



STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
MEGHAN HERTEL, Director

1234 East Shaw Avenue
Fresno, California 93710
(559) 243-4005
wildlife.ca.gov

May 8, 2026

Andrew Remus, Environmental Resources Manager
Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District
5469 E Olive Avenue
Fresno, California 93727
(559) 456-3292
andrewr@fresnofloodcontrol.org

**Subject: Fresno Metropolitan 2025 District Services Plan (Plan)
Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Program Environmental Impact
Report (PEIR)
SCH No.: 2026040455**

Dear Andrew Remus:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) received a NOP of a PEIR from the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD) for the Plan pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines.¹

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and recommendations regarding those activities involved in the Plan that may affect California fish and wildlife. Likewise, CDFW appreciates the opportunity to provide comments regarding those aspects of the Plan 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

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.

Andrew Remus, Environmental Resources Manager
Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District
May 8, 2026
Page 2

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, projects approved under the Plan 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 Plan 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.

Water Pollution: Pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 5650, it is unlawful to deposit in, permit to pass into, or place where it can pass into "Waters of the State" any substance or material deleterious to fish, plant life, or bird life, including non-native species. It is possible that without mitigation measures projects tiered from this Plan could result in pollution of a "Waters of the State" from increased sediment, salts, nitrates, and pathogens in storm water runoff; discharge of other constituents of concern such as endocrine disruptors; or construction related erosion. This could impact the fish and wildlife resources by causing increased sediment input. The Regional Water Quality Control Board and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers also has jurisdiction regarding discharge and pollution to "Waters of the State".

CDFW Ecological Reserve: Fish and Game Code section 1583 states "Except in accordance with the regulations of the commission it is unlawful to enter upon any ecological reserves established under the provisions of the article, or to take therein any bird or the nest or eggs thereof, or any mammal, fish, mollusks, crustaceans, amphibia, reptiles or any other form of plant or animal life." In addition, California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 630 states "All ecological reserves are maintained for the primary purpose of developing a statewide program for protection of rare, threatened, or endangered native plants, wildlife, aquatic organisms, and specialized terrestrial or aquatic habitat types", and therefore, any other activity on these lands is restricted.

Nesting Birds: CDFW has jurisdiction over actions with potential to result in the disturbance or destruction of active nest sites or the unauthorized take of birds. Fish and Game Code sections that protect birds, their eggs and nests include sections 3503 (regarding unlawful take, possession, or needless destruction of the nest or eggs of any bird), 3503.5 (regarding the take, possession, or destruction of any birds-of-prey or their nests or eggs), and 3513 (regarding unlawful take of any migratory nongame bird).

Fully Protected Species: CDFW has jurisdiction over fully protected species of birds, mammals, amphibians and reptiles, and fish, pursuant to Fish and Game Code sections 3511, 4700, 5050, and 5515. Fully protected species may not be taken or possessed at any time and no licenses or permits may be issued for their take except as follows

Andrew Remus, Environmental Resources Manager
Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District
May 8, 2026
Page 3

- Take is for necessary scientific research,
- Efforts to recover a fully protected, endangered, or threatened species, live capture, and relocation of a bird species for the protection of livestock, or

They are a covered species whose conservation and management is provided for in a Natural Community Conservation Plan (Fish & G. Code, §§ 3511, 4700, 5050, & 5515).

Additionally, specified types of infrastructure projects may be eligible for an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) for unavoidable impacts to fully protected species if certain conditions are met (see Fish & G. Code §2081.15). Project proponents should consult with CDFW early in the project planning process if an ITP may be pursued for a project.

Unlisted Species: Species of plants and animals need not be officially listed as Endangered, Rare, or Threatened (E, R, or T) on any State or Federal list to be considered E, R, or T under CEQA. If a species can be shown to meet the criteria for E, R, or T, as specified in the CEQA Guidelines section 15380, CDFW recommends it be fully considered in the environmental analysis for the Plan.

