



STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
MEGHAN HERTEL, Director

South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, CA 92123
wildlife.ca.gov

July 22, 2026

Brett Cannon
Senior Planner
City of Irvine, Community Development Department
PO Box 19575
Irvine, CA 92623-9575
bcannon@cityofirvine.org

Subject: Comments on the Notice of Preparation of a Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for the Our Lady of Peace Project, SCH No. 2023070463, Orange County, CA

Dear Brett Cannon:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) reviewed the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) and Draft Initial Study (Draft IS) from the City of Irvine (City) for the Our Lady of Peace Project (Project) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines¹.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and recommendations regarding those activities involved in the Project that may affect California fish and wildlife. Likewise, we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments regarding those aspects of the Project that CDFW, by law, may be required to carry out or approve through the exercise of its own regulatory authority under the Fish and Game Code.

CDFW ROLE

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

CDFW is also submitting comments as a **Responsible Agency** under CEQA. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21069; CEQA Guidelines, § 15381.) CDFW expects that it may need to exercise regulatory authority as provided by the Fish and Game Code. As proposed, for example, the Project may be subject to CDFW's lake and streambed alteration regulatory authority. (Fish & G. Code, § 1600 et seq.) Likewise, to the extent implementation of the Project as proposed may result in "take" as defined by State law of any species protected under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (Fish & G. Code, § 2050 et seq.), the project proponent may seek related take authorization as provided by the Fish and Game Code.

¹ CEQA is codified in the California Public Resources Code in section 21000 et seq. The "CEQA Guidelines" are found in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, commencing with section 15000.

Brett Cannon
City of Irvine
July 22, 2026
Page 2

CDFW also administers the Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) program, a California regional habitat conservation planning program (Fish & G. Code 2800 *et seq.*). The City of Irvine (City) participates in the NCCP as a Signatory to the Implementation Agreement (IA) under the County of Orange Central and Coastal Subregion Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Proponent: Diocese of Orange

Objective: The objective of the Project is to construct 68 multi-family residential units and a church building to replace a temporary church building. Primary Project activities include removal of existing buildings, trees, and shrubs, and ground disturbance in the form of excavation and grading.

Location: The approximately six-acre Project site is located at 14010 Remington, Irvine, California 92620 in Orange County. The Project site is bordered by Remington to the northwest, Trabuco Road to the northeast, Roosevelt to the southwest, and a residential community to the southeast. It is within a primarily residential land use area surrounded by single-family residences to the northwest and northeast and multi-family residences to the southwest and southeast. The site is accessed via Remington by way of Trabuco Road from the north or Roosevelt from the south.

Timeframe: Development is proposed to begin in the first quarter of 2027 and be completed in the fourth quarter of 2030.

Biological Setting: The Project site is within an area designated by the City's General Plan as Medium-High Density Residential use. It is not located within NCCP/HCP Reserve area boundaries, rather, it is located between central and coastal Reserve lands: approximately 2 miles southwest of the nearest central Reserve lands at Syphon Reservoir, and approximately 3.3 miles northeast of coastal Reserve lands at the City of Irvine Open Space Preserve South. Vegetation on the Project site consists of ornamental trees and shrubs that may provide potential nesting habitat for birds. No riparian habitat or wetland impacts are associated with this Project.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CDFW offers the comments and recommendations below to assist the City in adequately identifying and/or mitigating the Project's significant, or potentially significant, direct and indirect impacts on fish and wildlife (biological) resources. Editorial comments or other suggestions may also be included to improve the document.

Specific Comments

- 1) Nesting Birds. Project construction activities may result in removal or disturbance to trees and shrubs that could contain active bird nests. Ground-nesting species may also be impacted by vegetation removal or grading. Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the Fish and Game Code prohibit take of all birds and their active nests. The loss of protected bird nests, eggs, or young due to Project activities may constitute an adverse impact under CEQA. The SEIR should include a mitigation measure or measures which avoid impacts to nesting birds, including but not limited to seasonal avoidance. Project activities which could impact avian species should occur outside of the avian breeding season which runs from January 1 through September 15 to avoid take of raptors and migratory birds or their eggs.

