

---

## 3.4 - Biological Resources

---

### 3.4.1 - Introduction

This section describes the existing biological resources and potential impacts on biological resources because of implementation of the Project. Section 15125 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the area of a project that exist at the time that the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is circulated. These environmental conditions normally constitute the baseline physical conditions relative to which the CEQA lead agency evaluates the change in conditions that would result from project implementation. The NOP for this Draft EIR was issued on February 27, 2009. Therefore, environmental conditions as of February 2009 represent the baseline for CEQA purposes. To evaluate the footprint impacts of the Proposed Action (e.g., effects on biological resources), the conditions in 2009 are considered to be the baseline. Buildout of the Project is then added to existing conditions in order to determine whether Project implementation would substantially remove or impact the resources, thereby resulting in a significant impact on the environment. Data used to determine the baseline for biological resources were derived from the following technical studies, included in this Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) as Appendix D.

- LSA Associates, Inc. August 1, 2005. General Biological Resources and Habitat Assessment Report, Redlands Crossing, City of Redlands, San Bernardino County, California;
- LSA Associates, Inc. July 28, 2005. Delineation of Jurisdictional Waters, Redlands Crossing, City of Redlands, San Bernardino County, California;
- Michael Brandman Associates (MBA). March 5, 2009. Biological Update Letter Report for Redlands Crossing Walmart, City of Redlands, San Bernardino County, California; and
- Michael Brandman Associates (MBA). September 10, 2009. Focused San Bernardino Kangaroo Rat Survey Report Redlands Crossing Walmart City of Redlands, San Bernardino County, California.

Therefore, data used to derive baseline conditions is based on existing conditions at the time of NOP issuance (February 27, 2009 through March 31, 2009) and are appropriate to use within the following analysis.

### Biological Resource Study

The biological resources study prepared in 2005, involved a thorough review of relevant literature followed by a reconnaissance-level field survey. The reconnaissance-level survey provided documentation of the biological resources existing on the Project site. In March of 2009, an updated letter report was prepared to evaluate existing conditions.

## Literature Review

A compilation of sensitive plants and wildlife species recorded in the Project vicinity was derived from a sensitive species and natural community account database, the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), and recorded occurrences of plant species found on or near the Project site derived from the California Native Plant Society's (CNPS) database. The nearest recorded locations of the sensitive species were determined through a seven-mile radius query of the CNDDDB. Federal Register listings, protocols, and species data provided by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the CDFG were reviewed in conjunction with anticipated federal and State listed species potentially occurring within the vicinity of the Project site. The literature review provided a baseline to evaluate the biological resources potentially occurring on the Project site and surrounding area.

## Field Survey

The field survey was conducted over all portions of the Project site by LSA Assistant Wildlife Biologist Lisa Wadley on May 3, 2005. MBA biologist Dale Hameister conducted a revised reconnaissance-level field survey of the Project site on January 26, 2009. The focus of the surveys were to identify any potentially sensitive habitats or those areas potentially supporting sensitive flora and fauna species, and included the following five primary objectives:

- Vegetation community mapping;
- Sensitive plant species assessment;
- Sensitive wild species assessment;
- Jurisdictional drainage assessments; and
- Wildlife corridor assessment.

Data used to derive baseline conditions is based on existing conditions at the time of NOP issuance and are appropriate to use within the following analysis.

### 3.4.2 - Environmental Setting

#### Plant Communities

Plant communities in California have generally been classified by biologists according to either Holland's Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California (1986) or Sawyer and Keeler-Wolf's A Manual of California Vegetation (1995). Holland's descriptions were developed as part of CDFG's Natural Diversity Data Base, and Sawyer and Keeler-Wolf's manual was developed through CNPS. Exhibit 3.4-1, Plant Communities, depicts the existing plant communities within the Project site.



Source: San Bernardino County NAIP (2009) & MBA GIS (2009).





## Project Site Conditions

Non-native ruderal forbs and grasses dominate the Project site. The dominant species include annual bursage (*Ambrosia acanthicarpa*), rip-gut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), soft cheese (*Bromus hordeaceus*), rat-tail fescue (*Vulpia myuros*), red-stemmed stork's bill (*Erodium cicutarium*), common fiddleneck (*Amsinckia menziesii* var. *intermedia*), and London rocket (*Sisymbrium irio*).

