelter needs in the City. Impacts to oak woodlands are not anticipated.

7. As detailed in responses 4 through 6, significant impacts to oak trees are not anticipated; therefore, mitigation measures are not warranted. Furthermore, no development is currently proposed on the City Hall site. Any future development would be subject to the City of Bradbury applicable ordinances and development permit procedures of Title IX, Part IV, Section. 9.28.060 Environmental Assessment, which requires all projects as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to be reviewed and processed in accordance with CEQA and any local environmental regulations.
8. This comment suggests that future development of identified housing sites could result in erosion and siltation that could impair streams. The comment refers to Housing Element Figure IV-3 which identifies sites in the Housing Element sites inventory. However, all of the sites identified on Figure IV-3 are existing vacant undeveloped parcels that have development potential in the existing condition. These are identified in the City's Housing Element sites inventory to comply with Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) requirements, but the adoption of the Housing Element and overlay zone does not change development potential at these sites. As the project would not change the potential for development at these sites, there is no physical impact that would result from the project.

Future development at the sites identified on Figure IV-3 could be developed in the existing condition and development would be subject to the City's General Development Standards (Bradbury Municipal Code Chapter 94) or Hillside Development Standards (Bradbury Municipal Code Chapter 97) which require slope protection and stormwater retention to avoid erosion potential. Additionally, the City's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (Bradbury Municipal Code Chapter 121) includes requirements for planting disturbed areas and implementing stormwater management practices to minimize runoff and erosion. Future projects would also be required to adhere to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) standards which requires project-specific Best Management Practices (BMPs) to be implemented to control erosion and prevent topsoil from exiting the site. Additionally, future projects would implement General Plan policies including (but not limited to) the protection of water bodies, watershed, and courses from development impacts (Conservation Policy 1).

As stated throughout the MND, "The HEU is a policy document, and its adoption would not produce environmental impacts. While no actual development is proposed as part of the HEU or Zoning Actions, implementation of the programs contained in the document would accommodate development through regulations supporting SROs, ADUs, and through

application of an Affordable Housing Overlay Zone on the City Hall site that would allow development of up to 18 multi-family residential units and an emergency shelter for six individuals.” None of the proposed regulations or policies proposed as part of the Housing Element Update would increase development potential at the vacant undeveloped parcels shown on Figure IV-3 of the Housing Element Update compared to the existing condition. Therefore, the project would not result in physical impacts at these sites and no impacts to any rivers, streams, or other CDFW regulated resources would occur.

All future development would be required to adhere to the City’s regulations relating to environmental resource protection and General Plan policies including the conservation of riparian vegetation (Conservation Policy 6). Future projects would be evaluated independently under CEQA as applicable, including a project-level evaluation of sensitive biological and botanical resources (Bradbury Municipal Code Section 9.94.030).

Furthermore, the City Hall site does not support riparian habitat as there are no streams on or near the property. The application of the housing overlay on the City Hall site for low-income housing is the only proposed action that would change development potential in the City. Therefore, the project would have no impact to streams or riparian habitats.

9. This comment summarizes the CDFW permit authority pursuant to the California Fish and Game Code Section 1602 Streambed Alteration. As discussed throughout the Draft MND, the project does not identify, describe, promote, entitle, or permit any particular residential development project. Rather, the project is the adoption of the City’s Housing Element and associated Zoning Amendment and does not include any development plans or project-level proposals that could result in environmental impacts. Future development on vacant parcels would be evaluated independently under CEQA, including a project-level evaluation of sensitive biological and botanical resources (Bradbury Municipal Code Section 9.94.030). If required, future development would be subject to CDFW review and application for permits consistent with the resources potentially affected by the development plans. At that time appropriate mitigation measures would be determined. As the adoption of the Housing Element Update would not change the potential for development at vacant sites with potential jurisdictional resources, no impact to CDFW jurisdictional resources would result from project implementation.

The proposed project only changes development potential on the City Hall site through application of the housing overlay. No CDFW jurisdictional resources are present on or near the City Hall site, therefore, the project would have no potential to affect jurisdictional resources and a 1602 permit would not be required for development of that site.

10. This comment recommends mitigation measures for impacts to jurisdictional waters and wetlands. However, as detailed in response #9, adoption of the Housing Element and Zoning Update would not change the potential for development at vacant sites with potential jurisdictional resources; therefore, no impact to CDFW jurisdictional resources would result from project implementation. However, the City agrees that future

development with the potential to impact jurisdictional resources would need to prepare a jurisdictional delineation, impacts assessment, and identify feasible mitigation. While it is feasible that the suggested measures could apply to future development, the project includes the adoption of the City's Housing Element and associated Zoning Amendment which would not change development potential on vacant undeveloped parcels. Should future development be proposed, CDFW would have an opportunity to review and make recommendations for mitigation.

The proposed project only changes development potential on the City Hall site through application of the housing overlay. No CDFW jurisdictional resources are present on or near the City Hall site, therefore, the project would have no potential to affect wetlands and a 1602 permit would not be required for development of that site.

