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## Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Interstate 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amsl</td>
<td>above mean sea level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM</td>
<td>Assessor’s Parcel Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS</td>
<td>Biogeographic and Information Observation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFW</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNNDDB</td>
<td>California Natural Diversity Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNPS</td>
<td>California Native Plant Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>federal Clean Water Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS</td>
<td>FirstCarbon Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCP</td>
<td>Habitat Conservation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPaC</td>
<td>Information, Planning, and Conservation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA</td>
<td>International Society of Arboriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTA</td>
<td>Migratory Bird Treaty Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCP</td>
<td>Natural Community Conservation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWI</td>
<td>National Wetlands Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project</td>
<td>Anaheim Blvd. Hotel Development Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCM</td>
<td>regulatory compliance measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB</td>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>standard condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>United States Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>United States Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>United States Geological Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

FirstCarbon Solutions (FCS) conducted a reconnaissance-level biological survey for the proposed Anaheim Blvd. Hotel Development Project (project). The Applicant proposes to develop a hotel that is approximately 155 feet high with one level below ground and 12 levels above ground, with an associated four-story parking structure in the City of Anaheim, Orange County, California.

FCS conducted a literature review and field survey of the biological resources potentially associated with the project site. A FCS biologist visited the project site to conduct the following biological surveys:

- Habitat assessment and plant community mapping
- General plant survey
- General wildlife survey
- Jurisdictional assessment
- Wildlife movement evaluation

1.1 - Report Purpose

This biological resources evaluation report documents the methods and results of a literature review and field survey. The report summarizes the existing biological resources and conditions within the project site and project vicinity. This report was prepared in support of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process.

1.2 - Project Location

The project site is located on approximately 3.25 acres of private and city undeveloped land in the City of Anaheim, Orange County, California. The address of the site is 1601 South Anaheim Blvd., Anaheim, CA 92805. The project site is located in a developed central portion of the City, east of Disneyland Theme Park.

The project site is located northeast of Interstate 5 (I-5) freeway, adjacent to the northbound freeway on-ramp at the terminus of Anaheim Blvd. It is triangular in shape and bounded by commercial development to the north, I-5 freeway to the south and west, and Anaheim Blvd. to the east. Regional access to the site is provided via the I-5 freeway and Katella Avenue/Disney Way, which is located approximately 0.63 mile to the southeast. Local access to the site is provided via Anaheim Blvd. A chain-link fence completely surrounds the property, limiting access to the site.

The project site is located on one United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-Minute Topographic Map Anaheim Quadrangle, within the San Juan Cajon de Santa Ana Land Grant (San Bernardino Meridian).

1 A formal jurisdictional delineation was not performed in this study.
The property is made up of two separate parcels: a private parcel and a city-owned parcel. The private parcel has the Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) of 082-220-09. The City-owned parcel does not have an APN.

The approximate center of the project site is latitude 33°48’31.38”N, longitude 117°54’24.61”W.

1.3 - Brief Project Description

The Applicant proposes to construct a 12-story, 155-foot 6-inch-tall, high-quality hotel consisting of up to 326 guest rooms, 267,671 gross square feet of hotel floor area, and a four level, 127,700-gross-square foot parking garage with 339 parking spaces on approximately 3.18-acres (138,767 square feet) at 1601 S. Anaheim Blvd, Anaheim, CA, as shown on Exhibit 3—Site Plan. The proposed project would include hotel amenities on the ground level, such as a swimming pool, 2,800-square-foot restaurant, meeting space, fitness room, coffee shop, and gift shop. The 12th floor includes a rooftop pool, sun deck, and 4,000-square-foot restaurant and bar. The Radisson Blue-branded hotel would be constructed using modern, high-quality architecture.
Exhibit 2
Local Vicinity Map
Aerial Base

Legend

Project Site

Source: NAIP Aerial Imagery.
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SECTION 2: STUDY METHODS

This section describes the study methods (literature review and field survey) used by FCS for evaluating the biological resources that exist within the project site and project vicinity.

2.1 - Literature Review

Plant and wildlife species protected by federal agencies, state agencies, and nonprofit resource organizations, such as the California Native Plant Society (CNPS), are collectively referred to as “special-status species” in this report. Some of these plant and wildlife species are afforded special legal or management protection because they are limited in population size, and typically have a limited geographic range and/or habitat. An FCS biologist researched readily available information, including relevant literature, databases, agency websites, various previously completed reports and management plans, Geographic Information System (GIS) data, maps, aerial imagery from public domain sources, and in-house records to (1) assess habitats, special-status plant and wildlife species, jurisdictional waters, critical habitats, and wildlife corridors that may occur in and near the project site, and (2) identify local or regional plans, policies, and regulations that may apply to the project. The following data sources were accessed during the literature review:

- USGS 7.5-Minute Topographic Map Anaheim Quadrangle and current aerial imagery.
- California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) provided by the CDFW (CDFW 2017c).
- Information, Planning and Conservation (IPaC) provided by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) (USFWS 2017b).
- Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California provided by the CNPS (CNPS 2017).
- National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) and Wetlands Mapper provided by the USFWS (USFWS 2017c).
- Biogeographic Information and Observation System (BIOS) provided by CDFW (CDFW 2017a and 2017b).
- Critical Habitat Portal provided by the USFWS (USFWS 2017a).
- City of Anaheim’s General Plan, zoning ordinances, and municipal codes.