PLAN DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Proponent: The Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District

Objective: The proposed Plan provides a comprehensive framework for planning, constructing, operating, and maintaining regional flood control and stormwater management facilities within the FMFCD service area over the next 10 to 20 years, and includes an amendment to the FMFCD's Sphere of Influence (SOI) to better align with the City of Fresno's SOI. This amended SOI includes the City of Fresno's Southeast Development Area (SEDA) and expands the FMFCD's SOI to incorporate several existing drainage areas that currently extend beyond the FMFCD's boundary. Expansion of the SOI would allow the FMFCD to plan for and provide regional flood control and stormwater management services in areas expected to urbanize in the future.

Location: The Plan area is located in the north-central portion of Fresno County, within the central San Joaquin Valley. The FMFCD currently provides flood control and stormwater management services to the Fresno-Clovis metropolitan area and surrounding unincorporated areas. The proposed SOI expansion areas include the SEDA, and several drainage areas located within and adjacent to the boundaries of the City of Fresno, including Drainage Areas CD, CE, CG, EN, and EJ. These areas are generally located within or near the Fresno-Clovis metropolitan region and include both urbanized areas and lands anticipated for future development.

Andrew Remus, Environmental Resources Manager
Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District
May 8, 2026
Page 4

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CDFW offers the comments and recommendations below to assist the FMFCD in adequately identifying and/or mitigating the Plan'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 PEIR prepared for this Plan.

San Joaquin River and San Joaquin River Parkway

The San Joaquin River is the longest river in Central California and is lifeline of the many special-status plant and animal species that occur within the river and adjacent habitats. The San Joaquin River Parkway (SJR Parkway) is comprised of several properties along the San Joaquin River from Friant Dam to State Route (SR) 99; the goal of the San Joaquin River Conservancy Act for the SJR Parkway to consist of approximately 5,900 acres for a combination recreational uses, education, and wildlife protection. Currently, the roughly 5,000 acres which have been acquired in furtherance of this goal are owned by the San Joaquin River Conservancy, CDFW, City of Fresno, Fresno County, and Parkway (a non-profit organization formerly known as the San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust). The Plan's location adjacent to the San Joaquin River and SJR Parkway and proposed activities have the potential to directly and indirectly impact the many wildlife and plant species that utilize the river, SJR Parkway and adjacent habitats. The Plan, which includes activities and programs related to flood control, rural stream management, and stormwater drainage and management, has the potential to result in significant impacts to many sensitive habitats including streams, wetlands, and associated riparian habitats. Finally, the Plan has the potential to significantly impact ongoing conservation efforts and strategies, public recreational opportunities, and result in substantial cumulative impacts to the San Joaquin River, SJR Parkway, and the biological resources that utilize these habitats.

Additional details, recommendations, and suggestions are provided below.

Special-Status Species

Based on a review of the NOP, aerial imagery of the Plan area, and species occurrence records from the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) (CDFW 2026), CDFW recommends that special-status species be considered as part of the PEIR that will be prepared for this Plan, including, but not limited to, the species identified in **Attachment 1** of this letter. These resources need to be evaluated and addressed as part of the PEIR and prior to any approvals that would allow vegetation- or ground-disturbing activities. CDFW also recommends that the PEIR analyze potential impacts to these species and provide measurable mitigation measures that would reduce impacts to less than significant levels as needed for projects tiered (streamlined) from the this Plan.

Andrew Remus, Environmental Resources Manager
Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District
May 8, 2026
Page 5

California Endangered Species Act

Reasonably foreseeable future projects tiered from the Plan may be subject to CDFW's regulatory authority pursuant to CESA. In the event that species listed under CESA are detected during surveys, consultation with CDFW is warranted to discuss how to implement the project and avoid "take," or if avoidance is not feasible, to acquire a State ITP, pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2081 subdivision (b), prior to any ground disturbing activities. In addition, CDFW recommends that mitigation measures for the CESA listed species be fully addressed in the CEQA document prepared for any future project tiered from the Plan.

