

**Second Addendum to the
Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
for the
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District
Regional Water Reclamation Facility
Upgrade and Expansion Project**

**Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District
Engineering Department
31315 Chaney Street
Lake Elsinore, California 92530**

July 2023

Table of Contents

SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION	1-1
SECTION 2 – PROJECT AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION.....	2-1
2.1 Project Location.....	2-1
2.2 Background.....	2-1
2.3 Purpose of the Project.....	2-2
2.4 Changes to the Proposed Project.....	2-2
2.5 Construction Staging and Timeline	2-3
2.6 Operations	2-4
SECTION 3 – ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS.....	3-1
3.1 Prior Environmental Analysis and Mitigation	3-1
3.2 Environmental Analysis.....	3-1
SECTION 4 – FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	4-1
SECTION 5 – REFERENCES.....	5-1

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Biological Resources

Appendix B – Cultural Resources

List of Figures

Figure 2-1. Boundaries of the Elsinore Regional Water Reclamation Facility.....	2-2
Figure 2-2. Additional Construction Staging and Laydown Areas (1st Addendum)	2-3
Figure 2-3. Proposed Construction Trailers Site	2-4
Figure 3-1. Swale Location.....	3-3

Section 1 – Introduction

In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), this Second Addendum has been prepared for proposed changes to the Regional Water Reclamation Facility (RWRF) Upgrade and Expansion Project.

Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines states that the Lead Agency for a project shall prepare an addendum to an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or Negative Declaration if some changes or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred. These conditions are:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project, which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken, which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
 - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or Negative Declaration;
 - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives, which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR, would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

In compliance with CEQA and NEPA, an Initial Study (IS)/Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was prepared by the Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EVMWD), acting as the Lead Agency, to provide an assessment of the project's significant effects on the environment. The IS/MND was structured as a CEQA Plus document to meet CEQA and NEPA requirements. EVMWD adopted the MND and approved the project on July 26, 2018. An Addendum to the IS/MND was approved by EVMWD in January 2022 to address minor changes to the project associated with changes to the construction schedule and the use of additional construction staging and laydown areas.

At this time, additional minor changes are proposed to the project, but no changes to its circumstances have occurred, and no new information has become available after adoption of the MND for the project. Specifically, EVMWD is proposing that a disturbed, vacant lot adjacent to the RWRF be used to temporarily house construction trailers during Design Package 2 of the Upgrade and Expansion

Project. This Second Addendum serves as documentation that the proposed use of this site to temporarily house construction trailers would not lead to any new or more severe environmental impacts and that no new or revised mitigation measures are required.

Section 2 – Project and Background Information

EVMWD provides wastewater collection and treatment services to a 96-square-mile service area covering the cities of Lake Elsinore, Canyon Lake, Murrieta, Wildomar, and unincorporated communities of The Farm, Lakeland Village, Cleveland Ridge, Rancho Capistrano-El Cariso Village, Horsethief Canyon, Sedco, and Temescal Canyon in Riverside County. In 2016, EVMWD proposed an upgrade and expansion of its RWRf, which was to include the following elements:

1. **Design Package 1 (Upgrades)**
 - a. Comprehensive Condition Assessment
 - b. Reliability and Redundancy Upgrades
2. **Design Package 2 (Expansion)**
 - a. 4 million gallons per day (mgd) expansion with membrane bioreactor (MBR) and ultraviolet (UV) treatment processes

After completion of the environmental review and clearance process in 2018, construction of planned upgrades to the RWRf (Design Package 1) were initiated in 2022 and have been completed. Construction of the improvements to expand capacity (Design Package 2) are anticipated to begin in summer 2023.

A previous (January 2022) Addendum to the IS/MND addressed changes to the construction schedule for Design Package 2 and the addition of offsite construction staging and laydown areas.

Currently, a new construction trailer location adjacent to the RWRf is being proposed, as evaluated in this Second Addendum to the IS/MND.

PROJECT LOCATION

EVMWD's RWRf is located at 31315 Chaney Street in the City of Lake Elsinore, approximately 0.5 mile northeast of Lake Elsinore. The facility is bound by Strickland and Treleven avenues to the south/southwest and the floodway of Temescal Wash to the north/northeast. The RWRf occupies approximately 51 acres of property owned and operated by EVMWD. Figure 2-1 presents an aerial view of the RWRf project site and its general vicinity.

BACKGROUND

EVMWD provides wastewater collection and treatment services to more than 42,000 service accounts within its service area through 3 wastewater treatment plants, 226 miles of wastewater gravity mains, 11 miles of wastewater force mains, and 31 lift stations. The RWRf, the largest of the three wastewater treatment plants, was originally constructed in 1985 and expanded in 1988 and 2000 to its current capacity of 8 mgd. Facility upgrades were also completed in 2010, 2011, and 2021, but they did not expand capacity.

EVMWD anticipates future growth and development within its service area, and the RWRf is anticipated to receive flows from other water and wastewater treatment plants in the future, as well as from sewer discharges that could be diverted from septic systems to the public sewer system.



Figure 2-1. Boundaries of the Elsinore Regional Water Reclamation Facility

A Master Plan was prepared in 2008 to identify improvements to water and wastewater infrastructure that would meet domestic water and wastewater needs in EVMWD's service area through the year 2030. Subsequently, the RWRF Expansion Master Plan (June 2016) projected steep population growth and increased wastewater flows for EVMWD's service area. The document also identified several improvements to existing facilities that are needed to provide the required process redundancy and enhance the reliability of operations at the RWRF. Per the Master Plan recommendations, EVMWD also intends to expand the RWRF in two phases, first by 4 mgd via the current project and a subsequent second phase to add an additional 4.8 mgd, to bring the ultimate plant capacity to 16.8 mgd by 2040. The RWRF Upgrade and Expansion Project would implement the needed upgrades and improvements and would expand plant capacity by 4 mgd.

PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT

The purpose of the project remains the same:

- Improve plant reliability and reduce operating costs with enhancements that optimize current facilities and plan for future needs; and
- Provide adequate infrastructure facilities to meet wastewater treatment demands in EVMWD's service area through 2030 based on the 2008 Master Plan and the 2016 RWRF Expansion Master Plan.

CHANGES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Design Package 1 (for which construction is completed) served the first purpose of the project. Design Package 2 will serve its second purpose. Design Package 2 involves expansion of the RWRF from an existing capacity of 8 mgd to 12 mgd by adding a new treatment train (Train C) using MBR and UV treatment processes. Proposed improvements include expansion of the influent pump station with

new pumps; expansion of headworks screening and grit removal; expansion and new odor control biofilters; expansion of the Biosolids Building; a new biosolids storage silo and truck loading facility; a standby pump station for Train A filters; conversion of Train B pneumatic filter valve actuators to motorized; modifications to Train B filter feed pump station; new MBR process structures for Train C; new UV light treatment system; new covered parking areas, new mechanical maintenance building; and modifications to existing operations building. No changes to these improvements are proposed, and these improvements would still be constructed within the existing RWRf site.

CONSTRUCTION STAGING AND TIMELINE

As indicated in the IS/MND, the proposed RWRf expansion would require construction activities (e.g., site clearing, excavation, and grading) to occur within the existing plant boundaries. While construction vehicles, equipment, and materials were also initially planned to be staged at the RWRf, offsite construction staging and laydown areas will also be used, as shown in Figure 2-2. These areas consist mostly of EVMWD-owned property and a few privately owned parcels located immediately adjacent to the RWRf. Most of the parcels are also undeveloped, except for the animal clinic at 29001 Baston Avenue.




Figure 2-2. Additional Construction Staging and Laydown Areas (1st Addendum)

As shown in Figure 2-3, Proposed Construction Trailers Site, an additional site adjacent to the RWRf, also on EVMWD-owned land and in close proximity to the additional staging and laydown areas addressed in the first IS/MND Addendum, would be used to temporarily house construction trailers during Design Stage 2 construction. The construction trailers would require minimal grading before installation and would include temporary connections to water, sewer, and electrical utilities, as well as communications (e.g., internet) connections. The proposed construction trailers site would also include a gravel parking area and would be surrounded on three sides—northwest, southwest, and southeast—with chain link fencing. There would be an access gate (or gates) between the fencing and

the adjacent road, Strickland Avenue. The existing chain link fencing between the proposed construction trailers site and the RWRf (northeast side of the proposed construction trailers site) would be removed until the Design Package 2 construction is completed. Construction fencing would also be installed around a small swale near the southeastern portion of the proposed construction trailers site.



Figure 2-3. Proposed Construction Trailers Site

After construction is completed, the trailers, associated structures and equipment, and fencing would be removed. The fence between the proposed construction trailers site and the RWRf would be replaced.

OPERATIONS

The operational impacts of the project were previously evaluated in the IS/MND. No changes to the operations of the expanded RWRf are proposed as part of this Second Addendum, and the facility would continue to be managed by EVMWD.

Section 3 – Environmental Analysis

PRIOR ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND MITIGATION

The IS/MND that was prepared for the project determined that the proposed RWRF upgrade and expansion would have less than significant impacts on most environmental issues. However, potentially significant impacts would occur on biological resources, cultural resources, and tribal cultural resources, and several mitigation measures were identified to reduce these impacts. These measures include:

Biological Resources

1. Delineation of Construction Work Limits
2. Scheduling of Construction
3. Preconstruction Nesting Bird Survey
4. Nesting Bird/Burrowing Owl Awareness Training
5. Nesting Bird Avoidance
6. Avoidance of Damage to Burrows
7. Raptor Nest Protection
8. Nest Discovery Procedure
9. Swallow Exclusion

Cultural Resources

10. Attendance at Pregrade Conference
11. Inadvertent Discovery of Archaeological Materials
12. Paleontological Monitoring and Mitigation Plan
13. Attendance at Pregrade Conference
14. Paleontological Monitoring during Construction
15. Inadvertent Discovery of Paleontological Materials
16. Paleontological Mitigation Report
17. Discovery of Human Remains

Tribal Cultural Resources

18. Tribal Monitoring Plan
19. Treatment and Disposition of Cultural Resources

Project impacts would be less than significant after implementation of these mitigation measures. All mitigation measures are applicable to Design Package 2, except for Measure 6.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Changes in project impacts associated with the use of the proposed site to house temporary construction trailers are assessed below. The analysis follows the outline of the IS/MND, with the impacts on each environmental issue addressed individually.

I. Aesthetics

The use of a site adjacent to the RWRF to house construction trailers would be temporary and would not affect nearby scenic vistas around Lake Elsinore and Temescal Canyon. In addition, the proposed construction trailers site would not affect views from Interstate 15 and State Route 74, which are

eligible State Scenic Highways (i.e., not officially designated). While the proposed project change addressed in this Second Addendum would present views of construction trailers and chain link fencing, changes in views would be temporary, and the areas would revert to existing undeveloped land after construction. As with the project, any lighting for security and safety would be shielded and directed inward to minimize illumination onto adjacent land, in accordance with the Lake Elsinore Municipal Code, Chapter 17.112.040 (Lighting) and Green Building Standards Code (Chapter 15.42 and Light Pollution Reduction). While construction trailers and chain link fencing would not be considered an aesthetic amenity, they would be consistent with the nearby construction activities and existing RWRf facilities; accordingly, this impact would be considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

This is consistent with the findings of the IS/MND for the project.