2.2 - Field Survey

Following the literature review, FCS’s biologist, Mr. Damien Edwards, conducted a reconnaissance-level biological survey on the project site on September 6, 2017. The survey included the following:

- Habitat assessment and plant community mapping
- General plant survey

---

1 Avian species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) are not considered “special-status species.”
The pedestrian survey was conducted on foot during the daylight hours and covered all accessible areas of the project site. The biologist characterized the existing habitat and search for the presence of sensitive plant communities, special-status plants and wildlife, jurisdictional areas, and potential wildlife corridors.

The biologist used binoculars and pertinent regional flora/fauna field guides and topographic/aerial maps during the field survey. Digital color photographs were taken during the field survey to record site conditions at the time of the field survey. Data collected during the site visit were recorded in field notes.

While the studies performed in this analysis were designed to give a comprehensive overview of the biological resources found within the project site, no “focused surveys” or “protocol surveys,” which focus on individual plant or wildlife species and conform to CDFW and/or USFWS survey protocols for those species were conducted. Even so, the literature review and field surveys can still determine which species to rule out from occurring within the project site.

2.2.1 - Habitat Assessment and Plant Community Mapping

The biologist characterized the existing land cover and searched for the presence of sensitive plant communities within the project site. Identification of habitats and plant communities within the BSA were based on observed dominant species. Land cover types were identified and mapped in the field by marking their limits on a color aerial map. Topography, soil characteristics, substrates, rock formations, wetlands, and vernal pools were also components of the habitat assessment in order to search for special-status plants and wildlife.

2.2.2 - General Plant Survey

The biologist surveyed the BSA for common plants and for the presence of special-status plant species. Plant species were identified in the field and also in the office, when necessary, using plant field guides and plant taxonomical guides. All plants identified were recorded in field notes.

2.2.3 - General Wildlife Survey

The biologist surveyed the BSA for common wildlife and for the presence of special-status wildlife species. Biologists also searched for signs of wildlife, including animal tracks, burrows, dens, nests, nest sites, scat, or remains. Wildlife signs and wildlife species encountered visually or audibly during the field surveys were identified and recorded in field notes.

---

3 A formal jurisdictional delineation was not performed in this study.
4 The BSA is within the general distributional range of several special-status species; however, most of the special-status wildlife species that could occur within the BSA are not subject to specific published survey protocols or guidelines.
2.2.4 - Jurisdiction Assessment

The biologist surveyed the project site for the presence and extent of federal or state wetlands, waters, and habitats that are potentially subject to the jurisdictional authority of the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and CDFW.

2.2.5 - Wildlife Movement Evaluation

The biologist searched for potential natural and man-made travel routes that wildlife could use to traverse the site. Biologists also searched for natural and man-made barriers to wildlife movement, such as permanent structures, paved roads, sound walls, concrete walls, or fences that would interfere with the movement of wildlife.
SECTION 3: RESULTS

This section describes the results of the literature review and the conditions existing within the project site at the time the biological field survey was conducted. Photographs of the project site that were taken during the field surveys can be found in Appendix A, Site Photographs.

3.1 - Environmental Setting

The site is undeveloped and entirely surrounded by industrial and commercial complexes, development, and roadways. The property is vacant, disturbed, and no longer supports natural native plant communities nor is it connected to natural habitats. Some construction debris from previous activities at the site is present at the surface (GeoDesign, Inc. 2017). The project site is flat and there are no natural topography such as slopes, canyons, mounds, gullies, draws, rivulets, terraces, channels, drainage, or other natural features. Topography of the site is relatively level with approximate elevations of 140 to 145 feet above mean sea level (amsl). The site grades gently downward from north to south (GeoDesign, Inc. 2017).

Prior to 1963, the site was occupied by an orchard with several outbuildings and a residence. Between 1963 and 1972 an on-ramp between South Anaheim Blvd. and I-5 was constructed and commercial buildings and pavement were constructed on the south end of the site. By 1980, the on-ramp had been removed. Between 1980 and 1995, the buildings at the site had been removed. In 2003, the current configuration of the property between South Anaheim Blvd. and I-5 was completed. The site has remained unoccupied and predominately unaltered since 2003.