11. This comment recommends the Draft MND require future projects to specifically analyze biological effects of potential changes in hydrology and hydraulics associated with project development. The Draft MND does state that future development would be required to adhere to all applicable City regulations including compliance with the grading and drainage standards adopted by the City (Bradbury Municipal Code Section 9.94.040), on-site retention of stormwater and ensure that grading does not increase, concentrate or divert drainage across lot lines (Bradbury Municipal Code Section 9.94.060). The inclusion of these requirements as regulatory compliance precludes the need to include these recommendations in the Draft MND. Therefore, upon application of a specific development project, site-specific studies, including hydrology and hydraulics would be required to ensure project implementation of City regulations and ensure storm water runoff is controlled in a manner that would minimize environmental effects, including downstream biology. Refer also to responses 9 and 10.
12. This comment focuses on the potential for impacts to nesting birds during construction activities. As detailed in response #4, the removal of trees is not anticipated to allow development at the City Hall site. Furthermore, the project is primarily adoption of a policy document, and no development is proposed. However, throughout the City, in the event any tree removal, trimming or tree disturbance is proposed to implement housing, those actions would be subject to compliance with Fish and Game Code, Sections 3503, 3503.5, 3505, and 3513, and California Code of Regulation, Title 14, Sections 251.1, 652 and 783-786.6 which protects raptors and nesting birds. Additionally, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) prohibits the take (including killing, capturing, selling, trading, and transport) of protected migratory bird species without prior authorization by the Department of Interior U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Furthermore, development throughout the City is subject to the City's Tree Preservation and Protection Ordinance which would limit, if not preclude, the removal of trees with nesting bird potential. Therefore, through regulatory compliance future projects would not result in the loss of occupied habitat or reductions in sensitive bird species.
13. This comment recommends mitigation measures for impacts to nesting birds. While it is feasible that the suggested measures could apply to future development, the project

includes the adoption of the City's Housing Element and associated Zoning Amendment which are policy documents. The project does not propose any development at this time, but considers potential future development at the City Hall site. As discussed herein and throughout the MND, development at the City Hall site would occur on existing developed lands, avoiding impacts to sensitive plants or wildlife. Additionally, as detailed in responses 11 and 12 and throughout these responses, there are state, federal, and City regulations which require protections for nesting birds.

14. This comment suggests the need for site-specific biological surveys. As detailed in responses 7, 8 and 9, the project does not propose any physical development at this time. Development at the City Hall site is considered more specifically because of the application of the Housing Overlay which would incentivize development there; this is the only site at which there is a proposed change in development potential. However, the development would be limited to existing disturbed/developed areas of the site and would avoid sensitive biological resources, negating the obligation to require a biological resources survey. Any work related to the on-site oak trees would be handled consistent with the City's Tree Preservation and Protection Ordinance. Furthermore, development of housing citywide would be subject to the City of Bradbury applicable ordinances and development permit procedures of Title IX, Part IV, Section 9.28.060 Environmental Assessment, which requires all projects as defined by CEQA to be reviewed and processed in accordance with CEQA and any local environmental regulations.
15. This comment recommends mitigation measures for general biological impacts. As detailed throughout the MND and these responses, the project is not associated with any significant impacts to biological resources; therefore, no mitigation is required.
16. As detailed in Section 5.0, the City has indicated that payment of Fish and Game fees would be provided upon filing the Notice of Determination. While all biological resource impacts are determined to be less than significant, the City understands the high bar for obtaining a No Effect Determination; therefore, the fee will be paid. This is not a comment on the adequacy of the environmental document.
17. Conclusion paragraph is noted. The City will notify CDFW of future hearings and responses to comments.

Attachment 1: CDFW Comment letter with Numbering

ATTACHMENT 1



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 24, 2023

Kevin Kearney
City of Bradbury
600 Winston Ave
Bradbury, CA 91008
kkearney@cityofbradbury.org

Subject: Comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the City of Bradbury 2021-2029 6th Cycle Housing Element Update and Zoning Amendments Project, SCH # 2023020514, Los Angeles County

Dear Mr. Kearney:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has reviewed the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the City of Bradbury 2021-2029 6th Housing Element Update and Zoning Amendments Project (Project) from the City of Bradbury (City). Associated documentation includes the 2021-2029 Housing Element (HEU). Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and recommendations regarding those activities involved in the Project that may affect California fish and wildlife. Likewise, we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments regarding those aspects of the Project that CDFW, by law, may be required to carry out or approve through the exercise of its own regulatory authority under the Fish and Game Code.

CDFW's Role

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

CDFW is also submitting comments as a Responsible Agency under CEQA (Pub. Resources Code, § 21069; CEQA Guidelines, § 15381). CDFW expects that it may need to exercise regulatory authority as provided by the Fish and Game Code, including lake and streambed alteration regulatory authority (Fish & G. Code, § 1600 *et seq.*). Likewise, to the extent implementation of the Project as proposed may result in "take", as defined by State law, of any species protected under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (Fish & G. Code, § 2050 *et seq.*), or CESA-listed rare plant pursuant to the Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA; Fish & G. Code, §1900 *et seq.*), CDFW recommends the Project proponent obtain appropriate authorization under the Fish and Game Code.

Kevin Kearney
City of Bradbury
Page 2 of 20

Project Description and Summary

#2

Objective: The proposed Housing Element Update establishes programs, policies, and actions to further the goal of meeting the existing and projected housing needs of all family household levels of the community. It will also provide evidence of the City's ability to accommodate the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation through the year 2029, as established by the Southern California Association of Governments. To meet the City's RHNA for lower income households, the City has primarily identified affordable housing opportunities through Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) developments. The City has also identified opportunity for affordable housing development at the City Hall site located at 600 Winston Avenue. The Housing Element includes a program to modify the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone (Chapter 88 of the City's Development Code) to allow for multi-family affordable housing at a density range of 20-35 units per acre, through application of the Overlay Zone to the City Hall site. The Affordable Housing Overlay Zone would be applied to the City Hall site either prior to or concurrent with adoption of the Housing Element. The Affordable Housing Overlay Zone already allows an emergency shelter as an allowable land use. As a result, this Initial Study Checklist includes an evaluation of development of a 18-unit multi-family affordable development, based on development on up to 0.55 acre of the City Hall site at a density of 35 dwelling units per acre and an emergency shelter for up to six persons on the rear parking lot portion of the City Hall site.

