Appendix 3.0

MSHCP General Biological Resources Habitat Assessment and Compliance Analysis
MSHCP GENERAL BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES HABITAT ASSESSMENT AND COMPLIANCE ANALYSIS FOR THE 11-ACRE ST. FRANCES OF ROME CHURCH

CITY OF WILDOMAR, CALIFORNIA


Submitted to:
City of Wildomar
23873 Clinton Keith Road, Suite 201
Wildomar, California 92595

Prepared for:
David Meier
Diocese of San Bernardino
Office of Construction and Real Estate
1201 East Highland Avenue
San Bernardino, California 92404

Prepared by:
Ruben Ramirez
Cadre Environmental
c/o Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
14010 Poway Road, Suite A
Poway, California 92064

March 29, 2019
INFORMATION SUMMARY

A. Report Date: March 29th, 2019

B. Report Title: MSHCP General Biological Resources Habitat Assessment & Compliance Analysis for the 11 Acre St. Frances of Rome Church Project Site, City of Wildomar, California.

C. Case #: PA 19-0017


E. Project Location: USGS 7.5’ series Elsinore Quadrangle, Riverside County, Township 6 South, Range 4 West, Section 22, Extending south of Lemon Street and east of Orchard Street.

F. Applicant: Diocese of San Bernardino
1201 East Highland Avenue
San Bernardino, CA 92404
Contact: Mr. David Meier (909) 475-5300

G. MOU Principal: Cadre Environmental
701 Palomar Airport Road, Suite 300
Carlsbad, CA. 92011
Contact: Ruben S. Ramirez, Jr. (949) 300-0212
USFWS permit #TE780566-14, CDFW 002243


I. Summary: The 11-acre project site is dominated by developed (existing Church, support buildings, parking areas, etc.), ornamental landscaping and disturbed habitats. The project site is located within the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Elsinore Area Plan. The project site is not located within or adjacent to an MSHCP criteria area cell, group, or linkage area. Therefore, no Habitat Evaluation and Acquisition Negotiation Strategy (HANS) or Joint Project Review (JPR) are required.

The MSHCP has determined that all of the sensitive species potentially occurring onsite have been adequately covered (MSHCP Table 2-2 Species Considered for Conservation Under the MSHCP Since 1999, 2004). However, additional surveys may be required for
narrow endemic plants, criteria area species, and specific wildlife species if suitable habitat is documented onsite and/or if the property is located within a predetermined “Survey Area” (MSHCP 2004).

The project site does not occur within a predetermined Survey Area for narrow endemic or criteria area plant species. (RCA GIS Data Downloads 2019).

The project site does not occur within a predetermined Survey Area for burrowing owl, amphibians or mammals (RCA GIS Data Downloads 2019). No additional surveys are required.

No vernal pools or riparian habitats were documented onsite. The ephemeral drainage and detention basin are either devoid of vegetation or dominated by ruderal species and do not represent suitable habitat for the southwestern willow flycatcher, least Bell’s vireo, or western yellow-billed cuckoo. No additional surveys are required.

The detection basin was inundated during the site assessment and represents low quality habitat for common as well as sensitive fairy shrimp including the Riverside and vernal pool fairy shrimp. No impacts to the inundated region of the basin is proposed. Any direct and/or indirect impacts to the existing detention basin would require focused MSHCP and United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) protocol fairy shrimp surveys.

Although not an MSHCP requirement, a formal jurisdictional delineation was conducted to determine if the features onsite are regulated by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and/or United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). No jurisdictional features regulated by the RWQCB, CDFW, or USACE were documented onsite (Hernandez Environmental Services 2019). No regulatory permits or certifications required.

Based on the results of the initial habitat assessment and jurisdictional delineation, no MSHCP 6.1.2 riparian, riverine or vernal pool resources were documented onsite (Hernandez Environmental Services 2019). An MSHCP Determination of Biological Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP) will not be required.
SUBJECT

MSHCP General Biological Resources Habitat Assessment & Compliance Analysis for the 11-Acre St. Frances of Rome Church Project Site, City of Wildomar, California.

This report presents the findings of a Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) general biological resources habitat assessment and compliance analysis for the 11-acre St. Frances of Rome Church project site (“Project Site”) located within the City of Wildomar, California. Specifically, the Project Site is located within APNs 366-170-005, 366-170-058, and 366-330-011 extending south of Lemon Street and east of Orchard Street (Figure 1, Regional Location Map and Figure 2, Biological Resources Map). The purpose of this study, conducted by Cadre Environmental, is to document the existing biological resources, identify general vegetation types, and assess the potential biological and regulatory constraints associated with the proposed development as outlined by the Western Riverside County MSHCP.