Based on the updated field-survey conducted in January of 2009, a windrow of Eucalyptus trees exist along the northern property boundary, just south of San Bernardino Avenue. The orange trees associated with the previously mapped Citrus Grove, have been destroyed and the wood debris was left in place. There are several blue elderberries (*Sambucus Mexicana*) growing within the recently disturbed orchard area. Non-native trees including English walnut (*Juglans regia*), China berry (*Melia azedarach*), and Peruvian peppertree (*Schinus molle*) were also found within the abandoned orchard area.

## Special-Status Species

Special-status species are those animal and plant species that, in the judgment of the resource agencies, trustee agencies, and certain non-governmental organizations, warrant special consideration in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process. This includes the following:

- Officially designated “threatened,” “endangered,” or “candidate” species federally listed by the USFWS and protected under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA).
- Officially designated “rare,” “threatened,” “endangered,” or “candidate” species state listed by the CDFG and protected under the California Endangered Species Act. CDFG also maintains a list of “Fully Protected” species as well as “California Species of Special Concern” that are also generally included as special-status species under CEQA.
- Species considered rare, threatened, or endangered under the conditions of Section 15380 of the CEQA Guidelines, such as plant species identified on lists 1A, 1B, and 2 in the CNPS Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California.
- Other species considered sensitive, such as birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), which includes most native birds. A species may also be designated as special concern at the local level.

## Special Status Plant Species

None of the special status plant species was observed during the biological resource survey (MBA 2009a).

## Wildlife

The habitat assessment survey indicated that the Project site supports a moderate diversity of wildlife. Wildlife species observed on-site include; Botta's pocket gopher (*Thomomys bottae*), coyote (*Canis*

*latrans*), California ground squirrel (*Spermophilus beecheyi*), side-blotched lizard (*Uta stansburiana*), American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*), and American crow (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*).

### **Special Status Wildlife Species**

The literature review indicated that two special status wildlife species, San Bernardino kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys merriami parvus*) (SBKR) and Western Burrowing Owl (*Athene cunicularia*) (BUOW) have the potential to occur within the Project site.

#### **San Bernardino Kangaroo Rat (SBKR)**

SBKR is found in sandy and gravelly soil of alluvial fans in areas along the Santa Ana River in San Bernardino County as well as areas along the San Jacinto River in Riverside County. Preferred vegetation is Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub (RAFSS). The Project site is 1.25 miles from the closest reported location (CNDDDB 2009) of SBKR at the Alabama Street Bridge at the Santa Ana River. Due to the proximity to known locations of SBKR and the presence of suitable sandy soils, there is a moderate potential the species will occur within the Project site (MBA 2009a). As such, a SBKR focused survey was conducted by MBA on September 2009, which resulted in negative findings (MBA 2009b).

#### **Western Burrowing Owl (BUOW)**

The BUOW is a California species of concern due to their decline in the State over the past 30 years. The BUOW is a small, buff-colored owl that is unique in its habit of nesting in subterranean burrows. Suitable habitat for BUOW consists of low vegetation cover that allows visibility and access to prey and the presence of suitable burrows for nesting. Although open areas with short vegetation are critical for nesting, there is some evidence that BUOW prefer a vegetation mosaic with nesting habitat interspersed within taller vegetation for hunting. The BUOW species were not observed during the field survey. However, the Project site provides suitable habitat for foraging and burrows (MBA 2009).

### **Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands**

A reconnaissance-level survey was conducted on the entire Project site by LSA Assistant Wildlife Biologist Lisa Wadley on May 3, 2005. A formal jurisdictional waters delineation was conducted by LSA Senior Biologist, Leo Simone on June 17, 2005. MBA regulatory specialist, Dale Hameister conducted a revised survey of the Project site on January 26, 2009.

Two concrete-lined drainage ditches are located within the eastern portion of the Project site. The westernmost drainage ditch does not appear to carry flows except immediately following rainfall events. The concrete-lined drainage ditch located along the northeastern boundary of the Project site carries nuisance runoff from the adjacent residential development southeast of the Project site. Both drainage ditches convey flows northerly into San Bernardino Avenue via an existing curb and gutter located immediately north of the Project site. The existing drainages were evaluated for their jurisdictional delineation (LSA 2005a). According to the jurisdictional delineation for the Project,

there are no U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) or CDFG wetlands or riparian areas on the Project site.

### **Habitat Conservation Plan**

The Project site is not located within any habitat conservation plan (HCP) area.

### **Wildlife Corridors/Habitat Fragmentation**

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 likely not persist over time in fragmented or isolated habitat areas because the infusion of new individuals and genetic information is restricted or prohibited. Corridors effectively act as links between different populations of a species. The smaller the population, the more important immigration becomes, because prolonged inbreeding between a small group of individuals can reduce genetic variability over time. A significant decrease in a population’s genetic variability is generally associated with a decrease in population health and, eventually, extirpation. This can occur on a local or regional scale, depending upon the degree and type of fragmentation.

### **3.4.3 - Regulatory Framework**

The following policies and regulations are applicable to the potential biological resources associated with the Project site.

#### **Federal Regulations**

##### ***Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA)***

The purposes of this Act are to provide a means to conserve the ecosystems that endangered and threatened species depend on and to provide a program for conservation and recovery of these species. The FESA defines species as “endangered” or “threatened” and provides regulatory protection for any species so designated. Section 9 of the FESA prohibits the take of species listed by the USFWS as threatened or endangered. As defined in the FESA, take means “...to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect or attempt to engage in such conduct.” Harm is defined by the USFWS to encompass “an act which actually kills or injures wildlife. Such an act may include significant habitat modification or degradation where it actually kills or injures wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding or sheltering” (50 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Section 17.3). Thus, some instances of habitat modification can constitute prohibited “take” if it can be shown that such modification can be expected to result in injury or death to one or more individuals of a listed species.

In recognition that take cannot always be avoided, Section 10(a) of the FESA includes provisions for take that is incidental to, but not the purpose of, otherwise lawful activities. Section 10 (a)(1)(B)

permits (incidental take permits) may be issued if taking is incidental and will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of survival and recovery of the species in the wild.

Section 7 (a)(2) of the FESA requires any federal agency taking an action, including the USFWS, to evaluate a project with respect to any species proposed for listing or already listed as endangered or threatened and their critical habitat, if any is proposed or designated. Federal agencies must undertake programs for the conservation of endangered and threatened species, and are prohibited from authorizing, funding, or carrying out any action that will jeopardize a listed species or destroy or modify its “critical habitat.” As defined in the FESA, “individuals, organizations, states, local governments, and other non-Federal entities are affected by the designation of critical habitat only if their actions occur on Federal lands, require a Federal permit, license, or other authorization, or involve Federal funding.”

#### ***Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA)***

The MBTA makes it unlawful to pursue, capture, kill, or possess or attempt to do the same to any migratory bird or part, nest, or egg of any such bird listed in wildlife protection treaties between the United States, Great Britain, Mexico, Japan, and the countries of the former Soviet Union. As with the FESA, the MBTA authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to issue permits for incidental take.

#### **State Regulations**

##### ***California Endangered Species Act (CESA)***

The State of California considers an endangered species as one whose prospects of survival and reproduction are in immediate jeopardy; a threatened species as one present in such small numbers throughout its range that it is considered likely to become an endangered species in the near future in the absence of special protection or management; and a rare species as one present in such small numbers throughout its range that it may become endangered if its present environment worsens. The designation “rare species” applies only to California native plants. State threatened and endangered species include both plants and wildlife (not including invertebrates) and are legally protected against “take” as this term is defined in the CESA (California Fish & Game Code Section 2050 et seq.). “Species of Special Concern” is an informal designation used by the CDFG for some declining wildlife species that are not officially listed as endangered, threatened, or rare. This designation does not provide legal protection, but signifies that these species are recognized as vulnerable by the CDFG.

##### ***Section 2080 and 2081 of the State Fish and Game Code***

Section 2080 of the State Fish and Game Code states that no person shall import into this state (California), 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 (State Fish and Game Commission) determines to be an endangered species or threatened species, or attempt any of those acts, except as otherwise provided in this chapter, the Native Plant Protection Act, or the California Desert Native Plants Act. Under Section 2081 of the State Fish and Game Code, the CDFG may authorize individuals or public

agencies to import, export, take, or possess, any state-listed endangered, threatened, or candidate species. These otherwise prohibited acts may be authorized through permits or Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) if: (1) the take is incidental to an otherwise lawful activity; (2) impacts of the authorized take are minimized and fully mitigated; (3) the permit is consistent with any regulations adopted pursuant to any recovery plan for the species; and (4) the applicant ensures adequate funding to implement the measures required by CDFG. CDFG shall make this determination based on the best scientific and other information that is reasonably available and shall include consideration of the species' capability to survive and reproduce.

**Section 3503 of the State Fish and Game Code**

Section 3503 of the State Fish and Game Code states, "It is unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird, except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation made pursuant thereto."

**Section 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act**

Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA), which is administered by the USACE, regulates the discharge of dredge and fill material into waters of the United States. USACE has established a series of nationwide permits that authorize certain activities in waters of the United States (U.S.), provided that a proposed activity can demonstrate compliance with standard conditions. Normally, USACE requires an individual permit for an activity that will affect an area equal to or in excess of 0.3 acre of waters of the U.S.. Projects that result in impacts to less than 0.3 acre of waters of the U.S. can usually be conducted pursuant to one of the nationwide permits, if consistent with the standard permit conditions. USACE also has discretionary authority to require an Environmental Impact Statement for Projects that result in impacts to an area between 0.1 and 0.3 acre. Use of any nationwide permit is contingent on the activities having no impacts to endangered species.

**Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) Program**

The NCCP Program, managed by CDFG, is designed to conserve multiple species and their habitats, while also providing for the compatible use of private land. Through local planning, the NCCP planning process protects wildlife and habitat before the landscape becomes so fragmented or degraded by development that listings are required under the FESA. Instead of saving small, disconnected units of habitat for just one species at a time, agencies, local jurisdictions, and other interested parties have an opportunity, through the NCCP, to work cooperatively to develop plans that consider broad landscapes, or "ecosystems," and the needs of many species. Partners enroll in the programs and, by mutual consent, habitat areas with high conservation values are set aside and may not be developed. Partners also agree to study, monitor, and develop management plans for these "reserve" areas. The program provides a process for fostering economic growth by allowing approved development in enrolled areas with lower conservation values.

**Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA)**

The NPPA includes measures to preserve, protect, and enhance rare and endangered native plants. The definition of “rare and endangered” differs from those contained in CESA. However, the list of native plants afforded protection pursuant to this act includes those listed as rare and endangered under the CESA. The NPPA provides limitations on take as follows: “...no person will import into this State, or take, possess, or sell within this State” any rare or endangered native plant, except in compliance with provisions of the act”. Individual landowners are required to notify the CDFG at least 10 days in advance of changing land uses to allow the CDFG to salvage any rare or endangered native plant material.

**California Native Plant Society (CNPS)**

The CNPS is a statewide resource conservation organization that has developed an inventory of California’s special-status plant species. This inventory is a summary of information on the distribution, rarity, and endangerment of California’s vascular plants. This rare plant inventory consists of four lists. CNPS presumes that List 1A plant species are extinct in California because they have not been seen in the wild for many years. CNPS considers List 1B plants as rare, threatened, or endangered throughout their range. List 2 plant species are considered rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common in other states. Plant species on lists 1A, 1B, and 2 meet CDFG criteria for endangered, threatened, or rare listing. Plant species for which CNPS requires additional information in order to properly evaluate their status are included on List 3. List 4 plant species are those of limited distribution in California whose susceptibility to threat is considered low at the current time.

**Local Regulations****City of Redlands General Plan**

The City of Redlands General Plan establishes the following applicable goals and policies related to the biological resources.

**Guiding Policies: Biotic Resources**

Policy 7.21a Minimize disruption of wildlife and valued habitat throughout the Planning Area.

Policy 7.21b Preserve, protect and enhance natural communities of special status.

Policy 7.21c Where feasible, landscape public areas using native vegetation.