Brett Cannon
 City of Irvine
 July 22, 2026
 Page 3

If Project construction is necessary during the bird breeding season, CDFW recommends a qualified biologist with experience in conducting bird breeding surveys conduct a nesting bird survey within three days prior to commencing work in the area. Project personnel, including all contractors working on site, should be instructed on how to avoid bird nests in the area. If an active nest is identified, a buffer shall be established between the construction activities and the active nest so that nesting activities are not interrupted. In general, CDFW recommends a 100-foot buffer for common avian species, 300 feet for listed or highly sensitive species, and 500 feet for raptors. The buffer should be delineated by temporary fencing and remain in effect for the duration of all construction activities. No Project construction shall occur within the nesting buffer area until the young have fledged, are no longer being fed by the parents, have left the nest, and will no longer be impacted by the Project. Reductions in the nest buffer distance may be allowable depending on the avian species involved, ambient levels of human activity, screening vegetation, or possibly other factors.

Additionally, the SEIR should include a specific discussion and analysis of impacts to raptors such as white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*). White-tailed kite is a CDFW Fully Protected Species, known to reside, nest, and hunt for prey within urban and suburban areas of southern California. According to the [White-Tailed Kite Predicted Habitat](#)² (CDFW 2025a) and [White-Tailed Kite Range](#)³ (CDFW 2025b) datasets, the Project site occurs within the white-tailed kite's yearlong range. Observations of white-tailed kite have been submitted to eBird within 1 mile of the Project site as recently as 2025 (Sullivan *et al.* 2009). White-tailed kite is a Fully Protected Species, and no permit can be authorized to allow for incidental take. The SEIR should also include specific measures which ensure that no impacts will occur to this species.

- 2) Rodenticides. To avoid direct and indirect impacts to biological resources (i.e., rodents, raptors, and large mammals), the SEIR should include a mitigation measure to prohibit any use of first-generation anticoagulant rodenticides (i.e., diphacinone, chlorophacinone, and warfarin) and second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides (e.g., brodifacoum, bromadiolone, difethialone, and difenacoum) on site during Project implementation and for long-term management, operations, and maintenance activities. This prohibition on rodenticides should also be included in any long-term documents for the residences, including Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CCRs) for the property.
- 3) Use of Native Plants and Trees. CDFW recommends the City require the Project Applicant to provide a native plant palette for the Project. The Project's landscaping plan should be disclosed and evaluated in the SEIR for potential impacts on biological resources such as natural communities adjacent to the Project site (e.g., introducing non-native, invasive species). CDFW supports the use of native plants for the Project especially considering the Project's location adjacent to protected open space and natural areas. CDFW strongly recommends avoiding non-native, invasive species for landscaping and restoration, particularly any species listed as 'Moderate' or 'High' by the [California Invasive Plant Council](#).⁴ CDFW supports the use of native species found in naturally occurring plant communities within or adjacent to the Project site. In addition, CDFW supports planting species of trees, such as oaks (*Quercus* genus), and understory vegetation (e.g., ground cover, subshrubs, and shrubs) that create habitat and provide a food source for birds. CDFW recommends retaining any standing, dead, or dying tree (snags) where possible because

² <https://data.ca.gov/dataset/white-tailed-kite-predicted-habitat-cwhr-b111-ds20851>

³ <https://data.ca.gov/dataset/white-tailed-kite-range-cwhr-b111-ds1442>

⁴ <https://www.cal-ipc.org/plants/inventory/>

Brett Cannon
City of Irvine
July 22, 2026
Page 4

snags provide perching and nesting habitat for birds and raptors. Finally, CDFW supports planting species of vegetation with high insect and pollinator value.

- 4) Tree Removal and Replacement. The Draft IS states that the Project's landscaping activities will include the removal of 43 existing trees on site to be replaced with new landscaping consisting of trees, shrubs, and groundcover plants. CDFW recommends preservation of significant trees as defined in Section 5-7-404 of the City's Municipal Code. This preservation should be added to the Project Description of the SEIR and/or included as a mitigation or minimization measure in the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Plan (MMRP) in the document.
- 5) Tree Disease Management Plan. The Draft IS includes conceptual plans to plant native species of trees such as coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) and California sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*) (Figure 2.16). CDFW supports the preparation of these plans and recommends the Project activities include considerations of the potential to spread tree pests and diseases throughout the Project site and into adjacent natural habitat not currently exposed to these stressors. Pests and diseases include (but are not limited to): [sudden oak death](#)⁵ (*Phytophthora ramorum*), [Polyphagous shot hole borer](#)⁶ (*Euwallacea* spp.), and [goldspotted oak borer](#)⁷ (*Agrilus auroguttatus*) (Phytosphere Research 2012; UCANR 2020; UCIPM 2013). CDFW recommends the SEIR include an infectious tree disease management plan or a list of preventative measures, developed in consultation with an arborist, which describe how disease management will be implemented to avoid or reduce the spread of tree insect pests and diseases. The development of such a plan should be included as a mitigation measure in the document's MMRP table.