The Project Site is located in Western Riverside County, located on the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5’ series Elsinore Quadrangle, Township 6 South, Range 4 West, Section 22. Specifically, the Project Site is located within the Western Riverside County MSHCP Elsinore Plan Area and is not located within an MSHCP Criteria Cell, Group, or Linkage Area.

This report incorporates the findings of an extensive literature review, compilation of existing documentation, and field reconnaissance conducted on February 25th, 2019. This documentation is consistent with accepted scientific and technical standards, the requirements of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). When appropriate, general biological resources are described in summary form in an effort to provide the reader with adequate background information. However, the report focuses on documenting those resources considered to be significant and/or sensitive as outlined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the Western Riverside County MSHCP.

The following report provides a summary of topographic features, soils and habitats observed within the Project Site. Onsite resources were also analyzed to determine which if any are subject to the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) jurisdiction pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, CDFW jurisdiction pursuant to Division 2, Chapter 6, Section 1600 of the Fish and Game Code, the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) 401 certification/Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR’s), and MSHCP jurisdiction pursuant to section 6.1.2 (MSHCP 2004).

Accordingly, this report provides an overview of potential USACE, RWQCB, CDFW, MSHCP riparian/riverine/vernal pool jurisdictional resources and a habitat assessment for species that may require additional focused surveys as outlined by the Western Riverside County MSHCP.
METHODS OF STUDY

APPROACH

Prior to visiting the Project Site, a review of all available and relevant data on the biological characteristics, sensitive habitats, and species potentially present on or adjacent to the Project Site was conducted. Additionally, aerial photography, and USGS topographic map were examined. After reviewing the available information, Cadre Environmental conducted a physical site assessment.

As required by the MSHCP, and during the initial property assessment process, all Project Site APN’s were searched using the Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) online database to determine if the property falls within a “Criteria Area” and if additional surveys for narrow endemic/criteria area plant species or wildlife not adequately covered by the MSHCP may be required.

During the initial and updated survey, the Project Site’s habitat was characterized, preliminary vegetative communities and primary topographic features potentially subject to USACE/CDFW/RWQCB jurisdiction mapped, and the potential to support sensitive species as required by the guidelines of the MSHCP evaluated. Data, which contain digital images derived from aerial photography with orthographic projection properties, were used in conjunction with Cadre Environmental’s in-house geographic information system (GIS) database as an important base layer to identify vegetation communities, drainage features, and USFWS designated critical habitat boundaries. Vegetation communities were then “ground-truthed” during field observations to obtain characteristic descriptions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The study was initiated with a review of relevant literature on the biological resources of the Project Site and vicinity. The MSHCP list of covered species potentially occurring onsite was also examined (MSHCP Table 2-2 Species Considered for Conservation Under the MSHCP Since 1999, 2004). In addition, federal register listings, protocols, and species data provided by USFWS were reviewed in conjunction with anticipated federally listed species potentially occurring at the Project Site. The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), a review of the California Native Plant Society sixth inventory (Tibor 2001), and Roberts et al. (2004) were also reviewed for pertinent information regarding the location of known occurrences of sensitive species in the vicinity of the property. In addition, numerous regional floral and faunal field guides were utilized in the identification of species and suitable habitats. Documents consulted regarding potential onsite biological conditions are listed in the references section at the end of this report.

---

1 California Natural Diversity Data Base, Department of Fish and Wildlife. February 2019. Natural Heritage Program: RareFind, Elsinore Quadrangle.
FIELD INVESTIGATION

The Project Site was surveyed on February 25th, 2019. The survey included complete coverage of the Project Site with special attention focused toward sensitive species or those habitats potentially supporting sensitive flora or fauna that would be essential to efficiently implementing the terms and conditions of the Western Riverside County MSHCP, and features potentially subject to USACE, CDFW, RWQCB and MSHCP jurisdiction. Aerial photography of the Project Site was utilized to accurately locate and survey the property. General plant communities were preliminarily mapped directly on the aerial photo using visible landmarks in the field, which are depicted in Figure 2, Biological Resources Map. Representative photographs of the Project Site’s natural resources were taken during the field survey (Figures 3 and 4, Current Project Site Photographs).