Special-Status Plants

CDFW recommends that the PEIR for this Plan include a measure requiring that projects tiered from this Plan located within natural habitats be surveyed by a qualified biologist for any possible special-status plants following the "Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special-Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities". CDFW recommends that the plant surveys be floristic and, if necessary, utilize a known reference site for any special-status plants in order to provide a high level of confidence in the effort and results. In addition, CDFW recommends that mitigation measures for CESA listed plant species, Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA) plant species, and California Native Plant Society (CNPS) California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) plant species be fully addressed in the CEQA document prepared for any future project tiered from this Plan.

If a special-status plant is found, CDFW recommends that the special-status plant species be avoided whenever possible by delineating and observing a no disturbance buffer of at least 50 feet from the outer edge of the plant population(s) or specific habitat type(s) required by special-status plant species. If buffers cannot be maintained, then consultation with CDFW is warranted to determine appropriate minimization and mitigation measures for impacts to special-status plant species. If a State- or federally listed plant species is identified during botanical surveys, it is recommended that consultation with CDFW be conducted to determine permitting needs.

Lake and Streambed Alteration

Reasonably foreseeable future projects tiered from this Plan may be subject to CDFW's regulatory authority pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 1600 et seq. Fish and Game Code section 1602 requires project proponents to notify CDFW prior to commencing any activity that may (a) substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow of any river, stream, or lake; (b) substantially change or use any material from the bed, bank, or channel of any river, stream, or lake; or (c) deposit debris, waste or other materials that could pass into any river, stream, or lake. "Any river, stream, or lake" includes those that are ephemeral or intermittent as well as those that are perennial in nature. For information on notification requirements, please refer to CDFW's website

Andrew Remus, Environmental Resources Manager
Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District
May 8, 2026
Page 6

(<https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/LSA>) or contact CDFW staff in the Central Region Lake and Streambed Alteration Program at (559) 243-4593, or R4LSA@wildlife.ca.gov.

CDFW therefore recommends that the Plan include information related to these requirements of Fish and Game code and advise that projects tiered from this Plan retain a qualified biologist to determine if potential impacts to streams may require the need to notify pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 1602.

Wetland and Riparian Habitat

The Plan area contains numerous streams and riparian and wetland areas, including the San Joaquin River. Future projects within the Plan area have the potential to impact these features, and have the potential to result in the loss and degradation of riparian and wetland vegetation through grading, fill, runoff and related pollution, and related development.

Riparian systems and their associated floodplain and wetland areas are valuable for the ecosystem processes they carry out such as protecting water quality by filtering pollutants and transforming nutrients; stabilizing stream banks to prevent erosion and sedimentation/siltation; and dissipating flow energy during flood conditions, thereby spreading the volume of surface water, reducing peak flows downstream, and increasing the duration of low flows by slowly releasing stored water into the channel through subsurface flow. Within the San Joaquin Valley, modifications of streams to accommodate human uses has resulted in damming, canalizing, and channelizing of most streams, though some natural stream channels and small wetland or wetted areas remain (CDFW 2026). The Fish and Game Commission policy regarding wetland resources discourages development or conversion of wetlands that results in any net loss of wetland acreage or habitat value. Construction activities within these features also have the potential to impact downstream waters, such as the San Joaquin River, leading to erosion, scour, and changes in flow and stream morphology.

CDFW recommends that the PEIR include formal stream mapping, including the streams associated floodplain, and wetland delineation conducted by a qualified biologist or hydrologist (as warranted), to determine the baseline location, extent, and condition of streams (including any floodplain) and wetlands within and adjacent to the Plan area. Please note that while there is overlap, State and federal definitions of wetlands differ, and complete stream mapping commonly differs from delineations used by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers specifically to identify the extent of Waters of the U.S. Therefore, it is advised that the delineation identify both State and federal wetlands in the Plan area as well as the extent of all streams including floodplains, if present, within the Plan area. CDFW recommends that site map(s) depicting the extent of any activities that may affect wetlands, lakes, or streams be included within the Plan to assist projects tiered from this Plan to clearly identify areas where stream/riparian and wetland habitats could be impacted from project activities.