**Implementing Policies: Biotic Resources**

Policy 7.21h Require a biological assessment of any project site where species or the habitat of species defined as sensitive or special status by the Department of Fish and Game (DFG) or the USFWS might be present.

Policy 7.21t Evaluate the habitat value of agricultural fields and grooves prior to conversion to other uses; if habitat value is significant, consider a development plan which incorporates open space uses of similar value.

#### **3.4.4 - Thresholds of Significance**

According to the CEQA Guidelines' Appendix G Environmental Checklist, to determine whether impacts to biological resources are significant environmental effects, the following questions are analyzed and evaluated:

Would the Project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS?
- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFG or USFWS?
- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the CWA (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?
- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
- f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?
- g) Will the Project be affected by climate change through shifting vegetation, agriculture, or forest productivity decline?

#### **3.4.5 - Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

This section discusses potential impacts associated with the development of the Project and provides mitigation measures where appropriate.

---

**Effect on Species**

---

<b>Impact BR-1</b>	<b>Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS?</b> <b>[CEQA Biological Resources Threshold 4(a)]</b>
--------------------	--

---

**Impact Analysis**

The biological resource and habitat assessment report (LSA 2005b, MBA 2009a) indicated that none of the special-status plants was observed on the site during the field surveys. The Project site is regularly disked and is highly disturbed from past agricultural and human activities, and dominated by non-native species. Therefore, there is a very low potential for any rare plant species to occur on the Project site.

None of the special-status wildlife species was observed in the 2005 and 2009 surveys. However, the literature survey suggested that the Project site provides moderately suitable habitat for SBKR and BUOW. Both of these species are special-status wildlife species. Therefore, a live-trapping effort for the federally listed endangered SBKR was conducted within portions of the Project site (Appendix C). The focused survey was conducted to determine the presence or absence of SBKR on the site, as suggested by the habitat assessment report. According to the focused SBKR survey report, SBKR were not captured as part of the 2009 trapping effort and they are not currently present on the Project site. The species diversity is very low within the survey area (MBA 2009b).

Additionally, the Project site is not located within USFWS designated critical habitat for SBKR. The closest designated critical habitat area is approximately one mile north of the Project site. Based on the negative findings of the focused surveys and the disturbed nature of the habitat on-site, development and operation of the Project will not directly impact SBKR. Therefore, impacts to SBKR are less than significant.

The Project site contains suitable burrows and foraging habitat for BUOW. Even though BUOW were not observed during the biological survey, there is a potential for BUOW to utilize the site. Therefore, significant impacts could occur to BUOW from the Project without implementation of appropriate mitigation measures.

A number of common variety bird species were observed foraging on the Project site (MBA 2009). None of the common variety bird species observed were "special-status" species, however, the Project site contains approximately 0.25 acre of eucalyptus trees that will, presumably, be taken off the site. Ground clearance and vegetation removal (including the 0.25 acre of eucalyptus trees) could result in potential impacts to the nesting birds, as per Section 3503 of the State Fish and Game Code. Therefore, significant impacts could occur to nesting birds from the Project without implementation of appropriate mitigation measures.

### **Level of Significance Before Mitigation**

Potentially significant.

### **Mitigation Measures**

The following mitigation measures are recommended based upon the findings of the biological resource and habitat assessment report. The implementation of the following measures shall reduce the potential significant impact to sensitive species to a less than significant level.

### **Western Burrowing Owl (BUOW)**

**MM BR-1a** A protocol focus survey for BUOW shall be conducted pursuant to CDFG protocols and prior to grading activities to determine presence or absence. If owls are found, passive relocation (i.e., use of one-way doors to ensure owls have been evacuated and then collapse of burrows) shall be used to ensure that no owls are directly injured or killed during construction. Active relocation shall not be employed unless approved by the CDFG prior to grading, and if passive relocation has been determined not to be practical. Active relocation would entail capture of the owls, relocation off-site, construction of an artificial burrow, and fencing and feeding to habituate the owls to the new burrow.