Plant Community/Habitat Classification and Mapping

Plant communities were preliminarily mapped with the aid of an aerial photograph using the MSHCP uncollapsed vegetation communities classification system when appropriate. When a vegetation community could not be accurately characterized using this information, an updated community classification code was developed to more accurately represent onsite habitat types.

General Plant Inventory

All plants observed during the survey efforts were either identified in the field or collected and later identified using taxonomic keys. Plant taxonomy and nomenclatural changes follow Baldwin et al. (2012) or the Jepson Flora Project (2019). Common names used in this report generally follow Roberts et al. (2004) or Baldwin et al. (2012). Scientific names are included only at the first mention of a species; thereafter, common names alone are used.

General Wildlife Inventory

General wildlife surveys were not conducted during the general biological habitat assessment. However, animals identified during the reconnaissance survey by sight, call, tracks, nests, scat, remains, or other signs were recorded in field notes. All wildlife was identified in the field with the aid of binoculars and taxonomic keys (if applicable). Vertebrate taxonomy followed in this report is according to the Center of North American Herpetology (2019) for amphibians and reptiles, the American Ornithologists’ Union (1998 and supplemental) for birds, and Bradley et al. (2014) for mammals. Scientific names are used during the first mention of a species; common names only are used in the remainder of the text (if applicable).
Regional Connectivity/Wildlife Movement Corridor Assessment

The analysis of wildlife movement corridors associated with the Project Site and its immediate vicinity is based on information compiled from literature, analysis of the aerial photograph, and direct observations made in the field during the site visit.

A literature review was conducted that included documents on island biogeography (studies of fragmented and isolated habitat “islands”), reports on wildlife home range sizes and migration patterns, and studies on wildlife dispersal. Wildlife movement studies conducted in southern California were also reviewed. Use of field-verified digital aerial data, in conjunction with the GIS database, allowed proper identification of vegetation communities and drainage features. This information was crucial to assessing the relationship of the property to large open space areas in the immediate vicinity and was also evaluated in terms of connectivity and habitat linkages. Relative to corridor issues, the discussions in this report are intended to focus on wildlife movement associated with the property and the immediate vicinity.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The generally flat Project Site is characterized as developed (existing structures, parking lots and ornamental landscaping) and disturbed (ruderal) vegetation with an elevation ranging between 1,357 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) and 1,330 AMSL, as shown in Figure 2, Biological Resources Map and Figures 3 and 4, Current Project Site Photographs).

SOILS

The Soil Survey of Western Riverside Area has classified the Project Site as Greenfield sandy loam, 2 to 8 percent slopes eroded (GyC2) and Hanford course sandy loam, 2 to 8 percent slopes (HcC). All soils documented onsite within the Project Site are characterized as being well drained (drainage class) as shown in Figure 5, Soil Associations Map.

Plant Community/Habitat Classification

Developed

Developed regions of the Project Site include the existing structures and infrastructure including Church, residences, preschool, parking areas, offices, and classrooms. Associated species documented within the ornamental landscaped areas include but are not limited to turf, holly oak (Quercus ilex), Chinese elm (Ulmus parviflora), China berry tree (Melia azedarach), Mediterranean tamarisk (Tamarisk ramosissima), olive (Olea europaea), Mexican fan palm (Washingtonia robusta), queen palm (Syagrus romanzoffiana), jacaranda (Jacaranda mimosifolia), lantana (Lantana camara), lowboy (Acacia redolens), Australian brass buttons (Cotula australis), dandelion (Taraxacum officinale), and common sow thistle (Sonchus oleraceus).
Disturbed

Disturbed habitats were documented within the eastern and western regions of the Project Site and are dominated by non-native ruderal vegetation including glaucous barley (*Hordeum murinum* ssp. *glaucum*), cheeseweed (*Malva parviflora*), white stemmed filaree (*Erodium brachycarpum*), red stemmed filaree (*Erodium cicutarium*), wild oat (*Avena fatua*), Russian thistle (*Salsola australis*), common fiddleneck (*Amsinckia menziesii* var. *intermedia*), London rocket (*Sisymbrium irio*), California burclover (*Medicago polymorpha*), wild radish (*Raphanus sativus*) and African daisy (*Dimorphotheca sinuata*).

Representative distribution and photographs of these habitat types are illustrated in Figure 2, *Biological Resources Map* and Figures 3 and 4, *Current Project Site Photographs*.

WILDLIFE POPULATIONS

General wildlife species documented onsite northern mockingbird (*Mimus polyglottos*), mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*), Anna’s hummingbird (*Calypte anna*), black phoebe (*Sayornis nigricans*), Say’s phoebe (*Sayornis saya*), European starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*), and house finch (*Carpodacus mexicanus*).