No changes to RWRf operations are proposed as part of this Second Addendum; therefore, impacts and findings associated with operations remain the same as those analyzed in the IS/MND.

II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

The proposed construction trailers site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. This site is also not in agricultural use and is not under Williamson Act contracts. There is no land within the boundaries of the proposed site that is currently used as forest land, timberland, or timberland production. The Cleveland National Forest is more than 2.5 miles west of the RWRf. Therefore, the use of the proposed construction trailers site would not have an impact on agriculture and forestry resources.

This is consistent with the findings of the IS/MND for the project.

No changes to RWRf operations are proposed as part of this Second Addendum; therefore, impacts and findings associated with operations remain the same as those analyzed in the IS/MND.

III. Air Quality

The use of the proposed construction trailers site would not change the proposed construction activities that are planned under Design Package 2, as evaluated in the IS/MND for the project. Thus, the analysis of impacts on air quality in the IS/MND for the project remains the same, and impacts would be less than significant. Construction emissions would be temporary and minimal, and they would not have adverse, long-term effects on air quality. No mitigation is required.

This is consistent with the findings of the IS/MND for the project.

No changes to RWRf operations are proposed as part of this Second Addendum; therefore, impacts and findings associated with operations remain the same as those analyzed in the IS/MND.

IV. Biological Resources

A HELIX Environmental Planning biologist conducted a general biological survey of the proposed construction trailers site on July 14, 2023 (see Appendix A). The proposed construction trailers site consists of disturbed, disced habitat with a sparse mix of native and non-native plants. A few squirrel burrows were observed, but there was no sign of burrowing owl use. A few paniculate tarplant (*Deinandra paniculata*), a CNPS list 4 plant, were also observed on site.

There is a small swale that originates from a culvert under Strickland Avenue and dissipates on site (see Figure 3-1). This swale likely does not qualify as Waters of the U.S. but could potentially be Waters of the State and subject to the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife pursuant to the California Fish and Game Code. The proposed project does not include any planned construction within, or discharges to, this swale, which would be demarcated by a construction fence to prevent accidental intrusions.



Figure 3-1. Swale Location

Based on the site conditions, and the project's avoidance of construction within/discharges to the swale, the use of this site to temporarily house construction trailers would not lead to new or substantially more severe significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Potential impacts on biological resources would be less than significant with mitigation.

The mitigation measures identified in the IS/MND would be implemented during construction activities at the RWRF. These include:

1. Delineation of Construction Work Limits
2. Scheduling of Construction
3. Preconstruction Nesting Bird Survey
4. Nesting Bird/Burrowing Owl Awareness Training
5. Nesting Bird Avoidance
6. Avoidance of Damage to Burrows
7. Raptor Nest Protection
8. Nest Discovery Procedure
9. Swallow Exclusion

This is consistent with the findings of the IS/MND for the project.

No changes to RWRF operations are proposed as part of this Second Addendum; therefore, impacts and findings associated with operations remain the same as those analyzed in the IS/MND.

V. Cultural Resources

A HELIX Environmental Planning archaeologist conducted a pedestrian survey of the proposed construction trailers site on July 11, 2023, the results of which are provided in Appendix B. The survey did not identify any archaeological sites or historical resources within the proposed trailers site.

Similarly, a previous cultural resources record search for the proposed project did not identify any recorded cultural resources within this site.

Although no historical or archaeological resources were observed on site, installation of the trailers would require ground disturbance, and ground disturbance could affect buried resources that would not have been detectable during the pedestrian survey. Accordingly, the mitigation measures identified in the IS/MND related to cultural and tribal resources are applicable to the proposed installation of construction trailers and associated utility connections:

- 10. Attendance at Pregrade Conference
- 11. Inadvertent Discovery of Archaeological Materials
- 17. Discovery of Human Remains

The depth of ground disturbance associated with the trailers would not be sufficient to warrant paleontological mitigation during trailer installation.

As mitigated, cultural resources impacts would be less than significant, for the reasons described in the IS/MND.

This is consistent with the findings of the IS/MND for the project. No changes to RWRF operations are proposed as part of this Second Addendum; therefore, impacts and findings associated with operations remain the same as those analyzed in the IS/MND.

VI. Energy

Energy use during construction would be minimal and temporary. This would not be considered wasteful and inefficient use, and no new energy supplies would be necessary to meet this short-term demand. The energy consumption during project operations was estimated in the IS/MND and would not change. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

VII. Geology and Soils

The proposed construction trailers site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or in areas with potential for earthquake-induced liquefaction, landslide, or other geologic or seismic hazards. In addition, only minimal ground disturbance and installation of construction trailers, utilities, and fencing is proposed in these areas. Thus, the temporary use of this site to house construction trailers would not expose persons or property to geologic and seismic hazards, nor would it create geologic or seismic hazards. The trailers would be connected to a sewer, and no use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would occur. Similarly, little to no erosion or and no alteration of geologic features would occur.

This is consistent with the findings of the IS/MND for the project.

No changes to RWRF operations are proposed as part of this Second Addendum; therefore, impacts and findings associated with operations remain the same as those analyzed in the IS/MND.

VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The installation and use of construction trailers at the site evaluated in this Second Addendum would be consistent with the proposed construction activities that are planned under Design Package 2 and were previously evaluated in the IS/MND for the project. Thus, the analysis of impacts on greenhouse gas (GHG) in the IS/MND for the project remains the same, and only minor amounts of GHG would be

generated during construction, which would have no long-term effects related to climate change. The temporary use of the proposed construction trailers site would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

This is consistent with the findings of the IS/MND for the project.

No changes to RWRF operations are proposed as part of this Second Addendum; therefore, impacts and findings associated with operations remain the same as those analyzed in the IS/MND.

IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The use of the proposed construction trailers site would not change the type and amount of hazardous materials to be used and the hazardous wastes to be generated for project construction. These hazardous materials would be stored at the staging and laydown areas addressed in the first Addendum to the IS/MND for the project. The use, storage, handling, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes would be made in accordance with pertinent regulations, and no public safety hazards would be created at the proposed construction trailers site.

This is consistent with the findings of the IS/MND for the project.

No changes to RWRF operations are proposed as part of this Second Addendum; therefore, impacts and findings associated with operations remain the same as those analyzed in the IS/MND.

X. Hydrology and Water Quality

Of the proposed features addressed in this Second Addendum, only the trailers and ancillary trailer facilities (deck, stairways, and ADA-accessible ramp) would be impervious. The water and sewer lines would be underground, and the fencing and gravel parking area would not be impervious. Only minor grading (to level the trailer pads) and excavation (for the utility lines and fence post anchors) would occur. No modification would occur to the swale that is connected to the culvert under Strickland Avenue. Thus, only negligible alterations to runoff rates and volumes or to existing drainage patterns would result from the use of the proposed construction trailers site. In addition, the temporary use of this site would not affect underlying groundwater resources nor cause flooding or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Best management practices that would be implemented as part of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for construction activities would also be implemented at the proposed construction trailers site. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

This is consistent with the findings of the IS/MND for the project.

No changes to RWRF operations are proposed as part of this Second Addendum; therefore, impacts and findings associated with operations remain the same as those analyzed in the IS/MND.

XI. Land Use and Planning

The proposed construction trailers and site fencing would not serve as barriers or divide the adjacent community. The use would also be temporary, and the areas would revert back to existing conditions as undeveloped lands after the construction phase. No conflict with land use plans, policies, or regulations would occur.

This is consistent with the findings of the IS/MND for the project.

No changes to RWRf operations are proposed as part of this Second Addendum; therefore, impacts and findings associated with operations remain the same as those analyzed in the IS/MND.

XII. Mineral Resources

There are no aggregate resources or oil wells on the proposed construction trailers site. The temporary use of this site would not lead to the loss of availability of regionally or locally important mineral resources. No impact on mineral resources would occur, and no mitigation is required.

This is consistent with the findings of the IS/MND for the project.

No changes to RWRf operations are proposed as part of this Second Addendum; therefore, impacts and findings associated with operations remain the same as those analyzed in the IS/MND.

XIII. Noise

The use of the proposed construction trailers site would not change the construction and operational noise impacts of the project. However, the proposed construction trailers site would be closer to some residences. As stated in the Lake Elsinore Municipal Code, Section 17.176.060, *Exterior Noise Limit*, construction activities using powered equipment would be confined to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and construction activities between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. are prohibited from increasing noise levels beyond the property line. The City's Noise Ordinance allows daytime noise levels for construction ranging from 75 A-weighted decibels (dBA) in single-family residential districts up to 85 dBA in commercial and industrial districts. Therefore, use of the proposed construction trailers site would not result in the exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

This is consistent with the findings of the IS/MND for the project.

No changes to RWRf operations are proposed as part of this Second Addendum; therefore, impacts and findings associated with operations remain the same as those analyzed in the IS/MND.

XIV. Population and Housing

The use of the proposed construction trailers site would not induce growth nor displace residents, households, or employees. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.

This is consistent with the findings of the IS/MND for the project.

No changes to RWRf operations are proposed as part of this Second Addendum; therefore, impacts and findings associated with operations remain the same as those analyzed in the IS/MND.

XV. Public Services

Temporary use of the proposed construction trailers site would not require fire protection and police protection services that is different than those discussed in the IS/MND for the project. In addition, no demand for schools, parks, or other public facilities would occur. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

This is consistent with the findings of the IS/MND for the project.

No changes to RWRf operations are proposed as part of this Second Addendum; therefore, impacts and findings associated with operations remain the same as those analyzed in the IS/MND.

XVI. Recreation

The use of the proposed construction trailers site would not result in a demand for parks and recreational facilities. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.

This is consistent with the findings of the IS/MND for the project.

No changes to RWRf operations are proposed as part of this Second Addendum; therefore, impacts and findings associated with operations remain the same as those analyzed in the IS/MND.

XVII. Transportation/Traffic

The use of the proposed construction trailers site would have little to no change on the trip generation and traffic patterns associated with construction of the RWRf expansion, as analyzed in the IS/MND. As stated, construction-related traffic would be a temporary, short-term condition and would not result in any substantial or permanent effects on traffic volumes at nearby streets and intersections. Hauling the trailers (or component parts of the trailers) to/from the site would have a negligible impact on traffic. Some construction traffic that would have entered the RWRf via the plant's main gate, specifically cars and light trucks driven by the people working in the trailers, would instead access the RWRf via the gate between Strickland Avenue and the proposed construction trailers site. This minor change in traffic patterns would be negligible in terms of local traffic patterns and total miles driven.