General Comments

- 1) Disclosure. The SEIR should provide an adequate, complete, and detailed disclosure about the effects which a proposed project is likely to have on the environment (Pub. Resources Code, § 20161; CEQA Guidelines, § 15151). Such disclosure is necessary so CDFW may provide comments on the adequacy of proposed avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures, as well as assess the significance of the specific impact relative to plant and wildlife species impacted (e.g., current range, distribution, population trends, and connectivity).
- 2) Project Description and Alternatives. To enable adequate review and comment on the proposed Project from the standpoint of the protection of fish, wildlife, and plants, CDFW recommends the following information be included in the SEIR.
- a. A complete discussion of the purpose and need for, and description of the proposed Project.
 - b. A range of feasible alternatives to the Project location to avoid or otherwise minimize direct and indirect impacts on sensitive biological resources and wildlife movement areas. CDFW recommends the City select Project designs and alternatives that would avoid or otherwise minimize direct and indirect impacts on biological resources. CDFW also recommends the City consider establishing appropriate setbacks from sensitive and special status biological resources. Setbacks should not be impacted by ground disturbance or hydrological changes from any future Project-related construction, activities, maintenance, and development. As a general rule, CDFW recommends reducing or clustering a development footprint to retain unobstructed

⁵ <http://phytosphere.com/SODmgmtPUB/pg6Sidebar1-1SODmgmtpub.htm>
⁶ <http://eskalenlab.ucr.edu/avocado.html>
⁷ <https://ipm.ucanr.edu/home-and-landscape/goldspotted-oak-borer>

Brett Cannon
City of Irvine
July 22, 2026
Page 5

spaces for vegetation and wildlife and provide connections for wildlife between properties and minimize obstacles to open space.

- c. Project alternatives should be thoroughly evaluated, even if an alternative would impede, to some degree, the attainment of the Project objectives or would be more costly (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6). The SEIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, public participation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed Project (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6).
 - d. Where the Project may impact aquatic and riparian resources, CDFW recommends the City select Project designs and alternatives that would fully avoid impacts to such resources. CDFW also recommends an alternative that would not impede, alter, or otherwise modify existing surface flow, watercourse and meander, and water-dependent ecosystems and natural communities. Project designs should consider elevated crossings to avoid channelizing or narrowing of watercourses. Any modifications to a river, creek, or stream may cause or magnify upstream bank erosion, channel incision, and drop in water level, which may cause the watercourse to alter its course of flow.
- 3) Biological Baseline Assessment. An adequate biological resources assessment should provide a complete assessment and impact analysis of the flora and fauna within and adjacent to the Project site and where the Project may result in ground disturbance. The assessment and analysis should place emphasis on identifying endangered, threatened, rare, and sensitive species; regionally and locally unique species; and sensitive habitats. An impact analysis will aid in determining the Project's potential direct, indirect, and cumulative biological impacts, as well as specific mitigation or avoidance measures necessary to offset those impacts. CDFW also considers impacts to Species of Special Concern (SSC) a significant direct and cumulative adverse effect without implementing appropriate avoidance and/or mitigation measures. The SEIR should include the following information.
- a. Information on the regional setting that is critical to an assessment of environmental impacts, with special emphasis on resources that are rare or unique to the region (CEQA Guidelines, § 15125(c)). The SEIR should include measures to fully avoid and otherwise protect Sensitive Natural Communities. CDFW considers Sensitive Natural Communities as threatened habitats having both regional and local significance. Natural communities, alliances, and associations with a State-wide rarity ranking of S1, S2, and S3 should be considered sensitive and declining at the local and regional level. These ranks can be obtained by visiting the [Vegetation Classification and Mapping Program - Natural Communities webpage](#)⁸.
 - b. A thorough, recent, floristic-based assessment of special status plants and natural communities following CDFW's [Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities](#)⁹ (CDFW 2018). Botanical field surveys should be comprehensive over the entire Project site, including areas that will be directly or indirectly impacted by the Project. Adjoining properties should also be surveyed where direct or indirect Project effects could occur, such as those from fuel modification, herbicide application, invasive species, and altered hydrology. Botanical field surveys should be conducted in the field at the times of year when plants will be both evident and identifiable. Usually, this is during flowering or fruiting. Botanical field survey visits should be spaced throughout the growing season to accurately determine what