REGIONAL CONNECTIVITY/WILDLIFE MOVEMENT

Overview

Wildlife corridors link together areas of suitable habitat that are otherwise separated by rugged terrain, changes in vegetation, or human disturbance. The fragmentation of open space areas by urbanization creates isolated “islands” of wildlife habitat. In the absence of habitat linkages that allow movement to adjoining open space areas, various studies have concluded that some wildlife species, especially the larger and more mobile mammals, will not likely persist over time in fragmented or isolated habitat areas because they prohibit the infusion of new individuals and genetic information (MacArthur and Wilson 1967, Soule 1987, Harris and Gallager 1989, Bennett 1990). Corridors effectively act as links between different populations of a species. A group of smaller populations (termed “demes”) linked together via a system of corridors is termed a “metapopulation.” The long-term health of each deme within the metapopulation is dependent upon its size and the frequency of interchange of individuals (immigration vs. emigration). The smaller the deme, the more important immigration becomes, because prolonged inbreeding with the same individuals can reduce genetic variability. Immigrant individuals that move into the deme from adjoining demes mate with individuals and supply that deme with new genes and gene combinations that increases overall genetic diversity. An increase in a population’s genetic variability is generally associated with an increase in a population’s health.
Corridors mitigate the effects of habitat fragmentation by (1) allowing animals to move between remaining habitats, which allows depleted populations to be replenished and promotes genetic diversity; (2) providing escape routes from fire, predators, and human disturbances, thus reducing the risk that catastrophic events (such as fires or disease) will result in population or local species extinction; and (3) serving as travel routes for individual animals as they move within their home ranges in search of food, water, mates, and other needs (Noss 1983, Fahrig and Merriam 1985, Simberloff and Cox 1987, Harris and Gallagher 1989). Wildlife movement activities usually fall into one of three movement categories: (1) dispersal (e.g., juvenile animals from natal areas, individuals extending range distributions); (2) seasonal migration; and (3) movements related to home range activities (foraging for food or water, defending territories, searching for mates, breeding areas, or cover). A number of terms have been used in various wildlife movement studies, such as “wildlife corridor”, “travel route”, “habitat linkage”, and “wildlife crossing” to refer to areas in which wildlife moves from one area to another. To clarify the meaning of these terms and facilitate the discussion on wildlife movement in this study, these terms are defined as follows:

**Travel Route:** A landscape feature (such as a ridge line, drainage, canyon, or riparian strip) within a larger natural habitat area that is used frequently by animals to facilitate movement and provide access to necessary resources (e.g., water, food, cover, den sites). The travel route is generally preferred because it provides the least amount of topographic resistance in moving from one area to another; it contains adequate food, water, and/or cover while moving between habitat areas; and provides a relatively direct link between target habitat areas.

**Wildlife Corridor:** A piece of habitat, usually linear in nature, that connects two or more habitat patches that would otherwise be fragmented or isolated from one another. Wildlife corridors are usually bounded by urban land areas or other areas unsuitable for wildlife. The corridor generally contains suitable cover, food, and/or water to support species and facilitate movement while in the corridor. Larger, landscape-level corridors (often referred to as “habitat or landscape linkages”) can provide both transitory and resident habitat for a variety of species.

**Wildlife Crossing:** A small, narrow area, relatively short in length and generally constricted in nature, that allows wildlife to pass under or through an obstacle or barrier that otherwise hinders or prevents movement. Crossings typically are manmade and include culverts, underpasses, drainage pipes, and tunnels to provide access across or under roads, highways, pipelines, or other physical obstacles. These are often “choke points” along a movement corridor.

**Wildlife Movement within the Project Site**

The Project Site is not located adjacent to extensive native open space habitats and does not represent a wildlife travel route, crossing or regional movement corridor between large open space habitats. The Project Site is bordered by low-density residential development. The Project Site is not located within an MSHCP designated core,
extension of existing core, non-contiguous habitat block, constrained linkage, or linkage area.

**SENSITIVE BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

**OVERVIEW OF CLASSIFICATIONS**

The following discussion describes the plant and wildlife species present, or potentially present, within the property boundaries, that have been afforded special recognition by federal, state, or local resource conservation agencies and organizations, principally due to the species’ declining or limited population sizes, usually resulting from habitat loss. Also discussed are habitats that are unique, of relatively limited distribution, or of particular value to wildlife. Protected sensitive species are classified by either state or federal resource management agencies, or both, as threatened or endangered under provisions of the state and federal Endangered Species Acts. Vulnerable or “at-risk” species that are proposed for listing as threatened or endangered are categorized administratively as "candidates" by the USFWS. The CDFW uses various terminology and classifications to describe vulnerable species. There are additional sensitive species classifications applicable in California. These are described below.