The use of the proposed construction trailers site would not affect air traffic patterns because only one-story structures (trailers) are proposed, nor would it create traffic hazards or emergency access obstructions because no roadways would be affected by the installation of the trailers. There are no trails or bikeways near the proposed construction trailers site that may be affected by the installation and use of the proposed trailers. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

This is consistent with the findings of the IS/MND for the project.

No changes to RWRf operations are proposed as part of this Second Addendum; therefore, impacts and findings associated with operations remain the same as those analyzed in the IS/MND.

XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources

The use of the proposed construction trailers site would have no direct effect to Lake Elsinore, which is a Tribal Cultural Resource and located approximately 0.5 mile south of the RWRf. Pursuant to the IS/MND, the RWRf does not encompass other known tribal cultural sites, features, places, cultural landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, or in a local register of historic resources.

Although no Tribal Cultural Resources were observed during the pedestrian archaeological survey, which was not conducted in concert with a Native American monitor, the proposed trailer installation does include limited ground disturbance (minor grading to level the construction trailer sites, installation of water and sewer connections, and excavation for fence posts) that could affect buried

resources. Accordingly, the Tribal Cultural Resources mitigation that was included in the IS/MND is applicable to the installation of the trailers:

18. Tribal Monitoring Plan
19. Treatment and Disposition of Cultural Resources

The minor increase in ground disturbance associated with the proposed installation of the trailers represents a negligible expansion of the impacts addressed in the IS/MND and does not constitute a new significant impact or a substantially more significant impact. This level of ground disturbance is consistent with the findings of the IS/MND for the project, and Tribal Cultural Resources impacts would, as mitigated, be less than significant.

No changes to RWRF operations are proposed as part of this Second Addendum; therefore, impacts and findings associated with operations remain the same as those analyzed in the IS/MND.

XIX. Utilities and Service Systems

The existing water, sewer, and electrical utilities have capacity to support the use of temporary construction trailers at the proposed site. There would not be a need for new or expanded facilities or systems. The construction trailers would generate relatively little waste and would not result in the use of nonrenewable resources in a wasteful or inefficient manner. The availability of known mineral resources would not be impacted, and there would not be conflicts with adopted energy conservation plans. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

This is consistent with the findings of the IS/MND for the project.

No changes to RWRF operations are proposed as part of this Second Addendum; therefore, impacts and findings associated with operations remain the same as those analyzed in the IS/MND.

XX. Wildfire

The proposed construction trailers site is designated by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire) as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, but its use as temporary construction trailer location would not exacerbate wildfire hazards nor expose people or structures to undue risks from wildland fires.

Existing roadways that provide access to the proposed construction trailers site would be maintained, with only temporary obstruction as the trailers are hauled to/from the proposed site. Thus, no permanent loss or alteration of emergency response and evacuation routes would occur. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance

The analysis above indicates that the use of the proposed construction trailers site would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. In addition, the temporary use of this site would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

The use of the proposed construction trailers site would not result in additional or contribute to the cumulative impacts of the project. The implementation of mitigation measures and compliance with existing regulations would avoid any cumulatively considerable impacts from the use of the proposed construction trailers site. Cumulative impacts would still be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

In addition, no significant adverse effects on human beings would occur from the use of the proposed construction trailers site. There would be no socioeconomic impacts or disproportionate environmental effects on minority and low-income populations.

This is consistent with the findings of the IS/MND for the project and its first Addendum. No changes to RWRF operations are proposed as part of this Second Addendum; therefore, impacts and findings associated with operations remain the same as those analyzed in the IS/MND.

Section 4 – Findings and Conclusions

The environmental analysis in Section 3 shows that the use of the proposed construction trailers site would not result in new or more severe environmental impacts nor require new mitigation. No changes to the conclusions of the IS/MND would occur. Rather, only minor technical changes or additions are necessary to the IS/MND, and none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines calling for preparation of a subsequent MND have occurred. Specifically, the following findings can be made:

1. No substantial changes are proposed that require major revisions of the IS/MND due to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
2. No substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that require major revisions of the IS/MND due to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
3. No new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the MND was adopted, shows any of the following:
 - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the IS/MND;
 - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the IS/MND;
 - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.
 - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives, which are considerably different from those analyzed in the IS/MND, would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Thus, EVMWD will consider this Second Addendum with the IS/MND prior to any subsequent decision on the project.

Section 5 – References

The following documents were used during preparation of the First Addendum and are incorporated by reference into this Second Addendum:

- [1] California Department of Conservation. 2022. Wellfinder. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/doggr/wellfinder/#/-117.34324/33.67998/15>. Accessed on January 4, 2022.
- [2] California Department of Conservation. 2021, January. Riverside County Important Farmland 2018, Sheet 1 of 3.
- [3] California Department of Conservation. 1980, January. State of California Special Studies Zones, Elsinore Quadrangle.
- [4] California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2009, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA, Lake Elsinore. https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/5915/lake_elsinore.pdf. Accessed on January 3, 2022.
- [5] California Department of Transportation. 2018. California State Scenic Highway System Map. <https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>. Accessed on January 3, 2022.
- [6] California State Water Resources Control Board. 2022. GeoTracker. <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=31315+Chaney+street%2C+Lake+Elsinore%2C+CA>. Accessed on January 3, 2022.
- [7] City of Lake Elsinore. 2021, September. Lake Elsinore Municipal Code. <https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/LakeElsinore/>. Accessed on January 3, 2022.
- [8] City of Lake Elsinore. 2022. *Lake Elsinore General Plan*. Adopted December 11, 2011. <http://www.lake-elsinore.org/city-hall/city-departments/community-development/planning/lake-elsinore-general-plan>. Accessed on January 4, 2022.
- [9] California Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2022. EnviroStor. <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=31315+Chaney+Street%2C+Lake+Elsinore%2C+CA>. Accessed on January 3, 2022.
- [10] Parsons. 2018, July. Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District Regional Water Reclamation Facility Upgrade and Expansion Project.
- [11] U.S. Forest Service. 2022. US Forest Locator Map. <https://www.fs.fed.us/ivm/>. Accessed on January 3, 2022.

Appendix A – Biological Resources

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
7578 El Cajon Boulevard
La Mesa, CA 91942
619.462.1515 tel
619.462.0552 fax
www.helixepi.com



July 21, 2023

1008.3 Task 13

Parag Kalaria
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District
Engineering Department
31315 Chaney Street
Lake Elsinore, CA 92530

Subject: Biological Site Assessment of Potential Construction Trailer Yard

Dear Parag Kalaria

This letter provides a brief summary of the current biological issues located in the proposed construction trailer yard. The assessment is based on a site visit conducted on July 14, 2023, by HELIX biologist Rob Hogenauer.

LOCATION

The approximately 0.75-acre site is situated between the existing Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EVMWD) water treatment facility and Strickland Avenue in the City of Lake Elsinore, Riverside County, California (Figure 1). The site is located east of the Foster Street and Strickland Avenue intersection and consists of nine Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) 375-291-007 through 375-291-015.

DESCRIPTION

The site is currently disturbed by mechanical discing and has sparse ruderal vegetation. Based on a review of aerial photographs the site appears to have been regularly disced for at least two decades. A few shrubs and non-native trees currently occur along the shoulder of Strickland Avenue, but otherwise the site is sparsely vegetated with a mix of native and non-native annual plant species. The site has a gentle slope with elevation ranging from approximately 1,285 feet above mean sea level (amsl) in the southwest to 1,270 feet amsl in the east.

The site is located within the Elsinore Area Plan of the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) but is not within a criteria cell. The site is not located within an area requiring focus surveys for plants, burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), amphibians, mammals, or Delhi sands flower loving fly (*Rhaphiomidas terminatus abdominalis*). The EVMWD is not a signatory of the MSHCP, so this detail is for informational purposes.

ASSESSMENT

HELIX biologist Rob Hogenauer conducted a walking survey of the site on the morning of July 14 from 6:15 am to 7:00 am under clear skies, winds from zero to two miles per hour, and temperatures from 67 to 70 degrees Fahrenheit. The survey consisted of walking transects approximately 10 meters apart throughout the entire site to allow for 100 percent coverage. The assessment included searching for burrowing owl, nesting birds, aquatic resources, sensitive plants, and potential use of the site by listed or sensitive species.

Results

The site is largely unvegetated, but where vegetation does occur, it is dominated by sparse non-native annual vegetation such as Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*), short pod mustard (*Hirschfeldia incana*), soft chess (*Bromus madritensis*), totalote (*Centaurea melitensis*), rattail six-week grass (*Festuca myuros*). The site also includes sparse native species such as dove weed (*Croton setiger*), annual sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*), ranchers fiddleneck (*Amsinckia menziesii*), and paniculate tarplant (*Deinandra paniculata*). Soils on-site consist of Lodo rocky loam 25 to 50 percent sloped, eroded.

Burrowing owl

No burrowing owl or sign of use by burrowing owl were observed on the site. A few burrows potentially suitable for use by burrowing owl were observed on the southeast third of the site. The site is currently not occupied by burrowing owl. The survey conducted on July 14, 2023, by Mr. Hogenauer followed the CDFW guidelines for burrowing owl survey as a preconstruction survey. This survey does not constitute a protocol burrowing owl survey that would require four visits with specific timing for the surveys.

Nesting Birds

Active nests or sign of active nesting were not observed. The site primarily consists of disturbed, disced habitat that is not conducive to successful nesting. The adjacent trees were surveyed via binoculars and have the potential to support nesting birds, but no active nests were observed during the site visit.

Small Mammals

A few small burrows were observed on-site. The burrows on-site did not have the typical appearance of kangaroo rat burrows. Based on the regular discing, lack of kangaroo burrows, limited number of other burrows, and regular discing, it is unlikely that sensitive mammals such as Los Angeles Pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris brevinasus*) or kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys* spp.) occur on the site.

Sensitive Plants

Approximately 10 individual paniculate tarplant, a California Native Plant Society (CNPS) rank 4.2 species, were observed scattered throughout the site. They were observed in groups of one or two individuals. Impacts to this species are considered less than significant. Although not required as mitigation, following the removal of the construction trailers, a one-time seeding of the site with native species, including paniculate tarplant, is recommended.

Aquatic Resources

A culvert under Strickland Avenue has an outfall that direct flows to the site. There is a small (one-foot wide) swale that was observed on-site. The swale measures two to three feet wide at the culvert, and has sign of bed and bank for a few feet, then transitions to a barely visible round bottom swale that dissipates on-site after approximately 50 feet. This portion of the swale is potentially jurisdictional to CDFW and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) as a water of the State; however, due to a lack of downstream connection, it is not likely jurisdictional as a water of the U.S. to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Avoidance of the swale is recommended. A 1602 streambed alteration agreement (SAA) from the CDFW and a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) from RWQCB would be required for impacts to the swale.