Location: The Project would apply to the entire geographic area located within the boundaries of the City of Bradbury, which encompasses 1.9 square miles. The City is located at the base of the San Gabriel Mountains below Angeles National Forest in Los Angeles County. It is bordered on the west by the City of Monrovia, and on the south and east by the City of Duarte.

Comments and Recommendations

#3

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. Editorial comments or other recommendations are also included to improve the environmental document. 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 (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081.6; CEQA Guidelines, § 15097).

Specific Comments

Comment #1: Impacts to Oak Trees and Oak Woodland

#4

Issue: The Project's proposed activity will cause impacts to oak woodlands.

Specific impact: The MND indicates that the Project will accommodate the "application of an Affordable Housing Overlay Zone on the City Hall site that would allow development of up to 18 multi-family residential units and an emergency shelter for six individuals, remove two individual oak trees and encroach upon 10 other oak trees through branch and root pruning."

Why impacts would occur: There is no proposed mitigation for impacts to the oak woodland,

Kevin Kearney
 City of Bradbury
 Page 3 of 20

#5

including the removal of two trees, the understory associated vegetation, as well as the impacts through the encroachment activity for 10 oak trees. Any impacts to the critical root zone may jeopardize the health and persistence of the trees on site. Without enforceable compensatory mitigation, the Project will impact and result in a net loss of existing oak trees and their future recruitment both temporarily and permanently. As a result, the Project may result in a net loss of oak trees and oak woodlands.

#6

Evidence impacts would be significant: Oak trees provide nesting and perching habitat for approximately 170 species of birds (Griffin and Muick 1990). Oak woodlands serve several important ecological functions such as protecting soils from erosion and land sliding; regulating water flow in watersheds; and maintaining water quality in streams and rivers. Oak woodlands also have higher levels of biodiversity than any other terrestrial ecosystem in California (Block et al. 1990). Coast live oak and old-growth oak trees (native oak tree that is greater than 15 inches in diameter) are of importance due to increased biological values and increased temporal loss. Due to the historic and on-going loss of this ecologically important vegetation community, oak trees and woodlands are protected by local and State ordinances. CDFW considers oak woodlands a sensitive vegetation community.

Recommended Potentially Feasible Mitigation Measure(s):

Mitigation Measure #1: Prior to any Project ground-disturbing activities, the City should determine:

#7

- 1) Acres of oak woodlands impacted and density, coverage, and abundance of understory vegetation species impacted by life form (i.e., grass, forb, shrub, subshrub, vine);
- 2) Mitigation ratios if the loss of any oaks are anticipated and total number and/or area of replacement trees and vegetation. The mitigation site should mimic the pre-Project percent basal, canopy, and vegetation cover of oak woodland impacted. Associated understory and early successional native species should be planted and monitored along with trees to achieve viable habitat and adequately compensate for biological functions lost;
- 3) Location of restoration areas and a discussion of the adequacy of the location(s) to serve as mitigation (e.g., would support oak trees/oak woodlands; avoid habitat type conversion);
- 4) Location and assessment of appropriate reference site(s) to inform the appropriate planting rate to recreate the pre-Project function, density, percent basal, canopy, and vegetation cover of oak woodland impacted;
- 5) Scientific [Genus and species (subspecies/variety if applicable)] of all plants being used for restoration;
- 6) Location(s) of propagule source. Propagules should be collected or grown from on-site sources or adjacent areas within the same watershed and should not be purchased from a supplier. Seeds must originate from plants/trees of the same species (i.e., Genus, species, subspecies, and variety) as the species impacted; and
- 7) Species-specific planting methods (i.e., container).

Mitigation Measure #2: CDFW recommends the following measures be taken to protect any oak trees designated to have root systems pruned due to construction activities. These measures should be performed by a certified arborist or under the supervision of a certified arborist and/or qualified restoration professional. The exposed tap root, main roots, and any surface-feeding roots exceeding one inch in diameter should be wrapped in protective

Kevin Kearney
City of Bradbury
Page 4 of 20

moistened burlap during the excavation. Work should be done as quickly as possible to expose the roots for as little time as possible and the roots should be reburied with clean fill as soon as is feasible (no longer than a day or so, if possible). The burlap should be kept moist. Roots should be cut with sharpened, clean, disinfected tools (10% bleach solution) with every effort to avoid tearing the root and to avoid tearing the root surface. If a certified arborist or and/or qualified restoration professional determines work is being performed improperly, that individual(s) should stop work and determine the best course of action to avoid any tree damage or mortality before restarting work.

If any root disturbing activities are determined to have caused irreversible impacts that may eventually lead to decreased health or mortality of any oak tree, those activities and potential impacts should be documented immediately. All documentation should be summarized in a report provided to the City. Preserved oak trees that may succumb to impacts should be replaced with oak trees that are of the same species and variety.

Mitigation Measure #3: Placement of fill dirt, staging areas, chemicals, or debris should be away from any oak trees designated to be preserved.

Mitigation Measure #4: The City/Project proponent should work with a certified arborist and/or qualified restoration professional to select the most appropriate location for replacement oak trees. Oak trees should not be planted in areas that may be subject to future ground disturbance work that may impact replacement trees. Locations should have appropriate biological or physical factors required by oak trees to grow and persist where possible.

The City should work with a certified arborist and/or qualified restoration professional to acquire appropriately sized, locally sourced oak trees from a local native plant nursery that implements *Phytophthora*/Clean Nursery Stock protocols. This may reduce the probability of introducing oak trees contaminated with pests, diseases, and pathogens that could spread and infect native oak trees or habitats. A certified arborist and/or qualified restoration professional should inspect and potentially quarantine nursery stock before bringing them into the Project site and supervise the installation/transplanting of the oak trees.

The City should protect and monitor the survivorship of planted oak trees until the trees begin to produce seeds. The City should consult with the certified arborist and/or qualified restoration professional on a long-term maintenance plan to provide protective caging, shading, and irrigation. Oak trees should be protected from trampling, damage, or climbing. The City should also consult with the certified arborist and/or qualified restoration professional if coast live oak trees show symptoms of stress and determine the appropriate response to prevent mortality.

Mitigation Measure #5: The oak woodland restoration site should be monitored and managed for a minimum of 10 years to ensure success of the restoration effort. In addition, trees that have had roots pruned should also be monitored and evaluated to determine any decline in health. If a severe decline in health or mortality is seen in any of these trees, they should be removed and mitigated for.

Comment #2: Impacts to Streams

Issue: Development of potential sites facilitated by the Project could impact streams.

#7 cont.

#8

Kevin Kearney
City of Bradbury
Page 5 of 20

#8 cont.

Specific impacts: According to Figure IV-3: Bradbury Sites Inventory in the HEU, several sites identified for housing needs are adjacent to identified streams. Development in these areas may result in erosion and earth movement that could impair streams. These impacts may occur in ephemeral, intermittent, or perennial streams. In addition, vegetation along streams may need to be removed or may be degraded through habitat modification (e.g., loss of water source, encroachment, and edge effects leading to introduction of non-native plants).

Why impacts would occur: According to Figure IV-3 of the HEU, vacant undeveloped parcels have been identified to meet housing needs in the City. At least two of these sites are adjacent to a canal. Development of these sites could affect riparian habitat during project construction and operation. Development on these and potentially other sites may result in ground-disturbing activities and vegetation removal. Ground-disturbing activities and vegetation removal could result in erosion. Siltation or runoff downstream could impair streams and herbaceous vegetation. Herbaceous vegetation adjacent to streams protects the physical and ecological integrity of these water features and maintains natural sedimentation processes. Therefore, project sites that would impact vegetation adjacent to streams, but not the stream itself, may still impact the stream.

In addition, the MND does not recognize the potential need for Section 1602 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement, nor does it prescribe, require, or impose specific actions that would substantially mitigate for impacts on streams and associated natural communities. The MND does not require future development facilitated by the Project to undertake any measures to mitigate for impacts on streams and associated natural communities. As a result, the Project could result in unmitigated impacts.

#9

Evidence impacts would be significant: CDFW exercises its regulatory authority as provided by Fish and Game Code section 1600 et seq. to conserve fish and wildlife resources which includes rivers, streams, or lakes and associated natural communities. 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.

CDFW requires a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement when a project activity may substantially adversely affect fish and wildlife resources. The Project may result in significant impacts on streams and associated natural communities if development of sites identified by the Project or future projects would be in close proximity to these resources. Without appropriate mitigation, the Project continues to have a substantial adverse direct, indirect, and cumulative effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on fish and wildlife resources, including rivers, streams, or lakes and associated natural communities identified by CDFW.

Recommended Potentially Feasible Mitigation Measure(s) Required for Future Projects Facilitated by the Housing Element:

#10

Mitigation Measure #6: Project specific analyses should prepare a jurisdictional delineation and impact assessment provided along with the project's biological resources technical studies.

Kevin Kearney
City of Bradbury
Page 6 of 20

Mitigation Measure #7: If any river, stream, or lake are present and may be impacted, the project should be required to avoid impacts by implementing appropriate vegetative buffers and/or setbacks adjoining the stream or wetland feature to reduce impacts of the project on these resources.

Mitigation Measure #8: If avoidance is not feasible, the project applicant should be required to notify CDFW pursuant to Fish and Game Code 1602 and obtain an LSA Agreement from CDFW prior to obtaining a grading permit. The project applicant should comply with the mitigation measures detailed in an LSA Agreement issued by CDFW. The project applicant should also provide compensatory mitigation at no less than 2:1 for any impacted stream and associated natural community, or at a ratio acceptable to CDFW. Please visit CDFW's [Lake and Streambed Alteration Program](#) webpage for more information (CDFW 2023a).

Recommendation #1: CDFW recommends the MND require any projects to include an analysis of potential impacts in subsequent CEQA documents on biological resources resulting from any proposed water diversion. At a minimum, the analysis should evaluate a study reach that includes the channel downstream from a project site. The study reach should extend a minimum of one mile downstream or an appropriate distance determined by both a qualified biologist and hydrologist, whichever is greater. The analysis of the study reach should discuss changes in hydrology and hydraulics, including the following:

1. Under pre-project (i.e., baseline) conditions, the volume of water flow from both the project area and study reach during a) the wet (November through March); b) the dry season (April through October); and c) above-average and below-average water year (i.e., wet season/above-average water year, wet season/below-average water year, dry season/above-average water year, and dry season/below-average water year). The analysis should clearly define above-average or below-average rainfall year.
2. Under proposed project conditions, the percent reduction in flow from both the project area and study reach for a wet season/above-average water year, wet season/below-average water year, dry season/above-average water year, and dry season/below-average water year.
3. A quantitative analysis comparing the flow from the project area and other tributaries into the study reach, and their relative contribution to the hydrograph of the study reach.
4. An analysis of potential project-related changes to river hydraulics in both concrete-lined and soft-bottom reaches. This includes water depth (percent change), wetted perimeter (acres gained/lost), and velocity (percent change).

Recommendation #2: 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 from the lead agency/project applicant for the project. To minimize additional requirements by CDFW pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 1600 et seq. and/or under CEQA, a project's CEQA document should fully identify the potential impacts to the stream or riparian resources and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, monitoring, and reporting commitments for issuance of the LSA Agreement. To compensate for any on- and off-site impacts to aquatic and riparian resources, additional mitigation conditioned in any LSA Agreement may include the following: erosion and pollution control measures; avoidance of resources; protective measures for downstream resources; on- and/or off-site habitat creation; enhancement or restoration; and/or protection and management of mitigation lands in perpetuity.

Kevin Kearney
City of Bradbury
Page 7 of 20

Comment #3: Impacts to Nesting Birds

Issue: Aerial photography indicates ornamental trees around sites inventoried that may provide habitat for nesting birds.

Specific impacts: Construction during the breeding season of nesting birds could result in the incidental loss of fertile eggs or nestlings or otherwise lead to nest abandonment in trees adjacent to a project site.

Why impact would occur: The MND does not provide any avoidance or minimization measures for nesting birds. Without any protective measures, impacts to nesting birds could result from ground disturbing activities related to housing development. Impacts could result from noise disturbances, increased human activity, increased lighting, dust, vegetation clearing, ground disturbing activities (e.g., staging, access, excavation, grading), and vibrations caused by heavy equipment. Project disturbance activities could result in mortality or injury to nestlings, as well temporary or long-term loss of suitable foraging habitats. Construction during the breeding season of nesting birds could result in the incidental loss of breeding success or otherwise lead to nest abandonment.

Evidence impact would be significant: The loss of occupied habitat or reductions in the number of rare bird species, either directly or indirectly through nest abandonment or reproductive suppression, would constitute a significant impact absent appropriate mitigation. Furthermore, nests of all native bird species are protected under state laws and regulations, including Fish and Game Code sections 3503 and 3503.5.

Recommended Potentially Feasible Mitigation Measure(s) Required for Future Projects Facilitated by the Housing Element:

Mitigation Measure #9: To protect nesting birds that may occur on site or adjacent to the Project boundary, CDFW recommends that no construction occur from February 1 through September 15, as early as January 1 for some raptors.

Mitigation Measure #10: If avoidance during the nesting season is not feasible, a qualified biologist should complete a survey for nesting bird activity within a 500-foot radius of the construction site. The nesting bird surveys should be conducted at appropriate nesting times and concentrate on potential roosting or perch sites. CDFW recommends the Lead Agency require surveys be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 7 days prior to the beginning of any Project-related activity likely to impact raptors and migratory songbirds, for the entire Project site. If Project activities are delayed or suspended for more than 7 days during the breeding season, repeat the surveys. If nesting raptors and migratory songbirds are identified, CDFW recommends the following minimum no-disturbance buffers be implemented: 300 feet around active passerine (perching birds and songbirds) nests, 500 feet around active non-listed raptor nests and 0.5 mile around active listed bird nests.

These buffers should be maintained until the breeding season has ended or until a qualified biologist has determined that the birds have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival.

#12

#13

Kevin Kearney
City of Bradbury
Page 8 of 20

#13 cont.

Mitigation Measure #11: It should be noted that the temporary halt of Project activities within nesting buffers during nesting season does not constitute effective mitigation for the purposes of offsetting Project impacts associated with habitat loss. Additional mitigation would be necessary to compensate for the permanent removal of nesting habitat within the Project site based on acreage of impact and vegetation composition. CDFW shall be consulted to determine proper mitigation for impacts to occupied habitat depending on the status of the bird species. Mitigation ratios would increase with the occurrence of a California Species of Special Concern and would further increase with the occurrence of a CESA-listed species.

Comment #4: Biological Review

Issue: The MND does not indicate biological surveys will take place for site development under the HEU.

Specific impacts: Without appropriate biological surveys prior to development of residential areas, there is potential to impact biological resources. This may result in injury or death to unidentified wildlife or plant species as well as permanent impacts to their habitat.

Why impact would occur: Impacts to plant and wildlife species not previously known or identified to be on the Project site or within its vicinity have the possibility to occur. In addition, special status species that may exist on project sites or within its vicinity would go unidentified. Therefore, Project implementation, including grading, vegetation clearing, road construction, and road maintenance, may result in direct mortality, population declines, or local extirpation of sensitive plant and wildlife species that were not previously known or identified. This may result in mortality, reduced reproductive capacity, population declines, or local extirpation of a sensitive or special status plant or wildlife species.

#14

Evidence impact would be significant: Impacts to special status plant or wildlife 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 or wildlife 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 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).

Recommended Potentially Feasible Mitigation Measure(s) Required for Future Projects Facilitated by the Housing Element:

#15

Mitigation Measure #12: The City should retain a qualified biologist to prepare Biological Resources Assessments for review and approval by the City and other necessary agencies. The assessment should include biological field survey(s) of the project site to characterize the extent and quality of habitat that would be impacted by development. Surveys shall include

Kevin Kearney
 City of Bradbury
 Page 9 of 20

baseline surveys, protocol-level surveys, and tree inventories to confirm the presence of any special status species within or immediately adjacent to proposed impact areas. Surveys shall be conducted by qualified biologists and/or botanists in accordance with CDFW and/or United States Fish and Wildlife Services survey protocols for target species. Biological Resources Assessments should provide and include the following:

1. A complete, recent, assessment of rare, threatened, and endangered species, regionally and locally unique species, and sensitive habitats at the project site and within the area of potential effect, including California Species of Special Concern and California Fully Protected Species (Fish & G. Code, §§ 3511, 4700, 5050, and 5515). Species to be addressed should include all those which meet the CEQA definition of endangered, rare, or threatened species (CEQA Guidelines, § 15380). Seasonal variations in use of land around the project site should also be addressed. A nine-quadrangle search of CDFW's [California Natural Diversity Database](#) (CNDDDB) should be conducted to obtain current information on any previously reported sensitive species and habitat (CDFW 2023b);
2. A thorough, recent, floristic-based assessment of special status plants and natural communities following CDFW's [Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities](#) (CDFW 2018). Adjoining habitat areas should be included where project construction and activities could lead to direct or indirect impacts off site;
3. Floristic, alliance- and/or association-based mapping and vegetation impact assessments conducted at the project site and within the area of potential effect. The [Manual of California Vegetation](#) (MCV), second edition, should be used to inform this mapping and assessment;
4. A rare plant assessment using online databases for rare, threatened, and endangered plants, including the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) [Online Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California](#) (CNPS 2022) as well as the Calflora's [Information on Wild California Plants](#) database (Calflora 2022);
5. A discussion regarding project-related indirect impacts on biological resources in nearby public lands, open space, adjacent natural habitats, riparian ecosystems, and any designated and/or proposed or existing reserve lands [e.g., preserve lands associated with a Natural Community Conservation Plan (Fish & G. Code, § 2800 et. seq.)]; and
6. Impacts on, and maintenance of, wildlife corridor/movement areas, including access to undisturbed habitats in areas adjacent to the project site.

If biological resources are documented on the Project site, the Project proponent should comply with the applicable requirements of the regulatory agencies and should apply mitigation determined through the agency permitting process.

Additional Recommendations

Recommendation #3: 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 detected by completing and submitting [CNDDDB Field Survey Forms](#) (CDFW 2023c). This includes all documented occurrences of special status species. The City should ensure the data has been properly submitted, with all data fields applicable filled out, prior to Project ground-disturbing activities. The data entry should also list pending development as a threat and then update this

#15
 cont

Kevin Kearney
City of Bradbury
Page 10 of 20

#15
cont.

occurrence after impacts have occurred. The City should provide CDFW with confirmation of data submittal.

Recommendation #4: 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

#16

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 of Lancaster 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 & G. Code, § 711.4; Pub. Resources Code, § 21089).


Conclusion

#17

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 Felicia Silva, Environmental Scientist, at Felicia.Silva@wildlife.ca.gov or (562) 292-8105.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:



5991E19EF8094C3...
For Erin Wilson-Olgin

Environmental Program Manager I

EC: CDFW

Victoria Tang – Seal Beach – Victoria.Tang@wildlife.ca.gov

Ruby Kwan-Davis – Seal Beach – Ruby.Kwan-Davis@wildlife.ca.gov

Felicia Silva – Seal Beach – Felicia.Silva@wildlife.ca.gov

Julisa Portugal – Seal Beach – Julisa.Portugal@wildlife.ca.gov

Andrew Aitken - Seal Beach - andrew.aitken@wildlife.ca.gov

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

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

State Clearinghouse - state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov

Kevin Kearney
City of Bradbury
Page 11 of 20

References:

- Block, W.M., Morrison, M.M., Verner, J. 1990. Wildlife and oak-woodland interdependency. *Fremontia* 18(3):72-76.
- [CDFWa] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2023. Lake and Streambed Alteration Program. Available from: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/LSA>
- [CDFWb] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2023. California Natural Diversity Database. Available from: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Maps-andData#43018408-cnddb-in-bios>
- [CDFWc] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2023. Submitting Data to the CNDDDB. Available from: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Submitting-Data>
- [CDFW] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2018. Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities. Available from: <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=18959>
- Calflora. 2022. Information on Wild California Plants. Available from: <https://www.calflora.org/>
- [CNPS] California Native Plant Society, Rare Plant Program. 2022. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (online edition, v9-01 1.0). Available from: <https://www.rareplants.cnps.org>
- Griffin and Muick. 1990. California Native Oaks: Past and Present. *Fremontia* 18(3): 4-12.
- [MCV]. A Manual of California Vegetation, 2nd ed. (2023) Available from: <https://vegetation.cnps.org/>



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- Oak Woodland	<p>Prior to any Project ground-disturbing activities, the City shall determine:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Acres of oak woodlands impacted and density, coverage, and abundance of understory vegetation species impacted by life form (i.e., grass, forb, shrub, subshrub, vine); 2) Mitigation ratios if the loss of any oaks are anticipated and total number and/or area of replacement trees and vegetation. The mitigation site shall mimic the pre-Project percent basal, canopy, and vegetation cover of oak woodland impacted. Associated understory and early successional native species shall be planted and monitored along with trees to achieve viable habitat and adequately compensate for biological functions lost; 3) Location of restoration areas and a discussion of the adequacy of the location(s) to serve as mitigation (e.g., would support oak trees/oak woodlands; avoid habitat type conversion); 4) Location and assessment of appropriate reference site(s) to inform the appropriate planting rate to recreate the pre-Project function, density, percent basal, canopy, and vegetation cover of oak woodland impacted; 	<p>Prior to Project construction and activities</p>	<p>City of Bradbury/Project Applicant</p>