Sensitive biological resources are habitats or individual species that have special recognition by federal, state, or local conservation agencies and organizations as endangered, threatened, or rare. The CDFW, the USFWS, and special groups like the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) maintain watch lists of such resources. For the purpose of this assessment, sources used to determine the sensitive status of biological resources are:

**Plants:** USFWS (2018), CNDDB (CDFW 2018a), CDFW (2018c), CNPS (2019), and Skinner and Pavlik (1994),

**Wildlife:** California Wildlife Habitat Relationships (2008), USFWS (2018), CNDDB (CDFW 2018a), and CDFW (2018d, 2018e).

**Habitats:** CNDDB (CDFW 2018f).

**Federal Protection and Classifications**

The Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (FESA) defines an endangered species as “any species that is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.” Threatened species are defined as “any species which is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range.” Under provisions of Section 9(a)(1)(B) of the FESA, it is unlawful to “take” any listed species. “Take” is defined as follows in Section 3(18) of the FESA: “...harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct.” Further, the USFWS, through regulation, has interpreted the terms “harm” and “harass” to include certain types of habitat modification as forms of a “take.” These interpretations, however, are generally considered and applied on a case-by-case
basis and often vary from species to species. In a case where a property owner seeks permission from a federal agency for an action that could affect a federally listed plant and animal species, the property owner and agency are required to consult with the USFWS. Section 9(a)(2)(b) of the FESA addresses the protections afforded to listed plants. Recently, the USFWS instituted changes in the listing status of former candidate species. Former C1 (candidate) species are now simply referred to as candidate species and represent the only candidates for listing. Former C2 species (for which the USFWS had insufficient evidence to warrant listing at this time) and C3 species (either extinct, no longer a valid taxon, or more abundant than was formerly believed) are no longer considered as candidate species. Therefore, these species are no longer maintained in list form by the USFWS, nor are they formally protected. However, some USFWS field offices have issued memoranda stating that former C2 species are henceforth to be considered Federal Species of Concern. This term is employed in this document, but carries no official protections. All references to federally protected species in this report (whether listed, proposed for listing, or a candidate) include the most current published status or candidate category to which each species has been assigned by the USFWS. For purposes of this assessment, the following acronyms are used for federal status species:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>Federal Endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Federal Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPE</td>
<td>Federal Proposed Endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPT</td>
<td>Federal Proposed Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>Federal Candidate for Listing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State of California Protection and Classifications

The California Endangered Species Act (CESA) defines an endangered species as “...a native species or subspecies of a bird, mammal, fish, amphibian, reptile, or plant which is in serious danger of becoming extinct throughout all, or a significant portion, of its range due to one or more causes, including loss of habitat, change in habitat, overexploitation, predation, competition, or disease.” The State defines a threatened species as “...a native species or subspecies of a bird, mammal, fish, amphibian, reptile, or plant that, although not presently threatened with extinction, is likely to become an endangered species in the foreseeable future in the absence of the special protection and management efforts required by this chapter. Any animal determined by the commission as rare on or before January 1, 1985 is a threatened species.” Candidate species are defined as “...a native species or subspecies of a bird, mammal, fish, amphibian, reptile, or plant that the commission has formally noticed as being under review by the department for addition to either the list of endangered species or the list of threatened species, or a species for which the commission has published a notice of proposed regulation to add the species to either list.” Candidate species may be afforded temporary protection as though they were already listed as threatened or endangered at the discretion of the Fish and Game Commission. Unlike the federal FESA, the CESA does not include listing provisions for invertebrate species.
Article 3, sections 2080 through 2085 of the CESA addresses the taking of threatened or endangered species by stating “no person shall import into this state, export out of this state, or take, possess, purchase, or sell within this state, any species, or any part or product thereof, that the commission determines to be an endangered species or a threatened species, or attempt any of those acts, except as otherwise provided...” Under the CESA, “take” is defined as “…hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill.” Exceptions authorized by the state to allow “take” require “…permits or memorandums of understanding…” and can be authorized for “…endangered species, threatened species, or candidate species for scientific, educational, or management purposes.” Sections 1901 and 1913 of the California Fish and Game Code provide that notification is required prior to disturbance.