⁸ <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/VegCAMP/Natural-Communities>

⁹ <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=18959&inline>

Brett Cannon
City of Irvine
July 22, 2026
Page 6

- plants exist in the Project site. This usually involves multiple visits to the Project site (e.g., in early, mid, and late season) to capture the floristic diversity at a level necessary to determine if special status plants are present.
- c. Floristic alliance- and/or association-based mapping and vegetation impact assessments conducted in the Project site and within adjacent areas. The [Manual of California Vegetation](#)¹⁰, second edition, (Sawyer *et al.* 2009) should also be used to inform this mapping and assessment. Adjoining habitat areas should be included in this assessment where the Project's construction and activities could lead to direct or indirect impacts offsite.
 - d. A complete and recent assessment of the biological resources associated with each habitat type in the Project site and within adjacent areas. A full literature review includes but is not limited to CDFW's [California Natural Diversity Database](#)¹¹ (CNDDDB). The CNDDDB should be accessed to obtain current information on any previously reported sensitive species and habitat. An assessment should include a minimum nine-quadrangle search of the CNDDDB to determine a list of species potentially present in the Project site. A nine-quadrangle search should be provided in the Project's CEQA document for adequate disclosure of the Project's potential impact on biological resources.
 - e. A complete, recent, assessment of endangered, rare, or threatened species and other sensitive species within the Project site and adjacent areas, including SSC and California Fully Protected Species (Fish & G. Code, §§ 3511, 4700, 5050, and 5515). Species to be addressed should include all those which meet the CEQA definition of endangered, rare, or threatened species (CEQA Guidelines, § 15380). Seasonal variations in use of the Project site should also be addressed such as wintering, roosting, nesting, and foraging habitat. Focused species-specific surveys, conducted at the appropriate time of year and time of day when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable, may be required if suitable habitat is present. See [CDFW's Survey and Monitoring Protocols and Guidelines](#)¹² for established survey protocol. Acceptable species-specific survey procedures may be developed in consultation with CDFW and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
 - f. A recent wildlife and rare plant survey. A lack of records in the CNDDDB does not mean that rare, threatened, or endangered plants and wildlife do not occur. Field verification for the presence or absence of sensitive species is necessary to provide a complete biological assessment for adequate CEQA review (CEQA Guidelines, § 15003(i)). CDFW generally considers biological field assessments for wildlife to be valid for a one-year period, and assessments for rare plants may be considered valid for a period of up to three years. Some aspects of the proposed Project may warrant periodic updated surveys for certain sensitive taxa, particularly if Project implementation build out could occur over a protracted time frame or in phases.
- 4) Direct and Indirect Impacts on Biological Resources. The SEIR should provide a thorough discussion of direct and indirect impacts expected to affect biological resources with specific measures to offset such impacts. The SEIR should address the following.
- a. A discussion of potential impacts from lighting, noise, temporary and permanent human activity, and exotic species, and identification of any

¹⁰ <https://vegetation.cnps.org/>

¹¹ <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB>

¹² <https://wildlife.ca.gov/conservation/survey-protocols>

Brett Cannon
City of Irvine
July 22, 2026
Page 7

mitigation measures. A discussion regarding Project-related indirect impacts on biological resources. These include resources in nearby public lands, open space, adjacent natural habitats, riparian ecosystems, and any designated and/or proposed or existing reserve lands (e.g., preserve lands associated with a Natural Community Conservation Plan (Fish & G. Code, § 2800 et. seq.)).

- b. A discussion of both the short-term and long-term effects of the Project on species population distribution and concentration, as well as alterations of the ecosystem supporting those species impacted (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.2(a)).
 - c. Impacts on, and maintenance of, wildlife corridor/movement areas, including access to undisturbed habitats in areas adjacent to the Project, should be fully analyzed and discussed in the SEIR.
 - d. A discussion of post-Project fate of drainage patterns, surface flows, and soil erosion and/or sedimentation in streams and water bodies. The discussion should also address the potential water extraction activities and the potential resulting impacts on habitat supported by the groundwater. Measures to mitigate such impacts should be included.
 - e. An analysis of impacts from proposed changes to land use designations and zoning, and existing land use designation and zoning located nearby or adjacent to natural areas that may inadvertently contribute to wildlife-human interactions. A discussion of possible conflicts and mitigation measures to reduce these conflicts should be included in the SEIR.
- 5) Cumulative Impact. Cumulative impacts on biological resources can result from collectively significant projects which are individually insignificant. The Project, when considered collectively with prior, concurrent, and probable future projects, may have a significant cumulative effect on biological resources. The Project may have the potential to substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of endangered, rare, or threatened species. Species that may be impacted by the Project include, but are not limited to, the biological resources described in this letter.