Kevin Kearney
 City of Bradbury
 Page 13 of 20

	<p>5) Scientific [Genus and species (subspecies/variety if applicable)] of all plants being used for restoration;</p> <p>6) Location(s) of propagule source. Propagules shall be collected or grown from on-site sources or adjacent areas within the same watershed and shall not be purchased from a supplier. Seeds must originate from plants/trees of the same species (i.e., Genus, species, subspecies, and variety) as the species impacted; and</p> <p>7) Species-specific planting methods (i.e., container).</p>		
<p>MM-BIO-2- Oak Woodland</p>	<p>The following measures will be taken to protect any oak trees designated to have root systems pruned due to construction activities. These measures shall be performed by a certified arborist or under the supervision of a certified arborist and/or qualified restoration professional. The exposed tap root, main roots and any surface-feeding roots exceeding one inch in diameter shall be wrapped in protective moistened burlap during the excavation. Work shall be done as quickly as possible to expose the roots for as little time as possible and the roots shall be reburied with clean fill as soon as is feasible (no longer than a day or so, if possible). The burlap shall be kept moist. Roots shall be cut with sharpened, clean, disinfected tools (10% bleach solution) with every effort to avoid tearing the root and to avoid tearing the root surface. If a certified arborist or and/or qualified restoration professional determines work is being performed improperly, that individual(s) shall stop work and determine the best course of action to avoid any tree damage or mortality before restarting work.</p> <p>If any root disturbing activities are determined to have caused irreversible impacts that may eventually lead to decreased health or mortality of any oak tree, those activities and potential impacts shall be documented immediately. All documentation shall be summarized in a report provided to the City. Preserved oak trees that may succumb to impacts shall be replaced with oak trees</p>	<p>Prior to Project construction and activities</p>	<p>City of Bradbury/Project Applicant</p>

Kevin Kearney
 City of Bradbury
 Page 14 of 20

MM-BIO-3-Oak Woodland	Placement of fill dirt, staging areas, chemicals, or debris shall be away from any oak trees designated to be preserved.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Bradbury/Project Applicant
MM-BIO-4-Oak Woodland	<p>The City/Project proponent shall work with a certified arborist and/or qualified restoration professional to select the most appropriate location for replacement oak trees. Oak trees shall not be planted in areas that may be subject to future ground disturbance work that may impact replacement trees. Locations shall have appropriate biological or physical factors required by oak trees to grow and persist where possible.</p> <p>The City shall work with a certified arborist and/or qualified restoration professional to acquire appropriately sized, locally sourced oak trees from a local native plant nursery that implements <i>Phytophthora</i>/Clean Nursery Stock protocols. This may reduce the probability of introducing oak trees contaminated with pests, diseases, and pathogens that could spread and infect native oak trees or habitats. A certified arborist and/or qualified restoration professional shall inspect and potentially quarantine nursery stock before bringing them into the Project site and supervise the installation/transplanting of the oak trees.</p> <p>The City shall protect and monitor the survivorship of planted oak trees until the trees begin to produce seeds. The City shall consult with the certified arborist and/or qualified restoration professional on a long-term maintenance plan to provide protective caging, shading, and irrigation. Oak trees shall be protected from trampling, damage, or climbing. The City shall also consult with the certified arborist and/or qualified restoration professional if coast live oak trees show symptoms of stress and determine the appropriate response to prevent mortality.</p>	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Bradbury/Project Applicant
MM-BIO-5-Oak Woodland	The oak woodland restoration site shall be monitored and managed for a minimum of 10 years to ensure success of the restoration effort. In addition, trees that have had roots pruned	Prior to Project	City of Bradbury/Project Applicant

Kevin Kearney
City of Bradbury
Page 15 of 20

	shall also be monitored and evaluated to determine any decline in health. If a severe decline in health or mortality is seen in any of these trees, they shall be removed and mitigated for.	construction and activities	
MM-BIO-6-Impacts to Streams	Project specific analyses shall prepare a jurisdictional delineation and impact assessment provided along with the project's biological resources technical studies.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Bradbury/Project Applicant
MM-BIO-7-Impacts to Streams	If any river, stream, or lake are present and may be impacted, the project shall be required to avoid impacts by implementing appropriate vegetative buffers and/or setbacks adjoining the stream or wetland feature to reduce impacts of the project on these resources.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Bradbury/Project Applicant
MM-BIO-8-Impacts to Streams	If avoidance is not feasible, the project applicant shall be required to notify CDFW pursuant to Fish and Game Code 1602 and obtain an LSA Agreement from CDFW prior to obtaining a grading permit. The project applicant shall comply with the mitigation measures detailed in an LSA Agreement issued by CDFW. The project applicant shall also provide compensatory mitigation at no less than 2:1 for any impacted stream and associated natural community, or at a ratio acceptable to CDFW. Please visit CDFW's Lake and Streambed Alteration Program webpage for more information (CDFW 2023a).	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Bradbury/Project Applicant
REC-1-Impacts to Streams	CDFW recommends the MND require any projects to include an analysis of potential impacts in subsequent CEQA documents on biological resources resulting from any proposed water diversion. At a minimum, the analysis should evaluate a study reach that includes the channel downstream from a project site. The study reach should extend a minimum of one mile downstream, or an appropriate distance determined by both a qualified biologist and hydrologist, whichever is greater. The analysis of the study reach should discuss changes in hydrology and hydraulics, including the following: 1. Under pre-project (i.e., baseline) conditions, the volume of water flow from both the project area and study reach during a)	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Bradbury/Project Applicant

	<p>the wet (November through March); b) the dry season (April through October); and c) above-average and below-average water year (i.e., wet season/above-average water year, wet season/below-average water year, dry season/above-average water year, and dry season/below-average water year). The analysis should clearly define above-average or below-average rainfall year.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Under proposed project conditions, the percent reduction in flow from both the project area and study reach for a wet season/above-average water year, wet season/below-average water year, dry season/above-average water year, and dry season/below-average water year. 3. A quantitative analysis comparing the flow from the project area and other tributaries into the study reach, and their relative contribution to the hydrograph of the study reach. 4. An analysis of potential project-related changes to river hydraulics in both concrete-lined and soft-bottom reaches. This includes water depth (percent change), wetted perimeter (acres gained/lost), and velocity (percent change). 		
<p>REC-2- Impacts to Streams</p>	<p>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 from the lead agency/project applicant for the project. To minimize additional requirements by CDFW pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 1600 et seq. and/or under CEQA, a project's CEQA document should fully identify the potential impacts to the stream or riparian resources and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, monitoring, and reporting commitments for issuance of the LSA Agreement. To compensate for any on- and off-site impacts to aquatic and riparian resources, additional mitigation conditioned in any LSA Agreement may include the following: erosion and pollution control measures; avoidance of resources; protective measures for downstream resources; on- and/or off-site habitat creation; enhancement or restoration; and/or protection and management of mitigation lands</p>	<p>Prior to Project construction and activities</p>	<p>City of Bradbury/Project Applicant</p>