Additionally, some sensitive mammals and birds are protected by the State as Fully Protected Mammals or Fully Protected Birds, as described in the California Fish and Game Code, sections 4700 and 3511, respectively. California Species of Special Concern (“special” animals and plants) listings include special status species, including all state and federal protected and candidate taxa, Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Forest Service sensitive species, species considered to be declining or rare by the CNPS or National Audubon Society, and a selection of species that are considered to be under population stress but are not formally proposed for listing. This list is primarily a working document for the CDFW CNDDB project. Informally listed taxa are not protected per se, but warrant consideration in the preparation of biotic assessments. For some species, the CNDDB is only concerned with specific portions of the life history, such as roosts, rookeries, or nest sites. For the purposes of this assessment, the following acronyms are used for state status species:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>State Endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>State Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>State Candidate Endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCT</td>
<td>State Candidate Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFP</td>
<td>State Fully Protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>State Protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>State Rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC</td>
<td>California Species of Special Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WL</td>
<td>California Watch List</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**California Native Plant Society**

The CNPS is a private plant conservation organization dedicated to the monitoring and protection of sensitive species in the state. This organization has compiled an inventory comprised of the information focusing upon geographic distribution and qualitative characterization of rare, threatened, or endangered vascular plant species of California (Tibor 2001). The list serves as the candidate list for listing as threatened and
endangered by the CDFW. The CNPS has developed five categories of rarity (California Rare Plant Rank [CRPR]):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRPR 1A</th>
<th>Presumed extinct in California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRPR 1B</td>
<td>Rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPR 2</td>
<td>Rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPR 3</td>
<td>Plants about which we need more information – a review list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPR 4</td>
<td>Species of limited distribution in California (i.e., naturally rare in the wild), but whose existence does not appear to be susceptible to threat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As stated by the CNPS:

Threat Rank is an extension added onto the California Rare Plant Rank and designates the level of endangerment by a 1 to 3 ranking with 1 being the most endangered and 3 being the least endangered. A Threat Rank is present for all California Rare Plant Rank 1B, 2, 4, and the majority of California Rare Plant Rank 3. California Rare Plant Rank 4 plants are seldom assigned a Threat Rank of 0.1, as they generally have large enough populations to not have significant threats to their continued existence in California; however, certain conditions exist to make the plant a species of concern and hence be assigned a California Rare Plant Rank. In addition, all California Rare Plant Rank 1A (presumed extinct in California), and some California Rare Plant Rank 3 (need more information) plants, which lack threat information, do not have a Threat Rank extension (CNPS 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat Rank</th>
<th>Threat Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Seriously threatened in California (over 80 percent of occurrences threatened/high degree and immediacy of threat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Fairly threatened in California (20-80 percent occurrences threatened/moderate degree and immediacy of threat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Not very threatened in California (&lt;20 percent of occurrences threatened/low degree and immediacy of threat or no current threats known)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POTENTIALLY SENSITIVE SPECIES/RESOURCES**

Determinations of MSHCP sensitive species that could potentially occur on the Project Site are based on one or both of the following: (1) a record reported in the CNDDB or CNPS inventory and; (2) the Project Site is within the known distribution of a species and contains suitable habitat or species documented onsite.
Sensitive Plant Communities

As stated by CDFG:

“One purpose of the vegetation classification is to assist in determining the level of rarity and imperilment of vegetation types. Ranking of alliances according to their degree of imperilment (as measured by rarity, trends, and threats) follows NatureServe’s Heritage Methodology, in which all alliances are listed with a G (global) and S (state) rank. For alliances with State ranks of S1-S3, all associations within them are also considered to be highly imperiled” (CDFG 2012)

No sensitive plant communities were documented onsite. However, the project applicant may be required to pay MSHCP Local Development Mitigation fees as established and implemented by the City of Wildomar (BIO-MM 1, MSHCP Local Development Mitigation Fee). The City may waive the MSHCP fee requirement based on the fact that the project is characterized as redevelopment.

Sensitive Plant Species

The MSHCP has determined that all of the sensitive species potentially occurring onsite have been adequately covered (MSHCP Table 2-2 Species Considered for Conservation Under the MSHCP Since 1999, 2004). However, additional surveys may be required for narrow endemic plants and/or criteria area species if suitable habitat is documented onsite and/or if the property is located within a predetermined “Survey Area” (MSHCP 2004).