DATABASE SEARCH

A search of the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) and the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) was performed to obtain a list of sensitive plants and animals with the potential to occur on the site. The search used the Lake Elsinore 7.5-minute USGS quadrangle as the location. Additionally, a database search of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Information for Planning and Consultation was conducted using the project site for the location.

Animals

A total of 34 animal species comprised of eight invertebrates, eight reptiles and amphibians, 14 birds, and four mammals were assessed for their potential to occur on the site. No species have a moderate or high potential to occur, and only five of the 34 species have a low potential to occur. No listed (state or federal) animal species have the potential to occur. The five species with a low potential to occur are California glossy snake (*Arizona elegans occidentalis*), burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus* [foraging only]), loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*), and San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit (*Lepus californicus bennettii*).

Plants

A total of 28 plant species were assessed for their potential to occur on the site. One species, paniculate tarplant was observed on the site and is discussed above. Only one of the remaining 27 species has the potential to occur on-site. Robinson's pepper-grass (*Lepidium virginicum* var. *robinsonii*), a CNPS rank 4.2 species, has a low potential to occur.

CONCLUSION

Based on the site biological site assessment conducted on July 14, 2023, the site includes a swale that is potentially jurisdictional as a water of the state that would require an SAA from CDFW and a WDR from the RWQCB prior to impacts. If the swale is avoided, an SAA or WDR would not be required. Impacts to the few individual paniculate tarplant would be less than significant. The project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) Mitigation Measure 4 requires a burrowing owl pre-construction and nesting bird survey to occur within 30 days of impacts. If work on this site begins by August 13, 2023, the survey conducted on July 14, 2023 meets the requirements of MMRP Mitigation Measure 4; however,

Letter to Parag Kalaria
July 21, 2023

Page 4 of 4

an official burrowing owl and nesting bird pre-construction survey may be required, as described in the MMRP.

Based on the disturbed nature of the site and regular discing, there is minimal potential for additional sensitive species to occur on-site.

Sincerely,



Rob Hogenauer
Senior Scientist

Attachments:

Attachment A: Special Status Plant Species with Potential to Occur

Attachment B: Species Status Animal Species with Potential to Occur

Attachment C: USFWS IPaC resource list

Figure 1: Sensitive Resources

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status	Habitat, Ecology and Life History	Potential to Occur
<i>Allium munzii</i>	Munz's onion	FE/ST CNPS Rank 1B.1	Clay soils, opening in grassland, sage scrub.	None. No clay soils or sage scrub. Site highly disturbed.
<i>Ambrosia pumila</i>	San Diego ambrosia	FE/-- CNPS Rank 1B.1	Stream floodplain terraces and vernal pool margins. Loam or clay soils, typically slightly acidic, often in disturbed areas.	None. Pools, streams and alluvial habitat not present in study area.
<i>Atriplex coronata</i> var. <i>notatior</i>	San Jacinto Valley crownscale	FE/-- CNPS Rank 1B.1	Occurs in playas, chenopod scrub, valley and foothill grassland, and vernal pools. From 1,250 to 1,805 feet in elevation.	None. Playa, Chenopod scrub and vernal pool habitats not present.
<i>Brodiaea filifolia</i>	thread-leaved brodiaea	FT/SE CNPS Rank 1B.1	Semi alkaline mud flats and vernal pools, in clay soils.	None. No vernal pools, mud flats or clay soils.
<i>Carex buxbaumii</i>	Buxbaum's sedge	--/-- CNPS Rank 4.2	Bogs, fens, marshes, swamps and similar mesic habitats.	None. Mesic habitats do not occur.
<i>Caulanthus simulans</i>	Payson's jewel-flower	--/-- CNPS Rank 4.2	Pinyon-juniper woodland, chaparral and sage scrub. Typically, on slopes and ridgelines with sandy granitic soil.	None. Woodland and chaparral not present. Sandy slopes not present.
<i>Centromadia pungens</i> ssp. <i>laevis</i>	smooth tarplant	--/-- CNPS Rank 1B.1	Riparian/watercourses, grassland, alkali scrub.	None. Riparian habitats not present. Species easy to detect when present and was not observed.
<i>Chorizanthe leptotheca</i>	Peninsular spineflower	--/-- CNPS Rank 4.2	Alluvial fans with granitic soils and chaparral, coastal scrub or coniferous forest habitats.	None. Alluvial fan habitat does not occur in study area.
<i>Chorizanthe parryi</i> <i>parryi</i>	Parry's spineflower	--/-- CNPS Rank 1B.1	Openings in chaparral and sage scrub, sandy or rocky soil.	None. Sage scrub and chaparral not present. Sandy or rocky soils not present.
<i>Chorizanthe polygonoides longispina</i>	long-spined spineflower	--/-- CNPS Rank 1B.2	Chaparral, sage scrub, grassland, often in clay soils.	None. Clay soils not present. Site highly disturbed.
<i>Convolvulus simulans</i>	Small-flowering morning-glory	--/-- CNPS Rank 4.2	Clay soils, seeps, in chaparral, coastal scrub and grasslands.	None. Clay soils and seeps not present in study area.
<i>Deinandra paniculata</i>	paniculate tarplant	--/-- CNPS Rank 4.2	Usually found in vernal mesic areas and sometimes sandy areas within coastal scrub, grassland, near ephemeral streambeds and vernal pools.	Present. Approximately 10 individuals observed on site scattered throughout site.
<i>Dodecahema leptoceras</i>	slender-horned spineflower	FE/SE CNPS Rank 1B.1	Chaparral, woodland, scrub, sandy soil.	None. Preferred habitats and sandy soils not present.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status	Habitat, Ecology and Life History	Potential to Occur
<i>Dudleya multicaulis</i>	many-stemmed dudleya	--/-- CNPS Rank 1B.2	Clay soils in barren, rocky areas with limited vegetation.	None. No clay soils, chaparral or barren rocky areas present.
<i>Harpagonella palmeri</i>	Palmer's grapplinghook	--/-- CNPS Rank 4.2	Clay soil, chaparral, sage scrub, and grassland.	None. Chaparral and clay soils not present.
<i>Hordeum intercedens</i>	vernal barley	--/-- CNPS Rank 3.2	Mesic grasslands, vernal pools, and large saline flats or depressions.	None. No vernal pool, or other mesic habitats.
<i>Juglans californica</i>	southern California black walnut	--/-- CNPS Rank 4.2	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub, riparian woodland, alluvial soils.	None. Alluvial soils, woodland and chaparral not present. Species conspicuous and was not observed.
<i>Lasthenia glabrata</i> ssp. <i>coulteri</i>	Coulter's goldfields	--/-- CNPS Rank 1B.1	Sage scrub, oak woodland, grassland, usually in wetlands that are alkaline and associated with Travers or other clay soils.	None. No Travers or other clay soils. Mesic areas not present.
<i>Lepidium virginicum</i> var. <i>robinsonii</i>	Robinson's pepper-grass	--/-- CNPS Rank 4.3	Openings in chaparral and sage scrub, typically dry sites.	Low Potential to Occur. Site is dry, but also highly disturbed.
<i>Microseris douglasii</i> sp. <i>platycarpa</i>	Small-flowering microseris	--/-- CNPS Rank 4.2	Clay soils in woodland, coastal scrub, grasslands and vernal pools.	None. Clay soils and vernal pools, not present.
<i>Myosurus minimus</i> ssp. <i>apus</i>	little mousetail	--/-- CNPS Rank 3.1	Alkaline vernal pools in grassland.	None. Vernal pools not present.
<i>Navarretia fossalis</i>	spreading navarretia	FT/-- CNPS Rank 1B.1	Vernal pools.	None. No vernal pool habitat present.
<i>Navarretia prostrata</i>	prostrate navarretia	--/-- CNPS Rank 1B.2	Mesic, alkaline, vernal pools, grassland, scrub. Nearly always occurs in wetlands.	None. No vernal pools or other wetlands present.
<i>Orcuttia californica</i>	California Orcutt grass	FE/SE CNPS Rank 1B.1	Vernal pools.	None. Vernal pool habitat does not occur.
<i>Quercus engelmannii</i>	Engelmann oak	--/-- CNPS Rank 4.2	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, riparian woodland, grasslands.	None. Woodland habitats not present. No oak trees present.
<i>Romneya coulteri</i>	Coulter's matilija poppy	--/-- CNPS Rank 4.2	Often in burns, chaparral, coastal scrub.	None. Chaparral and burn areas do not occur in study area. species easily detected when present and was not observed.
<i>Trichocoronis wrightii</i> var. <i>Wrightii</i>	Wright's trichocoronis	--/-- CNPS 2B.1	Vernal pools, marshes, meadows and other alkaline riparian habitats.	None. Pools, marshes, meadows not present.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status	Habitat, Ecology and Life History	Potential to Occur
<i>Viguiera laciniata</i>	San Diego County viguiera	--/-- CNPS Rank 4.2	Chaparral, coastal scrub.	None. Sage scrub and chaparral not present, site highly disturbed.

¹ Listing is as follows: F = Federal; S = State of California; E = Endangered; T = Threatened; R = Rare

² CNPS = California Native Plant Society Rare Plant Rank: 1A—presumed extirpated in California and either rare or extinct elsewhere; 1B—rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere; 2A—presumed extirpated in California, but more common elsewhere; 2B—rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere; 3—more information needed; 4—watch list for species of limited distribution. Extension codes: .1—seriously endangered; .2—moderately endangered; .3—not very endangered.

None—There are no present or historical records of the species occurring on or in the immediate vicinity, (within 0.5 miles) of the Project Site and the diagnostic habitats strongly associated with the species do not occur on or in the immediate vicinity of the Site.

Low Potential to Occur—There is a historical record of the species in the vicinity of the Project Site and potentially suitable habitat on Site, but existing conditions, such as density of cover, prevalence of non-native species, evidence of disturbance, limited habitat area, isolation, substantially reduce the possibility that the species may occur. The Site is above or below the recognized elevation limits for this species.

Moderate Potential to Occur—The diagnostic habitats associated with the species occur on or in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site, but there is not a recorded occurrence of the species within the immediate vicinity (within 3 miles). Some species that contain extremely limited distributions may be considered moderate, even if there is a recorded occurrence in the immediate vicinity.

High Potential to Occur—There is both suitable habitat associated with the species and a historical record of the species on or in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site (within 3 miles).