Kevin Kearney
 City of Bradbury
 Page 17 of 20

	in perpetuity.		
MM-BIO-9- Nesting Birds	To protect nesting birds that may occur on site or adjacent to the Project boundary, CDFW recommends that no construction occur from February 1 through September 15, as early as January 1 for some raptors.	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Bradbury/Project Applicant
MM-BIO-10- Nesting Birds	<p>If avoidance during the nesting season is not feasible, a qualified biologist shall complete a survey for nesting bird activity within a 500-foot radius of the construction site. The nesting bird surveys shall be conducted at appropriate nesting times and concentrate on potential roosting or perch sites. The Lead Agency shall require surveys be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 7 days prior to the beginning of any Project-related activity likely to impact raptors and migratory songbirds, for the entire Project site. If Project activities are delayed or suspended for more than 7 days during the breeding season, repeat the surveys. If nesting raptors and migratory songbirds are identified, the following minimum no-disturbance buffers be implemented: 300 feet around active passerine (perching birds and songbirds) nests, 500 feet around active non-listed raptor nests and 0.5 mile around active listed bird nests.</p> <p>These buffers shall be maintained until the breeding season has ended or until a qualified biologist has determined that the birds have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival.</p>	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Bradbury/Project Applicant
MM-BIO-11- Nesting Birds	It shall be noted that the temporary halt of Project activities within nesting buffers during nesting season does not constitute effective mitigation for the purposes of offsetting Project impacts associated with habitat loss. Additional mitigation would be necessary to compensate for the permanent removal of nesting habitat within the Project site based on acreage of impact and vegetation composition. CDFW shall be consulted to determine proper mitigation for impacts to occupied habitat depending on the status of the bird species. Mitigation ratios would increase with the	Prior to Project construction and activities	City of Bradbury/Project Applicant

Kevin Kearney
 City of Bradbury
 Page 18 of 20

	<p>occurrence a California Species of Special Concern and would further increase with the occurrence of a CESA-listed species.</p>		
<p>MM-BIO-12-Bio Review</p>	<p>The City shall retain a qualified biologist to prepare Biological Resources Assessments for review and approval by the City and other necessary agencies. The assessment shall include biological field survey(s) of the project site to characterize the extent and quality of habitat that would be impacted by development. Surveys shall include baseline surveys, protocol-level surveys, tree inventories to confirm the presence of any special status species within or immediately adjacent to proposed impact areas. Surveys shall be conducted by qualified biologists and/or botanists in accordance with California Department of Fish and Wildlife and/or United States Fish and Wildlife Services survey protocols for target species. Biological Resources Assessments shall provide and include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A complete, recent, assessment of rare, threatened, and endangered species, regionally and locally unique species, and sensitive habitats at the project site and within the area of potential effect, including California Species of Special Concern and California Fully Protected Species (Fish & G. Code, §§ 3511, 4700, 5050, and 5515). Species to be addressed shall include all those which meet the CEQA definition of endangered, rare, or threatened species (CEQA Guidelines, § 15380). Seasonal variations in use of land around the project site shall also be addressed. A nine-quadrangle search of CDFW's California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) shall be conducted to obtain current information on any previously reported sensitive species and habitat (CDFW 2023b); 2. A thorough, recent, floristic-based assessment of special status plants and natural communities following CDFW's Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities (CDFW 2018). Adjoining habitat areas shall 	<p>Prior to Project construction and activities</p>	<p>City of Bradbury/Project Applicant</p>

Kevin Kearney
 City of Bradbury
 Page 19 of 20

	<p>be included where project construction and activities could lead to direct or indirect impacts off site;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Floristic, alliance- and/or association-based mapping and vegetation impact assessments conducted at the project site and within the area of potential effect. The Manual of California Vegetation (MCV), second edition, shall be used to inform this mapping and assessment; 4. A rare plant assessment using online databases for rare, threatened, and endangered plants, including the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Online Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (CNPS 2022) as well as the Calflora’s Information on Wild California Plants database (Calflora 2022); 5. A discussion regarding project-related indirect impacts on biological resources in nearby public lands, open space, adjacent natural habitats, riparian ecosystems, and any designated and/or proposed or existing reserve lands [e.g., preserve lands associated with a Natural Community Conservation Plan (Fish & G. Code, § 2800 et. seq.)]; and 6. Impacts on, and maintenance of, wildlife corridor/movement areas, including access to undisturbed habitats in areas adjacent to the project site. <p>If biological resources are documented on the Project site, the Project proponent shall comply with the applicable requirements of the regulatory agencies and shall apply mitigation determined through the agency permitting process.”</p>		
<p>REC-4-Data</p>	<p>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 detected by completing and submitting CNDDB Field Survey Forms (CDFW 2023c). This includes all documented occurrences of special status species. The City should ensure the data has</p>	<p>Prior to Project construction and activities</p>	<p>City of Bradbury/Project Applicant</p>

Kevin Kearney
City of Bradbury
Page 20 of 20

	been properly submitted, with all data fields applicable filled out, prior to Project ground-disturbing activities. The data entry should also list pending development as a threat and then update this occurrence after impacts have occurred. The City should provide CDFW with confirmation of data submittal.		
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--