The Project Site does not occur within a predetermined Survey Area for MSHCP narrow endemic or criteria area plant species.

County of Riverside Oak Tree Protection and Management

No native oak trees were documented within or adjacent to the Project Site.

Sensitive Wildlife Species

The MSHCP has determined that all of the sensitive species potentially occurring onsite have been adequately covered (MSHCP Table 2-2 Species Considered for Conservation Under the MSHCP Since 1999, 2004). However, additional surveys may be required for specific wildlife species if suitable habitat is documented onsite and/or if the property is located within a predetermined “Survey Area” (MSHCP 2004).

The Project Site does not occur within a predetermined Survey Area for burrowing owl, amphibians or mammals (RCA GIS Data Downloads 2019).

No vernal pools or riparian habitats were documented onsite. The ephemeral drainage and detention basin are either devoid of vegetation or dominated by ruderal species and
do not represent suitable habitat for the least Bell’s vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*), southwestern willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*) or western yellow-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus*).

The detection basin located in the southwest region of the Project Site was inundated during the site assessment and represents low quality habitat for common as well as sensitive fairy shrimp including the Riverside fairy shrimp (*Streptocephalus woottoni*), and vernal pool fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi*).

The Project Site falls within the Stephens’ kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys stephensi*, SKR) Fee Area outlined in the Riverside County SKR Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). The project applicant may be required to pay the fees pursuant to County Ordinance 663.10 for the SKR HCP Fee Assessment Area as established and implemented by the County of Riverside. The City may waive the fee requirement based on the fact that the project is characterized as redevelopment. *(BIO-MM 2, SKR Fee Area)*

**Nesting Bird Habitat**

The non-native vegetation and ornamental trees documented within the Project Site represent potential habitat for ground and tree nesting bird and raptor species. Potential direct/indirect impacts to regulated nesting birds will require compliance with the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) *(BIO-MM 3, Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act)*.

**MSHCP Riparian, Riverine, Vernal Pool Resources**

Based on the results of the initial habitat assessment and jurisdictional delineation, no MSHCP 6.1.2 riparian, riverine or vernal pool resources were documented onsite *(Hernandez Environmental Services 2019)*.

**Jurisdictional Resources**

Although not an MSHCP requirement, a formal jurisdictional delineation was conducted to determine if the features onsite are regulated by the RWQCB, CDFW and/or USACE. No jurisdictional features regulated by the RWQCB, CDFW, or USACE were documented onsite *(Hernandez Environmental Services 2019)*.

**SUMMARY OF CONSISTENCY WITH MSHCP POLICIES**

The purpose of this report is to document the existing biological resources, identify general vegetation types, and assess the potential biological and regulatory constraints and impacts associated with the proposed development within the Project Site as outlined by the Western Riverside County MSHCP. Specifically, the report is intended to assist the City of Wildomar during project review and compliance with MSHCP and regulatory requirements. The following sections summarize the Project Site’s relationship to MSHCP criteria areas and MSHCP compliance guidelines.
CRITERIA AREAS

The 11-acre Project Site is located within the Western Riverside County MSHCP Elsinore Area Plan and is not located within a Criteria Area and no onsite conservation is required or proposed. No Habitat Evaluation and Acquisition Negotiation Strategy (HANS) or Joint Project Review (JPR) are required.

The following outline summarizes the MSHCP conservation goals respective of MSHCP regulated resources.

CRITERIA AREA SPECIES SURVEY AREA

The Project Site does not occur within a predetermined Survey Area for criteria area plant species; therefore, no surveys are required (RCA GIS Data Downloads 2019).

The project is consistent with MSHCP Section 6.3.2.

NARROW ENDEMIC PLANT SPECIES SURVEY AREA

The Project Site does not occur within a predetermined Survey Area for narrow endemic plant species; therefore, no surveys are required (RCA GIS Data Downloads 2019).

The project is consistent with MSHCP Section 6.1.3

AMPHIBIAN SPECIES SURVEY AREA

The Project Site does not occur within the Amphibian Species Survey Area; therefore, no surveys are required (RCA GIS Data Downloads 2019).

The project is consistent with MSHCP Section 6.3.2.

MAMMAL SPECIES SURVEY AREA

The Project Site does not occur within the Mammal Species Survey Area; therefore, no surveys are required (RCA GIS Data Downloads 2019).

The project is consistent with MSHCP Section 6.3.2.

BURROWING OWL SURVEY AREA

The Project Site does not occur within the Burrowing Owl Survey Area; therefore, no surveys are required (RCA GIS Data Downloads 2019).