Accordingly, CDFW recommends the SEIR evaluate the Project's potential cumulative impacts on biological resources. The Project may have a "significant effect on the environment" if the possible effects of the Project are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects (Pub. Resources Code, § 21083(b)). The City's conclusions regarding the significance of the Project's cumulative impact should be justified and supported by evidence to make those conclusions. Specifically, if the City concludes that the Project would not result in cumulative impacts on biological resources, the City, "shall identify facts and analysis supporting the Lead Agency's conclusion that the cumulative impact is less than significant" (CEQA Guidelines section § 15130(a)(2)).

- 6) Mitigation Measures. Public agencies have a duty under CEQA to prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in a project through the use of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15002(a)(3), 15021). Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4, an environmental document shall describe feasible measures which could mitigate impacts below a significant level under CEQA. Mitigation measures must be feasible, effective, implementable, and fully enforceable/imposed by the lead agency through permit conditions,

Brett Cannon
City of Irvine
July 22, 2026
Page 8

agreements, or other legally binding instruments (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081.6(b); CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.4).

- a. The SEIR should provide mitigation measures that are specific and detailed (i.e., responsible party, timing, specific actions, location) in order for a mitigation measure to be fully enforceable and implemented successfully via a mitigation monitoring and/or reporting program (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081.6; CEQA Guidelines, § 15097).
 - b. If a proposed mitigation measure would cause one or more significant effects, in addition to impacts caused by the proposed Project, the SEIR should include a discussion of the effects of proposed mitigation measures (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.4(a)(1)). In that regard, the SEIR should provide an adequate, complete, and detailed disclosure about the Project's proposed mitigation measure(s). Adequate disclosure is necessary so CDFW may assess the potential impacts of proposed mitigation measures.
- 7) Compensatory Mitigation. The SEIR should include compensatory mitigation measures for the Project's significant impacts (direct and/or through habitat modification) to sensitive and special status plants, animals, and habitats. Mitigation measures should emphasize avoidance and minimization of Project-related impacts. For unavoidable impacts, on-site habitat restoration or enhancement should be discussed in detail. If on-site mitigation is not feasible or would not be biologically viable and therefore inadequate to mitigate the loss of biological functions and values, off-site mitigation through habitat creation and/or acquisition and preservation in perpetuity should be addressed. Areas proposed as mitigation lands should be protected in perpetuity with a conservation easement and financial assurance and dedicated to a qualified entity for long-term management and monitoring.
- 8) Long-term Management of Mitigation Lands. For proposed mitigation lands, the SEIR should include measures to protect the targeted habitat values in perpetuity. The mitigation should offset Project-induced qualitative and quantitative losses of biological resources. Issues that should be addressed include (but are not limited to) restrictions on access, proposed land dedications, monitoring and management programs, control of illegal dumping, water pollution, and increased human intrusion. An appropriate endowment should be set aside to provide for long-term management of mitigation lands.
- 9) CESA. CDFW considers adverse impacts to a species protected by CESA to be significant. Take of any endangered, threatened, candidate species, or NPPA-listed plant species that results from the Project is prohibited, except as authorized by state law (Fish & G. Code, §§ 2080, 2085; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §786.9). Consequently, if the Project or any Project-related activity will result in take of a species designated as endangered or threatened, or a candidate for listing under CESA, CDFW recommends that the Project proponent seek appropriate take authorization under CESA prior to implementing the Project. Appropriate authorization from CDFW may include an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) or a consistency determination in certain circumstances, among other options (Fish & G. Code, §§ 2080.1, 2081, subds. (b) and (c)). Early consultation is encouraged, as significant modification to a Project and mitigation measures may be required to obtain a CESA Permit.

To ensure CDFW will be able to use the City's CEQA document for the issuance of an ITP, the SEIR should address all Project impacts to CESA-listed species and specify a mitigation, monitoring, and reporting program that will meet the requirements of an ITP.