Andrew Remus, Environmental Resources Manager
Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District
May 8, 2026
Page 7

CDFW recommends that the potential direct and indirect impacts to stream/riparian and wetland habitat be analyzed within the Plan. CDFW also recommends that the PEIR include measures to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate those impacts. CDFW recommends that impacts to riparian habitat (i.e., biotic and abiotic/nonvegetative features) take into account the effects to stream function and hydrology from riparian habitat loss or damage, as well as potential effects from the loss of riparian habitat to special-status species already identified herein. CDFW recommends that losses to stream and wetland habitats be offset with corresponding riparian and wetland habitat restoration incorporating native vegetation to replace the value to fish and wildlife provided by the habitats lost from Plan implementation. If on-site restoration to replace habitats is not feasible, CDFW recommends off-site mitigation by restoring or enhancing in-kind riparian or wetland habitat and providing for the long-term management and protection of the mitigation area, to ensure its persistence.

Wildlife Corridors and Habitat Connectivity

California wildlife is losing the ability to move and migrate as habitat conversion and built infrastructure disrupt species habitat and cut off migration corridors. California Senate Bill (SB) 790, Assembly Bill (AB) 2344, and AB 1889 all address wildlife connectivity in California and assert authority and responsibility to CDFW and/or local and State agencies to implement wildlife connectivity actions by identifying where they are needed, coordinate and implement those actions, and establish compensatory mitigation credits for actions taken.

The Plan's location adjacent to the San Joaquin River and SJR Parkway could impact wildlife connectivity for many wildlife species that utilize the river and adjacent habitats. Direct and indirect impacts into these habitat types can adversely impact sensitive species including, but not limited to, the species identified in Attachment 1. These impacts can lead to reduction of habitat, reduced reproductive success; reduced health and vigor; nest abandonment; loss of foraging habitat that would reduce nesting success (loss or reduced health or vigor of eggs or young); and introduction of debris and/or deleterious materials into river habitats. Narrow riparian buffers are considerably less effective in minimizing the effects of adjacent development than wider buffers (Castelle et al. 1992, Brosofske et al. 1998, Kiffney et al. 2003, Moore et al. 2005). As such, CDFW recommends the Plan PEIR incorporate a discussion on foreseeable projects adjacent to the San Joaquin River and the associated potential for impacts to wildlife connectivity. CDFW also recommends that projects tiered from this Plan adjacent to the San Joaquin River and other stream or riparian habitats limit impacts to wildlife connectivity or enhance connectivity through restoration or enhancement of these habitats.

CDFW recommends in-depth studies on existing use of the San Joaquin River watershed and wildlife corridor adjacent to the Plan area and surrounding areas in order to evaluate the extent of potential impacts from Plan implementation on wildlife connectivity and to development different development alternatives. Data collection

Andrew Remus, Environmental Resources Manager
Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District
May 8, 2026
Page 8

methods should enable detection of species that have been found to utilize the existing movement corridors, including species mentioned above. The cumulative impacts of adjacent projects on wildlife corridors should also be considered.

CDFW also recommends that projects tiered from the Plan that are located adjacent or in the vicinity of the San Joaquin River and adjacent habitats incorporate project-specific wildlife movement studies to evaluate the potential for the project to significantly impact wildlife connectivity and to guide the development of wildlife corridor mitigation measures to mitigate for connectivity impacts. For projects where wildlife corridor improvement is considered, pre-construction study results should be used to develop biologically feasible movement corridor improvements. Post-construction monitoring should also assess the use of wildlife movement corridors. CDFW recommends that monitoring data be analyzed, summarized, and results discussed in reports be posted for interested parties and submitted to CDFW and other agencies or organizations that have a duty or interest in the effectiveness of wildlife movement corridors.