Species Present—The species was observed on the Project Site at the time of the survey or during a previous biological survey

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status	Habitat Associations	Potential to Occur
INVERTEBRATES				
Insects				
<i>Bombus crotchii</i>	Crotch bumblebee	--/CE	Scrub and grassland habitats. Uses sage, sunflowers, and similar species for nectar.	Not likely to Occur. Site highly disturbed, limited vegetation.
<i>Branchinecta lynchi</i>	vernal pool fairy shrimp	FT/--	Vernal pool and playa habitat, cool pools, preferable on clay soils.	Not likely to occur. No pools or similar habitat occurs.
<i>Branchinecta sandiegonensis</i>	San Diego fairy shrimp	FE/SSC	Vernal pools.	Not likely to occur. No pools or similar habitat occurs.
<i>Cicindela senilis frosti</i>	Senile tiger beetle	--/--	Occurs along marine shoreline, from central California coast south to salt marshes of San Diego, also found at Lake Elsinore.	Not likely to occur. Project not adjacent to lake or marine habitat.
<i>Danaus plexippus</i>	Monarch plexippus	FC/--	Variety of habitats with milkweed and flowering plants. Milkweed required for reproduction.	Not likely to occur. No milkweed present, site has minimal vegetation due to mechanical disturbance.
<i>Euphydryas editha quino</i>	Quino checkerspot butterfly	FE/--	Open areas, sparse vegetation, and flowers. Host plants are <i>Plantago</i> spp., <i>Antirrhinum coulterianum</i> , and <i>Cordylanthus rigidus</i> .	Not likely to occur. Limited vegetation, no host plants observed.
<i>Linderiella santarosae</i>	Santa Rosa Plateau fairy shrimp	--/--	Occurs in the vernal pools on the Santa Rosa Plateau on southern basalt flow vernal pools.	Not likely to occur. No pools or similar habitat occurs.
<i>Streptocephalus wootoni</i>	Riverside fairy shrimp	FE/--	Endemic to Western Riverside, Orange, and San Diego Counties. Found in deep long lasting seasonal vernal pools, ephemeral ponds and similar habitats.	Not likely to occur. No pools or similar habitat occurs.
VERTEBRATES				
Amphibians and Reptiles				
<i>Arizona elegans occidentalis</i>	California glossy snake	--/SSC	Scrub and grassland habitats, usually with loose or sandy soils. A generalist.	Low Potential to Occur. Scrub and grassland habitats not present. Soils are loose from disturbance.
<i>Emys marmorata</i>	western pond turtle	--/SSC	Slow moving stream, ponds, reservoirs, and other water bodies deeper than 6 feet with logs or other submerged cover.	Not Likely to Occur. Ponds or other waters for species do not occur in study area.
<i>Aspidoscelis hyperythra</i>	orange-throated whiptail	--/WL	Chaparral, sage scrub, grassland, woodland, riparian areas.	Not likely to Occur. Appropriate habitat not present.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status	Habitat Associations	Potential to Occur
<i>Aspidoscelis tigris stenjnegeri</i>	coastal western whiptail	--/SSC	Open rocky areas with sparse vegetation, usually scrub or grassland.	Not likely to Occur. Rocky areas not present. Site highly disturbed.
<i>Crotalus ruber</i>	northern red-diamond rattlesnake	--/SSC	Heavy brush, boulders, can use a variety of habitats; prey density determining factor.	Not Likely to Occur. Brush and boulders not present.
<i>Phrynosoma coronatum blainvillei</i>	coast horned lizard	--/SSC	Grassland, scrub, chaparral, and woodland. Abundance of ants as prey.	Not likely to Occur. Limited vegetation on site. Mechanical disturbance limits prey species.
<i>Salvadora hexalepis virgultea</i>	coast patch-nosed snake	--/SSC	Coastal and desert scrub, chaparral, dry washes. A generalist.	Not likely to Occur. Species uncommon, no scrub, chaparral or washes present.
<i>Spea hammondi</i>	western spadefoot	--/SSC	Grassland, sage scrub, or occasionally chaparral; standing water, puddles, vernal pools needed for reproduction.	Not Likely to Occur. Species requires standing pools that are not present in study area.
Birds				
<i>Accipiter cooperi</i>	Cooper's hawk	--/WL	This raptor species requires mature forest, open woodlands, and river groves habitat.	Not Likely to Occur. Forest and woodlands do not occur in study area.
<i>Amphispiza belli belli</i>	Bell's sage sparrow	--/WL	Evenly spaced sage scrub.	Not likely to Occur. Sage scrub not present.
<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>	golden eagle	--/FP	Open country, prefers mountains or hills.	Not Likely to Occur. Study area is immediately adjacent to water treatment plant with nearby residential area.. Species generally avoids populated areas.
<i>Athene cunicularia</i>	burrowing owl	--/SSC	Grassland, fallow agriculture, and areas of sparse cover, preferably with burrows of fossorial mammals.	Low Potential to Occur. Site is open and a few potential burrows are present. Site highly disturbed, and no sign of species observed.
<i>Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus</i>	Western snowy plover	FT/SSC	Coastal beaches, sand dune beaches, river mouths, estuaries.	Not Likely to Occur. Coastal areas and river mouths not present in study area.
<i>Empidonax traillii extimus</i>	Southwestern willow flycatcher	FE/SE	Dense layered riparian habitat with surface water or saturated soils present	Not Likely to Occur. Riparian habitat not present.
<i>Elanus leucurus</i>	white-tailed kite	--/-- Fully protected	Grassland, agriculture with nearby woodland for nesting.	Low Potential to Occur. Woodland present on east side of adjacent plant, Species may forage in vicinity.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status	Habitat Associations	Potential to Occur
<i>Eremophila alpestris actia</i>	California horned lark	--/WL	Grassland, agriculture fields, and disturbed fields.	Low Potential to Occur. Habitat is disturbed, and vegetation is limited.
<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	bald eagle	DL/SE	Large bodies of open water for foraging, Nearby trees for nesting and roosting.	Not likely to Occur. Species known to forage in winter at Lake Elsinore, but site is more than 0.5 miles from the lake.
<i>Icteria virens</i>	yellow breasted chat	--/SSC	Wide riparian woodland, dense willow thickets, with well-developed understory.	Not Likely to Occur. Riparian woodland and similar habitat does not occur in study area.
<i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>	loggerhead shrike	--/SSC	Open grassland or shrubland with trees, utility poles, fence post, or other perch sites.	Low Potential to Occur. Fence line and power poles present, limited vegetation on site.
<i>Plegadis chihi</i>	white-faced ibis	--/SSC	Shallow marshes, spoils banks, meadows, marshes.	Not Likely to Occur. Marshes and meadows not present in study area.
<i>Poliophtila californica californica</i>	coastal California gnatcatcher	FT/SSC	Coastal sage and other low scrub typically with California sage (<i>Artemisia californica</i>)	Not Likely to Occur. Sage scrub or other scrub not present.
<i>Vireo bellii pusillus</i>	least Bell's vireo	FE/SE	Riparian areas with dense ground cover and stratified canopy, prefers willows.	Not Likely to Occur. Riparian habitat for species does not occur in study area.
Mammals				
<i>Chaetodipus fallax fallax</i>	San Diego pocket mouse	--/SC	Sage scrub and grassland, sandy soils.	Not Likely to Occur. Soils are loam. Highly mechanical disturbance.
<i>Dipodomys merriami parvus</i>	San Bernardino kangaroo rat	FE/SSC	Sage scrub, sandy soils, alluvial fans, floodplains.	Not Likely to Occur. Soils are loam and highly mechanically disturbed. Limited vegetation. Kangaroo rat burrows not observed.
<i>Dipodomys stephensi</i>	Stephen's kangaroo rat	FE/ST	Open areas with sparse perennial cover and loose soil.	Not Likely to Occur. Soils are loam, but loose from mechanical disturbance. Kangaroo rat burrows not observed.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status	Habitat Associations	Potential to Occur
<i>Lepus californicus bennettii</i>	San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit	--/SSC	Primarily open scrub with short grasses.	Low Potential to Occur. Species locally common, but site is has limited vegetation.

¹ Listing codes are as follows: FE = Federally Endangered; FT = Federally Threatened; FC= Federal Candidate species; BCC = Birds of Conservation Concern; SE = State of California Endangered; FP = State of California Fully Protected; WL = State of California Wait-Listed; SSC = State of California Species of Special Concern.

² County of San Diego Sensitive Animal List: Group 1 = Animals that have a very high level of sensitivity, either because they are listed as threatened or endangered or because they have very specific natural history requirements that must be met; Group 2 = Animals that are becoming less common, but are not yet so rare that extirpation or extinction is imminent without immediate action; these species tend to be prolific within their suitable habitat types.

Not likely to occur - There are no present or historical records of the species occurring on or in the immediate vicinity, (within 0.5 miles) of the Project Site and/or the diagnostic habitats strongly associated with the species do not occur on or in the immediate vicinity of the Site.

Low Potential to Occur - There is a historical record of the species in the vicinity of the Project Site and potentially suitable habitat on Site, but existing conditions, such as density of cover, prevalence of non-native species, evidence of disturbance, limited habitat area, isolation, substantially reduce the possibility that the species may occur. The Site is above or below the recognized elevation limits for this species.

Moderate Potential to Occur - The diagnostic habitats associated with the species occur on or in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site, but there is not a recorded occurrence of the species within the immediate vicinity (within 3 miles). Some species that contain extremely limited distributions may be considered moderate, even if there is a recorded occurrence in the immediate vicinity.

High Potential to Occur - There is both suitable habitat associated with the species and a historical record of the species on or in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site (within 3 miles).

Species Present - The species was observed on the Project Site at the time of the survey or during a previous biological survey

IPaC resource list

This report is an automatically generated list of species and other resources such as critical habitat (collectively referred to as *trust resources*) under the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) jurisdiction that are known or expected to be on or near the project area referenced below. The list may also include trust resources that occur outside of the project area, but that could potentially be directly or indirectly affected by activities in the project area. However, determining the likelihood and extent of effects a project may have on trust resources typically requires gathering additional site-specific (e.g., vegetation/species surveys) and project-specific (e.g., magnitude and timing of proposed activities) information.

Below is a summary of the project information you provided and contact information for the USFWS office(s) with jurisdiction in the defined project area. Please read the introduction to each section that follows (Endangered Species, Migratory Birds, USFWS Facilities, and NWI Wetlands) for additional information applicable to the trust resources addressed in that section.

Location

Riverside County, California



Local office

Carlsbad Fish And Wildlife Office

☎ (760) 431-9440

📅 (760) 431-5901

2177 Salk Avenue - Suite 250

2177 Oak Avenue Suite 200
Carlsbad, CA 92008-7385

NOT FOR CONSULTATION

Endangered species

This resource list is for informational purposes only and does not constitute an analysis of project level impacts.

The primary information used to generate this list is the known or expected range of each species. Additional areas of influence (AOI) for species are also considered. An AOI includes areas outside of the species range if the species could be indirectly affected by activities in that area (e.g., placing a dam upstream of a fish population even if that fish does not occur at the dam site, may indirectly impact the species by reducing or eliminating water flow downstream). Because species can move, and site conditions can change, the species on this list are not guaranteed to be found on or near the project area. To fully determine any potential effects to species, additional site-specific and project-specific information is often required.