Brett Cannon
City of Irvine
July 22, 2026
Page 9

- 10) Salvage, Relocation and Translocation of Plants and Animal Species. Salvage, relocation and translocation require the collection, handling, capturing or possession of wildlife and/or plants with the goal of moving or removing them from one location and permanently moving them to a new location. CDFW generally does not support the use of relocation or translocation as mitigation measure for unavoidable impacts to endangered, rare, or threatened plants and animals. These efforts are often not monitored over the long-term and successful outcomes are dubious. CDFW has found that permanent preservation and management of habitat to support affected species is often a more effective long-term strategy for conserving plants and animals and their habitats.
- 11) Scientific Collecting Permit. A Scientific Collecting Permit would be necessary if there is a plan to capture and relocate wildlife. Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 650, qualified biologist(s) must obtain appropriate handling permits to capture, temporarily possess, and relocate wildlife to avoid harm or mortality in connection with Project-related activities. CDFW has the authority to issue permits for the take or possession of wildlife, including mammals; birds, nests, and eggs; reptiles, amphibians, fish, plants; and invertebrates (Fish & G. Code, §§ 1002, 1002.5, 1003). A Scientific Collecting Permit is required to monitor project impacts on wildlife resources, as required by environmental documents, permits, or other legal authorizations; and, to capture, temporarily possess, and relocate wildlife to avoid harm or mortality in connection with otherwise lawful activities (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 650). For more information, please see CDFW's [Scientific Collecting Permit webpage](#)¹³.
- 12) Lake and Streambed Alteration. CDFW has regulatory authority over activities in streams that will divert or obstruct the natural flow, or change the bed, channel, or bank (which may include associated riparian resources) of any river, stream, or lake or use material from a river, stream, or lake. For any such activities, the Project applicant (or "entity") must provide written notification to CDFW pursuant to section 1600 *et seq.* of the Fish and Game Code. Based on this notification and other information, CDFW determines whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (LSAA) with the applicant is required prior to conducting the proposed activities. CDFW's issuance of a LSAA for a project that is subject to CEQA will require CEQA compliance actions by CDFW as a Responsible Agency. CDFW recommends that the City assess whether notification is appropriate. A Notification package for a LSAA may be obtained by accessing CDFW's [Lake and Streambed Alteration Program website](#)¹⁴.
- 13) Wetland Resources. CDFW, as described in Fish and Game Code section 703(a), is guided by the [Fish and Game Commission's \(Commission\) policies](#)¹⁵. Through its Wetlands Resources policy, the Commission "...seek[s] to provide for the protection, preservation, restoration, enhancement, and expansion of wetland habitat in California" (California Fish and Game Commission, 2005). It is the policy of the Commission to strongly discourage development in or conversion of wetlands. It opposes, consistent with its legal authority, any development or conversion that would result in a reduction of wetland acreage or wetland habitat values. To that end, the Commission opposes wetland development proposals unless, at a minimum, project mitigation assures there will be 'no net loss' of either wetland habitat values or acreage. The Commission strongly prefers mitigation which would achieve expansion of wetland acreage and enhancement of wetland habitat values."
 - a. The Wetlands Resources policy provides a framework for maintaining wetland resources and establishes mitigation guidance. CDFW encourages

¹³ <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Licensing/Scientific-Collecting>

¹⁴ <http://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/LSA>

¹⁵ <https://fgc.ca.gov/About/Policies/Miscellaneous>

Brett Cannon
 City of Irvine
 July 22, 2026
 Page 10

avoidance of wetland resources as a primary mitigation measure and discourages the development or type conversion of wetlands to uplands. CDFW encourages activities that would avoid the reduction of wetland acreage, function, or habitat values. Once avoidance and minimization measures have been exhausted, a project should include mitigation measures to assure a “no net loss” of either wetland habitat values, or acreage, for unavoidable impacts to wetland resources. Conversions include, but are not limited to, conversion to subsurface drains, placement of fill or building of structures within the wetland, and channelization or removal of materials from the streambed. All wetlands and watercourses, whether ephemeral, intermittent, or perennial, should be retained and provided with substantial setbacks, which preserve the riparian and aquatic values and functions benefiting local and transient wildlife populations. CDFW recommends mitigation measures to compensate for unavoidable impacts be included in the SEIR and these measures should compensate for the loss of function and value.