On- or off-site compensatory mitigation should be implemented to completely offset unavoidable impacts from Plan implementation to avoid significant impacts to existing wildlife corridors. The DEIR should include an analysis of beneficial and feasible wildlife movement corridors and/or crossings at off-site locations that could be improved or constructed to enhance wildlife connectivity.

San Joaquin River Restoration Program

The San Joaquin River Restoration Program (SJRRP) is currently working to restore and maintain fish populations in “good condition” in the mainstem San Joaquin River downstream of Friant Dam to the confluence with the Merced River (i.e., Restoration Area) and restore and maintain naturally reproducing and self-sustaining populations of salmon and other fish. CDFW would like to note that the SJRRP is working on two major passage improvements projects (Sack Dam and Mendota Dam) to allow volitional passage of anadromous fishes upstream to Friant Dam (upstream of the Plan area). Further, CDFW has invested millions of dollars to construct a state-of-the-art Salmon Conservation and Research Facility (SCARF; i.e., conservation hatchery), also upstream of this site, to help with the reintroduction of spring-run Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* pop. 11). Once fully operational, the SCARF plans to release 1.2 million smolts annually from its volitional release channel upstream of the Plan area. Further, the northern section of the Plan area is adjacent to important sections of the river for spring-run Chinook salmon to complete various life-cycle stages (egg, juvenile, and adult), with holding, spawning, incubation, and rearing occurring within the adjacent San Joaquin River. As such, CDFW reiterates the recommendation that the Plan PEIR incorporate a discussion on foreseeable projects adjacent to the San Joaquin River and the associated potential for impacts to the river and associated habitats. CDFW also recommends that projects tiered from this Plan adjacent to the San Joaquin River incorporate project design features that limit disturbance to the river or enhance the function of the river for fish.

Andrew Remus, Environmental Resources Manager
Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District
May 8, 2026
Page 9

Nesting Birds

CDFW encourages that future tiered project ground-disturbing activities occur during the bird non-nesting season; however, if ground-disturbing or vegetation-disturbing activities must occur during the nesting season (February 1st through September 15th), the project proponent is responsible for ensuring that implementation of the project does not result in violation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or relevant Fish and Game Code sections as referenced above.

CDFW recommends that a qualified biologist conduct pre-activity surveys for active nests no more than 10 days prior to the start of ground or vegetation disturbance to maximize the probability that nests that could potentially be impacted are detected. CDFW also recommends that surveys cover a sufficient area around the project site to identify nests and determine their status. A sufficient area means any area potentially affected, either directly or indirectly, by the project. In addition to direct impacts (i.e., nest destruction), noise, vibration, and movement of workers or equipment could also affect nests. CDFW recommends that a qualified biologist establish a behavioral baseline of all identified nests. Once project activities begin, CDFW recommends having a qualified biologist continuously monitor nests to detect behavioral changes resulting from the project. If behavioral changes occur, CDFW recommends halting the work causing that change and consulting with CDFW for additional avoidance and minimization measures.

CDFW recommends if continuous monitoring of identified nests by a qualified biologist is not feasible, a no-disturbance buffer of 250 feet around active nests of non-listed bird species and a 500-foot no-disturbance buffer around active nests of non-listed raptors. These buffers are advised to remain in place until the breeding season has ended or until a qualified biologist has determined the birds have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or on-site parental care for survival. Variance from these no-disturbance buffers is possible when there is a compelling biological or ecological reason to do so, such as when the project site would be concealed from a nest site by topography. CDFW recommends that a qualified biologist advise and support any variance from these buffers and notify CDFW in advance of implementing a variance.

Cumulative Impacts

CDFW recommends that a cumulative impact analysis be conducted for all biological resources that will either be significantly or potentially significantly impacted by implementation of the Plan including future tiered projects. Including those whose impacts are determined to be less than significant with mitigation incorporated or for those resources that are rare or in poor or declining health and will be impacted by the Plan, even if those impacts are relatively small (i.e., less than significant). CDFW recommends cumulative impacts be analyzed using an acceptable methodology to evaluate the impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects on

Andrew Remus, Environmental Resources Manager
Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District
May 8, 2026
Page 10

resources and be focused specifically on the resource, not the Plan. An appropriate resource study area identified and utilized for this analysis is advised. CDFW staff are available for consultation in support of cumulative impacts analyses as a trustee and responsible agency under CEQA.

