



RCA Joint Project Review (JPR)

JPR #: 10-07-26-01

Date: 8/09/10

Project Information

Permittee: Riverside County
 Case Information: HANS 2015
 Site Acreage: 5.3 acres
 Portion of Site Proposed for MSHCP Conservation Area: 0 acres

Criteria Consistency Review

Consistency Conclusion: The project is consistent with both the Criteria and other Plan requirements.

Data:

Applicable Core/Linkage: Proposed Constrained Linkage 18
 Area Plan: Southwest

APN	Sub-Unit	Cell Group	Cell
476-010-010	SU5 – French Valley/Lower Sedco Hills	Independent	5275

Comments:

- a. Proposed Constrained Linkage 18 consists of an unnamed drainage located in the south-central region of the Plan Area. This Constrained Linkage connects Proposed Core 2 (Antelope Valley) to the west with Proposed Extension of Existing Core 7 (Lake Skinner/Diamond Valley Lake Extension). Existing agricultural use constrains the Linkage, and planned land uses surrounding the Linkage are limited nearly entirely to community Development. The Linkage also has a relatively high proportion of land affected by edge (approximately 250 acres of the total 310 acres) and will also be subject to Edge Effects also due to the widening or extension of several facilities including Washington Street, Briggs Road, and SR-79. Despite these issues, the Linkage nonetheless provides Live-In and movement Habitat for species. This Linkage likely provides for movement of common mammals such as bobcat. An adequate wildlife underpass or overpass may need to be implemented to insure movement of species in this area and to reduce the chance of mortality from vehicle collision.

- b. The project site is primarily located in Cell 5275. Conservation within Cell 5275 will contribute to the assembly of Proposed Constrained Linkage 18. Conservation within Cell 5275 will focus on riparian scrub, woodland and forest habitat and adjacent agricultural land. Areas conserved within this Cell will be connected to riparian scrub, woodland and forest habitat and agricultural land proposed for conservation in Cell 5376 to the south and to agricultural land proposed for conservation in Cell 5279 to the east. Conservation within Cell 5275 will range from 10% to 20% of the Cell focusing in the southern portion of the Cell.



RCA Joint Project Review (JPR)

JPR #: 10-07-26-01

Date: 8/09/10

- c. The 5.3-acre parcel is a recently disked vacant lot. The project site is relatively flat with no trees or rock formations present, with elevations of 1416 to 1432 feet above mean sea level. An intermittent blue stream crosses the southern end of the parcel. Soils mapped in the site vicinity include Escondido fine sandy loam, Friant fine sandy loam, Garretson very fine sandy loam, Monserate sandy loam, and Vallecitos loam. Permeability for these five soils ranges from very slow to moderately rapid. Vegetation consists of a natural sage brush type. Adjacent land uses include rural residential development and horse property to the west, Keller Road to the north, Highway 79 to the east, and vacant land to the south. The owner proposes to build a public storage facility and medical office building that will occupy the entire site. Given that the project site is located in the northeast portion of Cell 5275, which is not the area contemplated for Conservation, the project would not conflict with Reserve Assembly.

Other Plan Requirements

Data:

Section 6.1.2 – Was Riparian/Riverine/Vernal Pool Mapping or Information Provided?

Yes. There is a riverine area on the project site, but no reported riparian habitat. There are no vernal pools on the project site and soils are not suitable for fairy shrimp habitat.

Section 6.1.3 – Was Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Information Provided?

No. The project site is not located within a Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area (NEPSSA).

Section 6.3.2 – Was Additional Survey Information Provided?

Yes. The project site is not located in a Criteria Area Special Survey Area (CASSA). The project site is located in an Additional Survey Area for Burrowing owl.

Section 6.1.4 – Was Information Pertaining to Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines Provided?

No. The property is not located near future and existing Conservation Areas.

Comments:

- a. Section 6.1.2: The Habitat Assessment Report prepared by Joan R. Callahan, PhD. dated June 23, 2010 and the Permittee both indicated a small ditch mapped as an intermittent blueline stream crossing the southern portion of the site and flowing offsite to the southeast via a culvert under Winchester Road (Highway 79). No riparian habitat was observed to be associated with this drainage; therefore, no focused surveys were warranted for riparian bird species. The Permittee will ensure that flows through this drainage are maintained during the entitlement process, so that water flowing from this site is not interrupted. Soils onsite are generally too well drained to promote fairy shrimp habitat. The report also determined that one of the soils mapped in the site vicinity, Monserate sandy loam, has very slow



RCA Joint Project Review (JPR)

JPR #: 10-07-26-01

Date: 8/09/10

permeability due to a hardpan layer at a depth of about 10 to 36 inches. Soil with this type of subsurface layer is one of the prerequisites for the formation of vernal pools. However, the report stated since repeated deep disking has disturbed the soil profile and no basin is apparent, it is unlikely that vernal pools have been present in recent years. Based on the lack of riparian resources on site, and given that the water flowing from the site in the drainage feature will be maintained after project development, the project demonstrates compliance with Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP.

- b. Section 6.3.2: The project is located in an Additional Survey Area for Burrowing owl. There are records of burrowing owls in the Winchester area, but only where required habitat conditions are present. The project site has no cover objects or existing burrows, and it is surrounded by roads and developed areas. According to the Habitat Assessment Report dated June 23, 2010, "since the site is deeply disked or grubbed at least once or twice a year, any burrows would be destroyed in the process; therefore, the potential of the project site as a burrowing owl habitat is minimal". The Permittee indicates that the site does not support suitable habitat and therefore no focused surveys were conducted. Based on the information provided by Dr. Callahan, and the Permittee, the project demonstrates compliance with Section 6.3.2 of the MSHCP.

SNS/ST



RCA Joint Project Review (JPR)

JPR #: 10-07-26-01

Date: 8/09/10

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK