



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



November 25, 2019
Sent via email

Governor's Office of Planning & Research

NOV 25 2019

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

Ms. Sandra Yang
Senior Planner
City of Corona
400 S. Vincentia Avenue
Corona, CA 92882
Sandra.Yang@CoronaCA.gov

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report
Bedford Marketplace Project
State Clearinghouse No. 2006091093

Dear Ms. Yang:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) received a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) to the Arantine Hills Specific Plan EIR (SCH#2006091093) from the City of Corona (City) for the Bedford Marketplace/ DPR2019-0019, DPR2019-0020, and DPR2019-0021 Project (Project) pursuant the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines.¹

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

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.

agency environmental review efforts, focusing specifically on projects and related activities that have the potential to adversely affect 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. As proposed, for example, the Project may be subject to CDFW's lake and streambed alteration regulatory authority. (Fish & G. Code, § 1600 et seq.)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

The proposed Project located west of Interstate 15, south of Cajalco Road, and north and south of Bedford Canyon Wash, in the City of Corona, will amend the Arantine Hills Specific Plan (AHSP) to increase the boundary of the AHSP by approximately 17.85 acres. The Project will result in an increase in the size of the planned commercial center within the AHSP, referred to as Bedford Marketplace, and an increase in the acreage of designated Open Space. Specifically, the Project would increase the amount of commercial use to approximately 134,378 square feet plus a 135-room hotel on a combined approximate 21.67 acres. The amount of designed Open Space would increase by approximately 6.21 acres. The Project includes a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, Parcel Map, Noise Variance, Precise Plan, and Conditional Use Permits.

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 SEIR 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 SEIR 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.

The CDFW recommends that the SEIR 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. 2009). 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 and Game 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/MSHCP 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 communities, following CDFW's *Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities* (see <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Plants>).

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 mitigation/conservation lands within and adjacent to the Project.

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

The SEIR 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 SEIR:

1. A discussion of potential impacts from lighting, noise, human activity (e.g., recreation), 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).
3. An evaluation of impacts to 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

Note that the SEIR must 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]).

Mitigation Measures for Project Impacts to Biological Resources

The SEIR should include appropriate and adequate avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures for all direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that are expected to occur as a result of the construction and long-term operation and maintenance of the project. When proposing measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts, CDFW recommends consideration of the following:

1. *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 SEIR should include measures to fully avoid and otherwise protect sensitive plant communities from project-related direct and indirect impacts.
2. *Mitigation*: CDFW considers adverse project-related impacts to sensitive species and habitats to be significant to both local and regional ecosystems, and the SEIR 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 SEIR 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 SEIR. 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 SEIR 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 must be specific, enforceable, and feasible actions that will improve environmental conditions.

3. *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 the near future 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.

4. *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 except as provided by the rules and regulations adopted by the Secretary of the Interior under provisions of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 703 et seq.).

CDFW recommends that the SEIR 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 SEIR 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 SEIR, 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.

5. *Moving out of Harm's Way:* To avoid direct mortality, CDFW recommends that the lead agency condition the SEIR 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.
6. *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.

California Endangered Species Act

CDFW is responsible for ensuring appropriate conservation of fish and wildlife resources including threatened, endangered, and/or candidate plant and animal species, pursuant to CESA. CDFW recommends that a CESA Incidental Take Permit (ITP) be obtained if the Project has the potential to result in "take" (California Fish and

Game Code Section 86 defines "take" as "hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill") of State-listed CESA species, either through construction or over the life of the project; unless this Project is proposed to be a covered activity under the MSHCP. CESA ITPs are issued to conserve, protect, enhance, and restore State-listed CESA species and their habitats.

CDFW encourages early consultation, as significant modification to the proposed Project and avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures may be necessary to obtain a CESA ITP. CDFW must comply with CEQA for issuance of a CESA ITP. CDFW therefore recommends that the SEIR addresses all Project impacts to listed species and specifies a mitigation monitoring and reporting program that will meet the requirements of CESA.

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. In order to be considered a covered activity, Permittees must demonstrate that proposed actions are consistent with the MSHCP and its associated Implementing Agreement. The City is the Lead Agency and is signatory to the Implementing Agreement of the MSHCP. The Project occurs within the Temescal Plan Area. MSHCP policies and procedures that apply to the proposed project include the Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools (MSHCP section 6.1.2), Protection of Narrow Endemic Plant Species (MSHCP section 6.1.3), Additional Survey Needs and Procedures for burrowing owl, and the Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlands Interface (MSHCP section 6.1.4).

Regardless of whether take of threatened and/or endangered species is obtained through the MSHCP or through a CESA ITP, the SEIR needs to address how the proposed project will affect the policies and procedures of the MSHCP. Therefore, all surveys required by the MSHCP policies and procedures listed above to determine

consistency with the MSHCP should be conducted and results included in the SEIR so that CDFW can adequately assess whether the Project will impact the MSHCP.

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 SEIR 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 SEIR must 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 the Project Applicant may 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. It may also apply to work undertaken within the flood plain of a body of water.

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 SEIR 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>.

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). The CNDDDB field survey form can be found at the following link: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/pdfs/CNDDDB_FieldSurveyForm.pdf. 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: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/plants_and_animals.asp.

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 SEIR for the Bedford Marketplace Project (SCH No. 2006091093) and recommends that the City of Corona address CDFW's comments and concerns in the forthcoming SEIR. If you should have any questions pertaining to the comments provided in this letter, please contact Joanna Gibson, Senior Environmental Scientist, Specialist, at (909) 987-7449 or at Joanna.gibson@wildlife.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Scott Wilson
Environmental Program Manager

ec: Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse, Sacramento

REFERENCES

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/>