Plan Alternatives Analysis

CDFW recommends that the information and results obtained from the biological technical surveys, studies, and analysis conducted in support of the PEIR be used to develop and modify the Plan's alternatives to avoid and minimize impacts to biological resources to the maximum extent possible. When efforts to avoid and minimize have been exhausted, remaining impacts to sensitive biological resources should be mitigated to reduce impacts to a less than significant level, if feasible.

California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) Positive Submission of Data

Please note that the CNDDDB is populated by voluntary record submissions of species detections. As a result, species may be present in locations not depicted in the CNDDDB but where there is suitable habitat and features capable of supporting species. A lack of an occurrence record, or lack of recent occurrence records, in the CNDDDB does not mean that a species is not present. In order to adequately assess any potential project-related impacts to biological resources, surveys conducted by a qualified biologist/botanist during the appropriate protocol survey methodology are warranted in order to determine whether or not any special-status species are present at or near the project site.

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 CNDDDB. The CNDDDB field survey form can be filled out and submitted online at the following link:

<https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Submitting-Data>. The types of information reported to CNDDDB can be found at the following link:

<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Plants-and-Animals>.

FILING FEES

The Plan, 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 in order for the underlying project approval to be operative, vested, and final.

Andrew Remus, Environmental Resources Manager
Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District
May 8, 2026
Page 11

(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 FMFCD in identifying and mitigating the Plan's impacts on biological resources. More information on survey and monitoring protocols for sensitive species can be found at CDFW's website (<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Survey-Protocols>). Questions regarding this letter or further coordination should be directed to John Riedel, Environmental Scientist, at (559) 807-1453, or John.Riedel@wildlife.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

E9964E60293D40A...

For Julie A. Vance
Regional Manager

ATTACHMENT 1- Special-status Species Table

ec: State Clearinghouse
Land Use and Climate Innovation
state.clearinghouse@lci.ca.gov

San Joaquin River Conservancy
Kari Daniska, Executive Director
kari.daniska@sjrc.ca.gov

U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Justin Sloan
justin_sloan@fws.gov

Andrew Remus, Environmental Resources Manager
Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District
May 8, 2026
Page 12

References

Brosofske, K., J. Chen, R. Naiman, and J. Franklin. 1997. Harvesting effects on microclimatic gradients from small streams to uplands in western Washington. *Ecological Applications* 7:1188-1200.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2018. Protocols for surveying and evaluating impacts to special-status native plant populations and sensitive natural communities. California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Sacramento, California, USA.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2026. Biogeographic information and observation system (BIOS). <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/BIOS> Accessed 27 April 2026.

Castelle, A., C. Conolly, M. Emers, E. Metz, S. Meyer, M. Witter, S. Mauermann, T. Erickson, and S. Cooke. 1992. Wetlands buffers use and effectiveness. Adolfson Associates, Inc., Shorelands and Coastal Zone Management Program, Washington Department of Ecology, Olympia, WA. Pub. No. 92-10.

Kiffney, P., J. Richardson, and J. Bull. 2003. Responses of periphyton and insects to experimental manipulation of riparian buffer width along forest streams. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 40:1060-1076.

Moore, R., D. Spittlehouse, and A. Story. 2005. Riparian microclimate and stream temperature response to forest harvesting: a review. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 41:813-834.