- b. The Fish and Game Commission’s Water policy guides CDFW on the quantity and quality of the waters of this State that should be apportioned and maintained respectively so as to produce and sustain maximum numbers of fish and wildlife; to provide maximum protection and enhancement of fish and wildlife and their habitat; encourage and support programs to maintain or restore a high quality of the waters of this State; prevent the degradation thereof caused by pollution and contamination; and, endeavor to keep as much water as possible open and accessible to the public for the use and enjoyment of fish and wildlife. CDFW recommends avoidance of water practices and structures that use excessive amounts of water, and minimization of impacts that negatively affect water quality, to the extent feasible (Fish & G. Code, § 5650).

ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

CEQA requires that information developed in environmental impact reports and negative declarations be incorporated into a database which may be used to make subsequent or supplemental environmental determinations. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21003, subd. (e).) Accordingly, please report any special status species and natural communities detected during Project surveys to the California Natural Diversity Database. The CNDDB field survey form can be filled out and submitted online at the following link: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB/Submitting-Data>. The types of information reported to CNDDB can be found at the following link: <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB/Plants-and-Animals>.

The City should ensure data collected for the preparation of the SEIR is properly submitted.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT FILING FEES

The Project, as proposed, would have an impact on fish and/or wildlife, and assessment of environmental document filing fees is necessary. Fees are payable upon filing of the Notice of Determination by the Lead Agency and serve to help defray the cost of environmental review by CDFW. Payment of the environmental document filing fee is required for the underlying project approval to be operative, vested, and final. (Cal. Code Regs, tit. 14, § 753.5; Fish & G. Code, § 711.4; Pub. Resources Code, § 21089.)

CONCLUSION

CDFW appreciates the opportunity to comment on the NOP to assist the City in identifying and mitigating Project impacts on biological resources.

Brett Cannon
City of Irvine
July 22, 2026
Page 11

Questions regarding this letter or further coordination should be directed to Tristan Edgarian, Environmental Scientist, at (858) 203-5877 or Tristan.Edgarian@wildlife.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Signed by:

AD7D070BCB66466...
Glen M. Lubcke
Environmental Program Manager
South Coast Region

ec: California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Glen M. Lubcke, Environmental Program Manager
Jennifer Turner, Senior Environmental Scientist (Supervisor)
Tristan Edgarian, Environmental Scientist

Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation
State Clearinghouse - State.Clearinghouse@lci.ca.gov

REFERENCES

California Invasive Plant Council. 2020. Responsible Landscaping. Accessed at: <https://www.cal-ipc.org/solutions/prevention/landscaping>.

[CDFW] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2018. *Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities*. Accessed at: <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=18959&inline>.

[CDFW] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2025a. California Open Data Portal. White-Tailed Kite Predicted Habitat – CWHR B111 [ds1442]. Accessed at: <https://data.ca.gov/dataset/white-tailed-kite-predicted-habitat-cwhr-b111-ds20851>

[CDFW] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2025b. California Open Data Portal. White-Tailed Kite Range – CWHR B111 [ds1442]. Accessed at: <https://data.ca.gov/dataset/white-tailed-kite-range-cwhr-b111-ds1442>.

California Fish and Game Commission. 2005. *Miscellaneous Policies*. Accessed at: <https://fgc.ca.gov/About/Policies/Miscellaneous>.

Phytosphere Research. 2012. Understanding and Managing Sudden Oak Death in California. Accessed at: <https://phytosphere.com/SODmgtPUB/pg6Sidebar1-1SODmgntpub.htm>.

Sawyer, J. O., T. Keeler-Wolf, and J.M. Evens. 2009. *A Manual of California Vegetation* (Second ed.). Sacramento, CA: California Native Plant Society. Accessed at: <https://vegetation.cnps.org>.

Sullivan, B.L., C.L. Wood, M.J. Iliff, R.E. Bonney, D. Fink, and S. Kelling. 2009. eBird: a citizen-based bird observation network in the biological sciences. *Biological Conservation* 142: 2282-2292.

[UCANR] University of California Agriculture and Natural Resources Division. 2020. Invasive Shot Hole Borers. Accessed at: <https://ucanr.edu/sites/pshb/>.

[UCIPM] University of California Statewide Integrated Pest Management Program. 2013. How to Manage Pests. Pests in Gardens and landscapes. Goldspotted Oak Borer. Accessed at: <http://ipm.ucanr.edu/PMG/PESTNOTES/pn74163.html>.