### **Nesting Birds**

**MM BR-1b** Vegetation removal shall occur outside of the nesting bird season (February to August). If such avoidance is not feasible, the applicant shall have a qualified biologist survey for actively nesting birds within the nesting bird season. Any active nests identified shall have highly visible construction fencing installed not less than 100-feet (200-feet for birds of prey) of the active nests. Disturbance shall not occur within the buffer area until the biologist determines that the young have fledged.

### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Less than significant.

### **Riparian Habitat**

---

<b>Impact BR-2</b>	<b>Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFG or USFWS?</b>
--------------------	---

---

**[CEQA Biological Resources Threshold 4(b)]**

---

### **Impact Analysis**

The Project site does not contain any riparian/riverine habitat. In addition, no vernal pools, vernal pool habitat, or fairy shrimp habitat occur on the Project site. The habitat assessment conducted for the Project determined that the Project site does not contain sensitive natural community as identified in local or State plans or by the CDFG or USFWS (MBA 2009). Therefore, the Project would not result in significant impact to any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

**Biological Resources**

---

**Level of Significance Before Mitigation**

Less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Less than significant.

**Federally Protected Wetlands**

---

**Impact BR-3** Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the CWA (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?  
[CEQA Biological Resources Threshold 4(c)]

---

**Impact Analysis**

According to the jurisdictional delineation for the Project, there are no USACE or CDFG wetlands or riparian areas on the Project site; therefore, there would be no potential impacts to federally protected wetlands (LSA 2005a, MBA 2009a).

**Level of Significance Before Mitigation**

Less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Less than significant.

**Wildlife Corridors and Nursery Sites**

---

**Impact BR-4** Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?  
[CEQA Biological Resources Threshold 4(d)]

---

**Impact Analysis**

The Project site does not contain flowing water or standing pools, nor does the site support any vegetation or resources that serves as a habitat for the migratory fish or wildlife. The site does not lie within any known wildlife corridors. In addition, the use of the Project site as a wildlife corridor is unlikely, given the close proximity of residential development to the east, the State Route 210 (SR-210) Freeway located immediately west of the site, and the I-10 Freeway located approximately one mile south of the Project site. Further, no regional wildlife corridor traverses, or is in proximity to the Project site. Therefore, implementation of the Project will not have a significant impact on wildlife movement routes or result in habitat fragmentation (LSA 2005b, MBA 2009a).

**Level of Significance Before Mitigation**

Less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Less than significant.

**Local Policies or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources**

---

<b>Impact BR-5</b>	<b>Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? [CEQA Biological Resources Threshold 4(e)]</b>
--------------------	--

---

**Impact Analysis**

The following are the implementing policies related to biological resources within the City of Redlands General Plan applicable to the Project.

**Policy 7.21h** Require a biological assessment of any project site where species or the habitat of species defined as sensitive or special status by the DFG or the USFWS might be present.

**Analysis**

A General Biological Resource and Habitat Assessment Report was prepared for the Project by LSA Associates, Inc. on August 1, 2005. The report was updated by MBA on March 5, 2009. The report determined that the Project site does not contain any species or habitat species defined as sensitive or special status by the DFG or the USFWS. Therefore, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

**Policy 7.21t** Evaluate the habitat value of agricultural fields and groves prior to conversion to other uses; if habitat value is significant, consider a development plan, which incorporates open space uses of similar value.

**Analysis**

A General Biological Resource and Habitat Assessment Report prepared for the Project analyzed the habitat value of agricultural fields and citrus groves. The Project site has been historically utilized for agriculture purposes as an orchard. However, the updated report indicated that the previously mapped Citrus Grove has been changed. The citrus farming in the Project site has been discontinued and the orange trees have been destroyed, cut, and left in place (MBA 2009a). Therefore, at present, the Project site does not contain significant habitat value in regard to

agricultural fields and grooves and therefore conversion of the Project site to the Redlands Crossing Center would not result in significant impact in this regard.

**Level of Significance Before Mitigation**

Less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Less than significant.

**Conservation Plans**

---

Impact BR-6	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? [CEQA Biological Resources Threshold 4(f)]
-------------	---

---

**Impact Analysis**

There are no local, regional or State approved conservation plans applicable to the Project. Therefore, the Project will not conflict with the provisions of any adopted habitat/natural community conservation plan.

**Level of Significance Before Mitigation**

Less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Less than significant.