MSHCP RIPARIAN/RIVERINE AREAS AND VERNAL POOLS

Based on the results of the initial habitat assessment and jurisdictional delineation, no MSHCP 6.1.2 riparian, riverine or vernal pool resources were documented onsite
(Hernandez Environmental Services 2019). An MSHCP Determination of Biological Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP) will not be required.

The project is consistent with MSHCP Section 6.1.2.

**URBAN/WILDLANDS INTERFACE**

The MSHCP Urban/Wildlands Interface guidelines presented in Section 6.1.4 are intended to address indirect effects associated with locating commercial, mixed uses and residential developments in proximity to a MSHCP Conservation Area. The Project Site is not located adjacent to an existing or proposed MSHCP Conservation Area.

The project is consistent with MSHCP Section 6.1.4.

**FUELS MANAGEMENT**

The fuels management guidelines presented in Section 6.4 of the MSHCP are intended to address brush management activities around new development within or adjacent to MSHCP Conservation Areas. The Project Site is not located adjacent to an existing or proposed MSHCP Conservation Area. No mitigation proposed.

The project is consistent with MSHCP Section 6.4.

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-MM 1 through BIO-MM 3 and complying with the Recommendation Section below would reduce all potential significant unavoidable impacts on biological resources below a level of significance, thereby ensuring compliance with CEQA and MSHCP guidelines.

**BIO-MM 1 MSHCP Local Development Mitigation Fee**

The project applicant may be required to pay MSHCP Local Development Mitigation fees as established and implemented by the City of Wildomar. The City may waive the MSHCP fee requirement based on the fact that the project is characterized as redevelopment.

**BIO-MM 2 SKR Fee Area**

The Project Site falls within the SKR Fee Area outlined in the Riverside County SKR HCP. The project applicant may be required to pay the fees pursuant to County Ordinance 663.10 for the SKR HCP Fee Assessment Area as established and implemented by the County of Riverside. The City may waive the fee requirement based on the fact that the project is characterized as redevelopment.

**BIO-MM 3 Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act**
Mitigation for potential direct/indirect impacts to common and MSHCP covered sensitive bird and raptor species will require compliance with the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Construction outside the nesting season (between September 16th and January 31st) do not require pre-removal nesting bird surveys. If construction is proposed between February 1st and September 15th, a qualified biologist must conduct a nesting bird survey(s) no more than three (3) days prior to initiation of grading to document the presence or absence of nesting birds within or directly adjacent (100 feet) to the Project Site.

The survey(s) would focus on identifying any bird or raptor nests that would be directly or indirectly affected by construction activities. If active nests are documented, species-specific measures shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and implemented to prevent abandonment of the active nest. At a minimum, grading in the vicinity of a nest shall be deterred until the young birds have fledged. A minimum exclusion buffer of 100 feet shall be maintained during construction, depending on the species and location. The perimeter of the nest setback zone shall be fenced or adequately demarcated with stakes and flagging at 20-foot intervals, and construction personnel and activities restricted from the area. A survey report by a qualified biologist verifying that no active nests are present, or that the young have fledged, shall be submitted to the City of Wildomar for review and approval prior to initiation of grading in the nest-setback zone. The qualified biologist shall serve as a construction monitor during those periods when construction activities occur near active nest areas to ensure that no inadvertent impacts on these nests occur. A report of the findings prepared by a qualified biologist shall be submitted to the City of Wildomar for review and approval prior to construction that has the potential to disturb any active nests during the nesting season.

Any nest permanently vacated for the season would not warrant protection pursuant to the MBTA.
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PHOTOGRAPH 1 - Southward view of disturbed habitat documented in the eastern and western regions of the project site - dominated by ruderal non-native vegetation.

PHOTOGRAPH 2 - Southeast view of existing developed parking lot east of Mojonnier Way.

Refer to Figure 2 for Photographic Key Map
PHOTOGRAPH 3 - Westward view of ephemeral drainage which bisects the project site through the flood control easement. The drainage extends to an existing onsite detention basin and offsite overflow channel.

PHOTOGRAPH 4 - Southward view of the developed region of the project site including an existing church and associated ornamental landscaping.

Refer to Figure 2 for Photographic Key Map
Figure 5 - Soil Associations Map
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GyC2  Greenfield sandy loam, 2 to 8 percent slopes
HcC   Hanford course sandy loam, 2 to 8 percent slopes

Source: NRCS 2019

Figure 6 - Biological Resources Impact Map
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