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act **requires** Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of such proposed action" for any project that is conducted, permitted, funded, or licensed by any Federal agency. A letter from the local office and a species list which fulfills this requirement can **only** be obtained by requesting an official species list from either the Regulatory Review section in IPaC (see directions below) or from the local field office directly.

For project evaluations that require USFWS concurrence/review, please return to the IPaC website and request an official species list by doing the following:

1. Draw the project location and click CONTINUE.
2. Click DEFINE PROJECT.
3. Log in (if directed to do so).
4. Provide a name and description for your project.
5. Click REQUEST SPECIES LIST.

Listed species¹ and their critical habitats are managed by the [Ecological Services Program](#) of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the fisheries division of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA Fisheries²).

Species and critical habitats under the sole responsibility of NOAA Fisheries are **not** shown on this list. Please contact [NOAA Fisheries](#) for [species under their jurisdiction](#).

1. Species listed under the Endangered Species Act are threatened or endangered; IPaC also shows species that are candidates, or proposed, for listing. See the [listing status page](#) for more information. IPaC only shows species that are regulated by USFWS (see FAQ).

2. [NOAA Fisheries](#), also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

The following species are potentially affected by activities in this location:

Mammals

NAME	STATUS
San Bernardino Merriam's Kangaroo Rat <i>Dipodomys merriami parvus</i> Wherever found There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2060	Endangered
Stephens' Kangaroo Rat <i>Dipodomys stephensi</i> (incl. <i>D. cactus</i>) Wherever found No critical habitat has been designated for this species. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3495	Threatened

Birds

NAME	STATUS
Coastal California Gnatcatcher <i>Poliioptila californica californica</i> Wherever found There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8178	Threatened
Least Bell's Vireo <i>Vireo bellii pusillus</i> Wherever found There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5945	Endangered
Southwestern Willow Flycatcher <i>Empidonax traillii extimus</i> Wherever found There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6749	Endangered

Western Snowy Plover <i>Charadrius nivosus nivosus</i>	Threatened
There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat.	
https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8035	

Insects

NAME	STATUS
Monarch Butterfly <i>Danaus plexippus</i>	Candidate
Wherever found	
No critical habitat has been designated for this species.	
https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9743	
Quino Checkerspot Butterfly <i>Euphydryas editha quino</i> (=E. e. wrighti)	Endangered
Wherever found	
There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat.	
https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5900	

Crustaceans

NAME	STATUS
Riverside Fairy Shrimp <i>Streptocephalus woottoni</i>	Endangered
Wherever found	
There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat.	
https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8148	
Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp <i>Branchinecta lynchi</i>	Threatened
Wherever found	
There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat.	
https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/498	

Flowering Plants

NAME	STATUS
California Orcutt Grass <i>Orcuttia californica</i>	Endangered
Wherever found	
No critical habitat has been designated for this species.	
https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4923	

Endangered

Munz's Onion *Allium munzii*

Wherever found

There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat.

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2951>

Endangered

San Diego Ambrosia *Ambrosia pumila*

Wherever found

There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat.

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8287>

Endangered

San Jacinto Valley Crownscale *Atriplex coronata* var. notator

Wherever found

There is **final** critical habitat for this species. However, no *actual* acres or miles were designated due to exemptions or exclusions. See Federal Register publication for details.

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4353>

Endangered

Slender-horned Spineflower *Dodecahema leptoceras*

Wherever found

No critical habitat has been designated for this species.

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4007>

Threatened

Spreading Navarretia *Navarretia fossalis*

Wherever found

There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat.

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1334>

Threatened

Thread-leaved Brodiaea *Brodiaea filifolia*

Wherever found

There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat.

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6087>

Critical habitats

Potential effects to critical habitat(s) in this location must be analyzed along with the endangered species themselves.

There are no critical habitats at this location.

You are still required to determine if your project(s) may have effects on all above listed species.

Bald & Golden Eagles

Bald and golden eagles are protected under the [Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act](#) and the [Migratory Bird Treaty Act](#).

Any person or organization who plans or conducts activities that may result in impacts to bald or golden eagles, or their habitats, should follow appropriate regulations and consider implementing appropriate conservation measures, as described [below](#).

Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Eagle Management <https://www.fws.gov/program/eagle-management>
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds
<https://www.fws.gov/library/collections/avoiding-and-minimizing-incidental-take-migratory-birds>
- Nationwide conservation measures for birds
<https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/nationwide-standard-conservation-measures.pdf>

There are bald and/or golden eagles in your project area.

For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to migratory birds on your list, click on the PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY at the top of your list to see when these birds are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.

NAME

BREEDING SEASON

Bald Eagle *Haliaeetus leucocephalus*

Breeds Jan 1 to Aug 31

This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities.

Golden Eagle *Aquila chrysaetos*

Breeds Jan 1 to Aug 31

This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities.

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1680>

Probability of Presence Summary

The graphs below provide our best understanding of when birds of concern are most likely to be present in your project area. This information can be used to tailor and schedule your project activities to avoid or minimize impacts to birds. Please make sure you read and understand the FAQ "Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report" before using or attempting to interpret this report.

Probability of Presence ()

Each green bar represents the bird's relative probability of presence in the 10km grid cell(s) your project overlaps during a particular week of the year. (A year is represented as 12 4-week months.) A taller bar indicates a higher probability of species presence. The survey effort (see below) can be used to establish a level of confidence in the presence score. One can have higher confidence in the presence score if the corresponding survey effort is also high.

How is the probability of presence score calculated? The calculation is done in three steps:

1. The probability of presence for each week is calculated as the number of survey events in the week where the species was detected divided by the total number of survey events for that week. For example, if in week 12 there were 20 survey events and the Spotted Towhee was found in 5 of them, the probability of presence of the Spotted Towhee in week 12 is 0.25.
2. To properly present the pattern of presence across the year, the relative probability of presence is calculated. This is the probability of presence divided by the maximum probability of presence across all weeks. For example, imagine the probability of presence in week 20 for the Spotted Towhee is 0.05, and that the probability of presence at week 12 (0.25) is the maximum of any week of the year. The relative probability of presence on week 12 is $0.25/0.25 = 1$; at week 20 it is $0.05/0.25 = 0.2$.
3. The relative probability of presence calculated in the previous step undergoes a statistical conversion so that all possible values fall between 0 and 10, inclusive. This is the

probability of presence score.

To see a bar's probability of presence score, simply hover your mouse cursor over the bar.

Breeding Season (☀)

Yellow bars denote a very liberal estimate of the time-frame inside which the bird breeds across its entire range. If there are no yellow bars shown for a bird, it does not breed in your project area.

Survey Effort (|)

Vertical black lines superimposed on probability of presence bars indicate the number of surveys performed for that species in the 10km grid cell(s) your project area overlaps. The number of surveys is expressed as a range, for example, 33 to 64 surveys.


To see a bar's survey effort range, simply hover your mouse cursor over the bar.

No Data (-)

A week is marked as having no data if there were no survey events for that week.

Survey Timeframe

Surveys from only the last 10 years are used in order to ensure delivery of currently relevant information. The exception to this is areas off the Atlantic coast, where bird returns are based on all years of available data, since data in these areas is currently much more sparse.



What does IPaC use to generate the potential presence of bald and golden eagles in my specified location?

The potential for eagle presence is derived from data provided by the [Avian Knowledge Network \(AKN\)](#). The AKN data is based on a growing collection of [survey, banding, and citizen science datasets](#) and is queried and filtered to return a list of those birds reported as occurring in the 10km grid cell(s) which your project intersects, and that have been identified as warranting special attention because they are a BCC species in that area, an eagle ([Eagle Act](#) requirements may apply). To see a list of all birds potentially present in your project area, please visit the [Rapid Avian Information Locator \(RAIL\) Tool](#).

What does IPaC use to generate the probability of presence graphs of bald and golden eagles in my specified location?

The Migratory Bird Resource List is comprised of USFWS [Birds of Conservation Concern \(BCC\)](#) and other species that may warrant special attention in your project location.

The migratory bird list generated for your project is derived from data provided by the [Avian Knowledge Network \(AKN\)](#). The AKN data is based on a growing collection of [survey, banding, and citizen science datasets](#) and is queried and filtered to return a list of those birds reported as occurring in the 10km grid cell(s) which your project intersects, and that have been identified as warranting special attention because they are a BCC species in that area, an eagle ([Eagle Act](#) requirements may apply), or a species that has a particular vulnerability to offshore activities or development.

Again, the Migratory Bird Resource list includes only a subset of birds that may occur in your project area. It is not representative of all birds that may occur in your project area. To get a list of all birds potentially present in your project area, please visit the [Rapid Avian Information Locator \(RAIL\) Tool](#).

What if I have eagles on my list?

If your project has the potential to disturb or kill eagles, you may need to obtain a permit to avoid violating the [Eagle Act](#) should such impacts occur. Please contact your local Fish and Wildlife Service Field Office if you have questions.

Migratory birds

Certain birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act¹ and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act².

Any person or organization who plans or conducts activities that may result in impacts to migratory birds, eagles, and their habitats should follow appropriate regulations and consider implementing appropriate conservation measures, as described [below](#).

1. The [Migratory Birds Treaty Act](#) of 1918.
2. The [Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act](#) of 1940.

Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Birds of Conservation Concern <https://www.fws.gov/program/migratory-birds/species>
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds <https://www.fws.gov/library/collections/avoiding-and-minimizing-incidental-take-migratory-birds>
- Nationwide conservation measures for birds <https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/nationwide-standard-conservation-measures.pdf>

The birds listed below are birds of particular concern either because they occur on the [USFWS Birds of Conservation Concern](#) (BCC) list or warrant special attention in your project location. To learn more about the levels of concern for birds on your list and how this list is generated, see the FAQ [below](#). This is not a list of every bird you may find in this location, nor a guarantee that every bird on this list will be found in your project area. To see exact locations of where birders and the general public have sighted birds in and around your project area, visit the [E-bird data mapping tool](#) (Tip: enter your location, desired date

range and a species on your list). For projects that occur off the Atlantic Coast, additional maps and models detailing the relative occurrence and abundance of bird species on your list are available. Links to additional information about Atlantic Coast birds, and other important information about your migratory bird list, including how to properly interpret and use your migratory bird report, can be found [below](#).

For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to migratory birds on your list, click on the PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY at the top of your list to see when these birds are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
Allen's Hummingbird <i>Selasphorus sasin</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9637	Breeds Feb 1 to Jul 15
Bald Eagle <i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i> This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities.	Breeds Jan 1 to Aug 31
Belding's Savannah Sparrow <i>Passerculus sandwichensis beldingi</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8	Breeds Apr 1 to Aug 15
Black Skimmer <i>Rynchops niger</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5234	Breeds May 20 to Sep 15
Black Swift <i>Cypseloides niger</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8878	Breeds Jun 15 to Sep 10
Black Tern <i>Chlidonias niger</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3093	Breeds May 15 to Aug 20

<p>Black-chinned Sparrow <i>Spizella atrogularis</i></p> <p>This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.</p> <p>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9447</p>	Breeds Apr 15 to Jul 31
<p>Bullock's Oriole <i>Icterus bullockii</i></p> <p>This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA</p>	Breeds Mar 21 to Jul 25
<p>California Gull <i>Larus californicus</i></p> <p>This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.</p>	Breeds Mar 1 to Jul 31
<p>California Thrasher <i>Toxostoma redivivum</i></p> <p>This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.</p>	Breeds Jan 1 to Jul 31
<p>Clark's Grebe <i>Aechmophorus clarkii</i></p> <p>This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.</p>	Breeds Jun 1 to Aug 31
<p>Common Yellowthroat <i>Geothlypis trichas sinuosa</i></p> <p>This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA</p> <p>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2084</p>	Breeds May 20 to Jul 31
<p>Golden Eagle <i>Aquila chrysaetos</i></p> <p>This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities.</p> <p>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1680</p>	Breeds Jan 1 to Aug 31
<p>Lawrence's Goldfinch <i>Carduelis lawrencei</i></p> <p>This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.</p> <p>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9464</p>	Breeds Mar 20 to Sep 20
<p>Marbled Godwit <i>Limosa fedoa</i></p> <p>This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.</p> <p>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9481</p>	Breeds elsewhere

Nuttall's Woodpecker *Picoides nuttallii*

Breeds Apr 1 to Jul 20

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9410>

Oak Titmouse *Baeolophus inornatus*

Breeds Mar 15 to Jul 15

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9656>

Olive-sided Flycatcher *Contopus cooperi*

Breeds May 20 to Aug 31

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3914>

Short-billed Dowitcher *Limnodromus griseus*

Breeds elsewhere

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9480>

Tricolored Blackbird *Agelaius tricolor*

Breeds Mar 15 to Aug 10

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3910>

Western Grebe *Aechmophorus occidentalis*

Breeds Jun 1 to Aug 31

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6743>

Willet *Tringa semipalmata*

Breeds elsewhere

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.

Wrentit *Chamaea fasciata*

Breeds Mar 15 to Aug 10

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.

Probability of Presence Summary

The graphs below provide our best understanding of when birds of concern are most likely to be present in your project area. This information can be used to tailor and schedule your project activities to avoid or minimize impacts to birds. Please make sure you read and

understand the FAQ "Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report" before using or attempting to interpret this report.

Probability of Presence ()

Each green bar represents the bird's relative probability of presence in the 10km grid cell(s) your project overlaps during a particular week of the year. (A year is represented as 12 4-week months.) A taller bar indicates a higher probability of species presence. The survey effort (see below) can be used to establish a level of confidence in the presence score. One can have higher confidence in the presence score if the corresponding survey effort is also high.

How is the probability of presence score calculated? The calculation is done in three steps:

1. The probability of presence for each week is calculated as the number of survey events in the week where the species was detected divided by the total number of survey events for that week. For example, if in week 12 there were 20 survey events and the Spotted Towhee was found in 5 of them, the probability of presence of the Spotted Towhee in week 12 is 0.25.
2. To properly present the pattern of presence across the year, the relative probability of presence is calculated. This is the probability of presence divided by the maximum probability of presence across all weeks. For example, imagine the probability of presence in week 20 for the Spotted Towhee is 0.05, and that the probability of presence at week 12 (0.25) is the maximum of any week of the year. The relative probability of presence on week 12 is $0.25/0.25 = 1$; at week 20 it is $0.05/0.25 = 0.2$.
3. The relative probability of presence calculated in the previous step undergoes a statistical conversion so that all possible values fall between 0 and 10, inclusive. This is the probability of presence score.

To see a bar's probability of presence score, simply hover your mouse cursor over the bar.

Breeding Season ()

Yellow bars denote a very liberal estimate of the time-frame inside which the bird breeds across its entire range. If there are no yellow bars shown for a bird, it does not breed in your project area.

Survey Effort ()

Vertical black lines superimposed on probability of presence bars indicate the number of surveys performed for that species in the 10km grid cell(s) your project area overlaps. The number of surveys is expressed as a range, for example, 33 to 64 surveys.


To see a bar's survey effort range, simply hover your mouse cursor over the bar.


No Data ()

A week is marked as having no data if there were no survey events for that week.

Survey Timeframe

Surveys from only the last 10 years are used in order to ensure delivery of currently relevant information. The exception to this is areas off the Atlantic coast, where bird returns are based on all years of available data, since data in these areas is currently much more sparse.





Tell me more about conservation measures I can implement to avoid or minimize impacts to migratory birds.

[Nationwide Conservation Measures](#) describes measures that can help avoid and minimize impacts to all birds at any location year round. Implementation of these measures is particularly important when birds are most likely to occur in the project area. When birds may be breeding in the area, identifying the locations of any active nests and avoiding their destruction is a very helpful impact minimization measure.

To see when birds are most likely to occur and be breeding in your project area, view the Probability of Presence Summary. [Additional measures](#) or [permits](#) may be advisable depending on the type of activity you are conducting and the type of infrastructure or bird species present on your project site.

What does IPaC use to generate the list of migratory birds that potentially occur in my specified location?

The Migratory Bird Resource List is comprised of USFWS [Birds of Conservation Concern \(BCC\)](#) and other species that may warrant special attention in your project location.

The migratory bird list generated for your project is derived from data provided by the [Avian Knowledge Network \(AKN\)](#). The AKN data is based on a growing collection of [survey, banding, and citizen science datasets](#) and is queried and filtered to return a list of those birds reported as occurring in the 10km grid cell(s) which your project intersects, and that have been identified as warranting special attention because they are a BCC species in that area, an eagle ([Eagle Act](#) requirements may apply), or a species that has a particular vulnerability to offshore activities or development.

Again, the Migratory Bird Resource list includes only a subset of birds that may occur in your project area. It is not representative of all birds that may occur in your project area. To get a list of all birds potentially present in your project area, please visit the [Rapid Avian Information Locator \(RAIL\) Tool](#).

What does IPaC use to generate the probability of presence graphs for the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location?

The probability of presence graphs associated with your migratory bird list are based on data provided by the [Avian Knowledge Network \(AKN\)](#). This data is derived from a growing collection of [survey, banding, and citizen science datasets](#).

Probability of presence data is continuously being updated as new and better information becomes available. To learn more about how the probability of presence graphs are produced and how to interpret them, go the Probability of Presence Summary and then click on the "Tell me about these graphs" link.

How do I know if a bird is breeding, wintering or migrating in my area?

To see what part of a particular bird's range your project area falls within (i.e. breeding, wintering, migrating or year-round), you may query your location using the [RAIL Tool](#) and look at the range maps provided for birds in your area at the bottom of the profiles provided for each bird in your results. If a bird on your migratory bird species list has a breeding season associated with it, if that bird does occur in your project area, there may be nests present at some point within the timeframe specified. If "Breeds elsewhere" is indicated, then the bird likely does not breed in your project area.

What are the levels of concern for migratory birds?

Migratory birds delivered through IPaC fall into the following distinct categories of concern:

1. "BCC Rangewide" birds are [Birds of Conservation Concern](#) (BCC) that are of concern throughout their range anywhere within the USA (including Hawaii, the Pacific Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands);
2. "BCC - BCR" birds are BCCs that are of concern only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA; and
3. "Non-BCC - Vulnerable" birds are not BCC species in your project area, but appear on your list either because of the [Eagle Act](#) requirements (for eagles) or (for non-eagles) potential susceptibilities in

offshore areas from certain types of development or activities (e.g. offshore energy development or longline fishing).

Although it is important to try to avoid and minimize impacts to all birds, efforts should be made, in particular, to avoid and minimize impacts to the birds on this list, especially eagles and BCC species of rangewide concern. For more information on conservation measures you can implement to help avoid and minimize migratory bird impacts and requirements for eagles, please see the FAQs for these topics.

Details about birds that are potentially affected by offshore projects

For additional details about the relative occurrence and abundance of both individual bird species and groups of bird species within your project area off the Atlantic Coast, please visit the [Northeast Ocean Data Portal](#). The Portal also offers data and information about other taxa besides birds that may be helpful to you in your project review. Alternately, you may download the bird model results files underlying the portal maps through the [NOAA NCCOS Integrative Statistical Modeling and Predictive Mapping of Marine Bird Distributions and Abundance on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf](#) project webpage.

Bird tracking data can also provide additional details about occurrence and habitat use throughout the year, including migration. Models relying on survey data may not include this information. For additional information on marine bird tracking data, see the [Diving Bird Study](#) and the [nanotag studies](#) or contact [Caleb Spiegel](#) or [Pam Loring](#).

What if I have eagles on my list?

If your project has the potential to disturb or kill eagles, you may need to [obtain a permit](#) to avoid violating the Eagle Act should such impacts occur.

Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report

The migratory bird list generated is not a list of all birds in your project area, only a subset of birds of priority concern. To learn more about how your list is generated, and see options for identifying what other birds may be in your project area, please see the FAQ "What does IPaC use to generate the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location". Please be aware this report provides the "probability of presence" of birds within the 10 km grid cell(s) that overlap your project; not your exact project footprint. On the graphs provided, please also look carefully at the survey effort (indicated by the black vertical bar) and for the existence of the "no data" indicator (a red horizontal bar). A high survey effort is the key component. If the survey effort is high, then the probability of presence score can be viewed as more dependable. In contrast, a low survey effort bar or no data bar means a lack of data and, therefore, a lack of certainty about presence of the species. This list is not perfect; it is simply a starting point for identifying what birds of concern have the potential to be in your project area, when they might be there, and if they might be breeding (which means nests might be present). The list helps you know what to look for to confirm presence, and helps guide you in knowing when to implement conservation measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts from your project activities, should presence be confirmed. To learn more about conservation measures, visit the FAQ "Tell me about conservation measures I can implement to avoid or minimize impacts to migratory birds" at the bottom of your migratory bird trust resources page.

Facilities

National Wildlife Refuge lands

Any activity proposed on lands managed by the [National Wildlife Refuge](#) system must undergo a 'Compatibility Determination' conducted by the Refuge. Please contact the individual Refuges to discuss any questions or concerns.

There are no refuge lands at this location.

Fish hatcheries

There are no fish hatcheries at this location.

Wetlands in the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI)

Impacts to [NWI wetlands](#) and other aquatic habitats may be subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, or other State/Federal statutes.

For more information please contact the Regulatory Program of the local [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers District](#).

This location did not intersect any wetlands mapped by NWI.

NOTE: This initial screening does **not** replace an on-site delineation to determine whether wetlands occur. Additional information on the NWI data is provided below.

Data limitations

The Service's objective of mapping wetlands and deepwater habitats is to produce reconnaissance level information on the location, type and size of these resources. The maps are prepared from the analysis of high altitude imagery. Wetlands are identified based on vegetation, visible hydrology and geography. A margin of error is inherent in the use of imagery; thus, detailed on-the-ground inspection of any particular site may result in revision of the wetland boundaries or classification established through image analysis.