Attachment 1

Attachment 1

**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES TABLE**

**PROJECT: Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control 2025 District Services
Plan**

SCH No.: 2026040455

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	
		State	Federal
Bald eagle	<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	E/FP	-
Great gray owl	<i>Strix nebulosa</i>	E	-
Least Bell's vireo	<i>Vireo bellii pusillus</i>	E	E
Willow flycatcher	<i>Empidonax traillii</i>	E	-
Foothill yellow-legged frog-south Sierra Distinct Population Segment (DPS)	<i>Rana boylei</i> pop. 5	E	E
Colusa grass	<i>Neostapfia colusana</i>	E	T
Hairy Orcutt grass	<i>Orcuttia pilosa</i>	E	E
Hartweg's golden sunburst	<i>Pseudobahia bahiifolia</i>	E	E
San Joaquin adobe sunburst	<i>Pseudobahia peirsonii</i>	T	E
San Joaquin Valley orcutt grass	<i>Orcuttia inaequalis</i>	E	T
Succulent owl's-clover	<i>Castilleja campestris</i> var. <i>succulenta</i>	E	T
Greene's tuctoria	<i>Tuctoria greenei</i>	R	E
Swainson's hawk	<i>Buteo swainsoni</i>	T	-
Tricolored blackbird	<i>Agelaius tricolor</i>	T	-
California tiger salamander- central California DPS	<i>Ambystoma californiense</i> pop. 1	T	T
Chinook salmon - Central Valley spring-run evolutionary segment unit (ESU)	<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i> pop. 11	T	T
Tree-anemone	<i>Carpenteria californica</i>	T	-
Golden eagle	<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>	FP	-
White-tailed kite	<i>Elanus leucurus</i>	FP	-
Western burrowing owl	<i>Athene cunicularia hypugaea</i>	C	-
Crotch's bumble bee	<i>Bombus crotchii</i>	C	-

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	
		State	Federal
American badger	<i>Taxidea taxus</i>	SSC	-
Pallid bat	<i>Antrozous pallidus</i>	SSC	-
Townsend's big-eared bat	<i>Corynorhinus townsendii</i>	SSC	-
Western mastiff bat	<i>Eumops perotis californicus</i>	SSC	-
Western red bat	<i>Lasiurus frantzii</i>	SSC	-
California spotted owl	<i>Strix occidentalis occidentalis</i>	SSC	PE/PT
Loggerhead shrike	<i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>	SSC	-
Yellow-headed blackbird	<i>Xanthocephalus xanthocephalus</i>	SSC	-
Yellow warbler	<i>Setophaga petechia</i>	SSC	-
California glossy snake	<i>Arizona elegans occidentalis</i>	SSC	-
Coast horned lizard	<i>Phrynosoma blainvillii</i>	SSC	-
Northern California legless lizard	<i>Anniella pulchra</i>	SSC	-
Northwestern pond turtle	<i>Actinemys marmorata</i>	SSC	PT
Western spadefoot	<i>Spea hammondi</i>	SSC	PT
Central California roach	<i>Hesperoleucus symmetricus symmetricus</i>	SSC	-
Central Valley fall-run Chinook salmon-Evolutionary Significant Unit (ESU)	<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>	SSC	-
Hardhead	<i>Mylopharodon conocephalus</i>	SSC	-
Kern brook lamprey	<i>Lampetra hubbsi</i>	SSC	-
Pacific lamprey	<i>Entosphenus tridentatus</i>	SSC	-
Sacramento hitch	<i>Lavinia exilicauda exilicauda</i>	SSC	-
Steelhead-Central Valley DPS	<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus</i> pop. 11	SSC	T
Western river lamprey	<i>Lampetra ayresii</i>	SSC	-
California horned lark	<i>Eremophila alpestris actia</i>	WL	-
Vernal pool fairy shrimp	<i>Branchinecta lynchi</i>	SSA	T
Valley elderberry longhorn beetle	<i>Desmocerus californicus dimorphus</i>	SSA	T

E= Endangered, T= Threatened, C= Candidate for listing as Threatened and/or Endangered, FP= Fully Protected, PE = Proposed Endangered, PT= Proposed Threatened, R= Rare, SSC= Species of Special Concern, SSA= State Special Animal, WL= Watch List, (-)= None