The accuracy of image interpretation depends on the quality of the imagery, the experience of the image analysts, the amount and quality of the collateral data and the amount of ground truth verification work conducted. Metadata should be consulted to determine the date of the source imagery used and any mapping problems.

Wetlands or other mapped features may have changed since the date of the imagery or field work. There may be occasional differences in polygon boundaries or classifications between the information depicted on the map and the actual conditions on site.

Data exclusions

Certain wetland habitats are excluded from the National mapping program because of the limitations of aerial imagery as the primary data source used to detect wetlands. These habitats include seagrasses or submerged aquatic vegetation that are found in the intertidal and subtidal zones of estuaries and nearshore coastal waters. Some deepwater reef communities (coral or tubercid worm reefs) have also been excluded from the inventory. These habitats, because of their depth, go undetected by aerial imagery.

Data precautions

Federal, state, and local regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over wetlands may define and describe wetlands in a different manner than that used in this inventory. There is no attempt, in either the design or products of this inventory, to define the limits of proprietary jurisdiction of any Federal, state, or local government or to establish the geographical scope of the regulatory programs of government agencies. Persons intending to engage in activities involving modifications within or adjacent to wetland areas should seek the advice of appropriate Federal, state, or local agencies concerning specified agency regulatory programs and proprietary jurisdictions that may affect such activities.



Appendix B – Cultural Resources

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
7578 El Cajon Boulevard
La Mesa, CA 91942
619.462.1515 tel
619.462.0552 fax
www.helixepi.com



July 20, 2023

01008.00003.000

Mr. Parag Kalaria
Water Resources Manager
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District
31315 Chaney Street
Lake Elsinore, CA 92530

Subject: Cultural Resources Assessment for the Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District Regional Water Reclamation Facility Expansion and Upgrades Project Construction Trailers Site (IS/MND Addendum #2)

Dear Mr. Kalaria:

Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EVMWD) contracted HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX) to conduct a cultural resources survey for the Construction Trailers Site associated with the EVMWD Regional Water Reclamation Facility (RWRF) Expansion and Upgrades Project, located in the City of Lake Elsinore, Riverside County, California. HELIX reviewed the previous cultural resources reports for the RWRF and off-site parcels, addressed in the RWRF Expansion and Upgrades Project Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) and First IS/MND Addendum, and conducted an archaeological field survey of the proposed Construction Trailers Site. This letter report details the methods and results of the cultural resources survey and has been prepared to support the Second IS/MND Addendum for the RWRF Expansion and Upgrades Project. In summary, no cultural resources were identified within the Construction Trailers Site; thus, no effects to historic properties or historical resources are anticipated. However, the Lake Elsinore area is sensitive for cultural resources, and the measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) in the RWRF Expansion and Upgrades IS/MND will be implemented during ground-disturbing activities for the Construction Trailers Site including monitoring of ground-disturbing activities by an archaeologist and tribal cultural monitors.

PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

EVMWD is proposing to use offsite construction staging and laydown areas adjacent to the RWRF for staging of construction vehicles, equipment, and materials during construction of Design Package 2 of the RWRF Expansion and Upgrades Project. A number of parcels were addressed in the First Addendum to the IS/MND, consisting mainly of EVMWD-owned property and a few privately owned parcels located immediately adjacent to the RWRF. Most of the parcels are undeveloped, except for the animal clinic at 29001 Bastron Avenue (Kirkish et al. 2022). An additional site adjacent to the RWRF, also on EVMWD-owned land and in close proximity to the staging and laydown areas addressed in the first IS/MND

Addendum, would be used to temporarily house construction trailers during Design Package 2 construction; this proposed staging area, the Construction Trailers Site, is the subject of the second Addendum to the IS/MND and of the cultural resources survey documented in this letter report.

To accommodate the construction trailers, the contractor proposes to lower the grade by about two feet on the west side and use that material to fill the east side to obtain a level pad. Trenching for utilities for the trailers would be about 18 inches deep for the sanitary sewer lines and approximately 12 inches deep for the water lines. Other utilities, such as electrical and internet connections would require similar trenching.

The RWRF and the associated Construction Trailers Site are located southwest of Interstate 15 (I-15) and State Route 74 (SR 74), and northeast of Lake Elsinore (Figure 1, *Regional Location*). The project area is located within unsectioned portions of Township 5 South, Range 5 West and Township 5 South, Range 4 West, on the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5' Lake Elsinore topographic quadrangle (Figure 2, *USGS Topography*). The RWRF is located at 31315 Chaney Street in the City of Lake Elsinore, Riverside County, approximately 0.5 mile northeast of Lake Elsinore. The facility is bound by Strickland and Treleven avenues to the south/southwest and the floodway of Temescal Wash to the north/northeast. The RWRF occupies approximately 51 acres of property owned and operated by EVMWD. The Area of Potential Effects (APE) currently under study consists of the proposed Construction Trailers Site, which is approximately 0.75 acre in area and is located immediately adjacent to the RWRF, between the facility and Strickland Avenue (Figure 3 *Aerial Photograph*).

While Parsons conducted a cultural resource investigation for six parcels covering most of the proposed Construction Trailers Site in conjunction with the First IS/MND Addendum in 2022, two parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers [APNs] 375-291-008 and 375-291-013) were not surveyed; these two parcels, as well as the entire trailers site were surveyed by HELIX in 2023.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Parsons conducted a cultural resource investigation in June 2017 for the proposed upgrade and expansion of the RWRF. This study included a records search of the project site and a one half-mile radius and a search of the Native American Heritage Commission's (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (Parsons 2017). The results of the records search indicated that 10 previously recorded resources were located within one-half mile of the RWRF, half of these within one-quarter mile of the project area; none were located within the APE for the RWRF project. These resources consisted of four prehistoric isolates, two historic isolates, a historic site, and three historic built environment resources (Parson 20017). In April 2017, the NAHC responded with the results of the Sacred Lands File Search; the results were negative, and EVMWD contacted the Native American contacts supplied by the NAHC for further comment. No Tribal Cultural Resources or Traditional Cultural Properties were identified within the project site.

In January 2022, Parsons conducted a pedestrian survey of six parcels (APNs 275-291-009 through 375-291-012, and 375-291-014 and -015) outside the RWRF for proposed staging and laydown areas, the subject of the First IS/MND Addendum. It was noted that the parcels were undeveloped, though they appeared to have been disked or grubbed, resulting in virtually no vegetation in the area. No cultural resources were observed during the survey (Kirkish et al. 2022).

METHODS

Historical maps and aerial photographs were reviewed to assess the potential for historical archaeological resources and examine changes in land use over time, including the 1901 Elsinore (1:250,000) USGS topographic map; the 1953 Elsinore and 1973, 1982, and 1997 Lake Elsinore 7.5' USGS topographic maps; and aerial photographs from 1967, 1978, 1980, and 1985 (NETR Online 2023; UCSB Digital Library 2023).

HELIX Principal Archaeologist Mary Robbins-Wade conducted a field survey of the Construction Trailers site on July 11, 2023, using parallel transects spaced approximately 10 meters apart.

RESULTS

Archival Research

No roads or structures are recorded in the area on the 1901 Elsinore (1:250,000) topographic map. Strickland Avenue is recorded in its current alignment on the 1953 Elsinore and 1973, 1982, and 1997 Lake Elsinore maps; the existing water reclamation facility is first present on the 1973 map. No structures are recorded within the Construction Trailers Site on any of the available topographic maps.

The earliest available aerial photographs of the area, from 1962 and 1967, show the area within and surrounding the project as being undeveloped (NETR Online 2023; UCSB Digital Library 2023). Strickland Avenue, located immediately southwest of the Construction Trailers Site, appears in these photographs, though the quality is too poor to determine whether it is a paved or dirt road. The area remains relatively unchanged through the 1980s, when the existing water reclamation facility was built (NETR Online 2023).

Geologically, the project area is underlain by young alluvial-fan deposits dating to the early Holocene and late Pleistocene (Morton and Weber 2003). The project area consists entirely of soils from the Lodo rocky loam series, a series of somewhat excessively drained soils formed in material weathered from hard shale and fine grained sandstone (National Cooperative Soil Survey 2009).

Field Survey

The project area consisted of a large parcel with a gentle slope from the street to the northeast, towards the existing facility. Visibility in the parcels was good, though dead grasses and some native vegetation were present in the area. Modern trash and gravel were scattered throughout the project area. Observed soil consisted primarily of loose loams. No cultural resources were observed during the site visit.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the review of 2022 Parsons report and historic maps and aerial photographs, as well as a field survey, no cultural resources have been identified within the Construction Trailers Site APE. Therefore, no effects to historic properties or historical resources are anticipated. Due to the general cultural sensitivity of the Lake Elsinore area, the mitigation measures identified in the MMRP for the RWRF Expansion and Upgrades IS/MND will be implemented during ground-disturbing activities for the

Letter to Mr. Parag Kalaria
July 20, 2023

Page 4 of 5

Construction Trailers Site including monitoring of ground-disturbing activities by an archaeologist and Native American monitor(s) from the Consulting Tribe(s) for the RWRF project.

If you have any questions regarding this cultural resource study, please contact Mary Robbins-Wade at (619) 462-1515 or MaryRW@helixepi.com.

Sincerely,



James Turner, RPA
Staff Archaeologist



Mary Robbins-Wade, RPA
Cultural Resources Group Manager

Attachments:

- Figure 1: Regional Location
- Figure 2: USGS Topography
- Figure 3: Aerial Photograph

REFERENCES

Kirkish, Alex, Brian Upchurch, and Angela Schnapp

- 2022 Technical Memorandum: Construction Staging and Laydown Areas for the Proposed Regional Water Reclamation Facility Expansion Project Cultural Resources Assessment. Prepared by Parsons for the Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District. Report on file at HELIX.

Morton, Douglas M., and F. Harold Weber, Jr.

- 2008 Geologic Map of the Elsinore 7.5' Quadrangle, California. Digital preparation Rachel M. Alvarez and Diane Burns. Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey.

National Cooperative Soil Survey

- 2009 Lodo Series. Electronic resource available at https://soilseries.sc.egov.usda.gov/OSD_Docs/L/LODO.html, accessed July 13, 2023.

NETR Online

- 2023 *Historic Aerials*. Nationwide Environmental Title Research, LLC. Electronic document available at: <http://www.historicaerials.com>, accessed July 13, 2023.

Parsons

- 2017 *Cultural Resources Inventory and Survey Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District Regional Water Reclamation Facility Expansion and Upgrade Project*. Prepared by Parsons for the Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District. Report on file at HELIX.

University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) Digital Library

- 2023 UCSB Frame Finder. University of California, Santa Barbara Digital Library. Electronic document available at https://mil.library.ucsb.edu/ap_indexes/FrameFinder, accessed July 13, 2023.



Figure 1