3.2 - Land Cover

Ruderal/disturbed habitat was the only land cover type on the project site, as determined by the literature review and field survey.

Ruderal/disturbed habitats contain areas that are heavily to sparsely vegetated by non-native ruderal weedy species or lack vegetation completely. They are not considered sensitive plant communities and they provide little to no habitat value for wildlife. Ruderal vegetation is adapted to frequent disturbances. Ruderal habitats are persistent in California where habitat has been affected by human activities, resulting in a dominance of weedy annual, non-native species (ruderal plants). Ruderal plants can easily colonize areas that are devoid of vegetation. The project site is dominated by exotic grasses and Russian thistle (Salsola tragus). Disturbed habitat refers to bare areas that have little to no vegetation growing on them but continues to retain a soil substrate. These areas have been physically disturbed by human activity. Vegetation, if any, is most likely non-native. Disturbed areas contain compacted soils and are generally the result of severe or repeated mechanical perturbation.
3.3 - Special-Status Plants

No listed, sensitive, or rare plant species were observed within the project site during the field survey. In addition, the literature review and field survey determined that the project site lacks suitable habitats, soils, and/or other factors to support special-status plant species.

3.4 - Special-Status Wildlife

No listed or sensitive wildlife species were observed within the project site during the field survey. In addition, the literature review and field survey concluded that the project site lacks suitable and adequate biological and physical features that are needed to support special-status wildlife species. No wildlife was observed during the survey.

3.5 - Trees

Trees on north edge property at or near fence include eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus sp.*), Mexican fan palm (*Washingtonia robusta*), Brazilian pepper tree (*Schinus terebinthifolius*), bougainvillea (*Bougainvillea spectabilis*) and mule fat (*Baccharis salicifolia* ssp. *salicifolia*). Trees growing just outside the fence along the freeway ramp include Canary Island pine (*Pinus canariensis*), crepe myrtle (*Lagerstroemia* sp.), and a few street trees along Anaheim Blvd., including Mexican fan palm and locust (*Robinia* sp.).

3.6 - Jurisdictional Areas

The literature review determined that the project site does not contain NWI wetlands. The jurisdictional assessment determined that the project site does not contain hydrological features, wetlands, marshes, vernal pools, channels with a bed or bank, or evidence of an ordinary high water mark; therefore, the project site does not contain federal or state wetlands, waters, or habitats that are potentially subject to the jurisdictional authority of the USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW.

3.7 - Critical Habitats

The literature review determined that the project site is not located within a designated or proposed critical habitat for listed plant or wildlife species.

3.8 - Wildlife Corridors

The literature review determined that the project site is not located within a CDFW designated Essential Habitat Connectivity Area or a Natural Landscape Block. The field survey determined that the project site does not function as a wildlife movement corridor. The project site does not contain wildlife travel routes, such as a riparian strip, ridgeline, or drainage; or wildlife crossings, such as a tunnel, culvert, or underpass. In addition, the project site is not located adjacent to nor connects large blocks of habitat. The project site does not represent a wildlife movement corridor because the site is disturbed and is completely surrounded by other development, walls, fencing, and roadways. These permanent structures serve as significant barriers to wildlife movement through the project site and region.
3.9 - Nursery Sites

The project site does not support resident or migratory fish species, and no native wildlife nursery sites or rookeries were observed within the project site during the field survey.
SECTION 4: IMPACT ANALYSIS

This section was prepared in support of the CEQA review. This section describes the significance criteria used for determining impacts on biological resources. Significance criteria serve as benchmarks for determining if a project would result in a significant adverse environmental impact when evaluated against the baseline. CEQA Guidelines (Section 15065(a)) state that a project may have a “significant impact” on the environment if the project has the potential to:

- Substantially degrade the quality of the environment;
- Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species;
- Cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels;
- Threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; or
- Substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species.

The Environmental Checklist Form in Appendix G, Biological Resources of the CEQA Guidelines was used to determine the level of significance of project-related impacts on biological resources. Under CEQA Guidelines (Appendix G, Biological Resources), impacts on biological resources are considered potentially “significant” if one or more of the following thresholds is met.

Threshold 1: The Project would 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 CDFW and USFWS.

Threshold 2: The Project would have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by CDFW and USFWS.

Threshold 3: The Project would have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

Threshold 4: The Project would 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 native wildlife nursery sites.

Threshold 5: The Project would conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Threshold 6: The Project would conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state HCP.
Responses to the Environmental Checklist include the following:

- **“No Impact”** applies where the project does not create an impact on biological resources.

- **“Less than Significant Impact”** applies where the project creates no significant impacts on biological resources, only less than significant impacts. CEQA does not require mitigation of “less-than-significant impacts.”

- **“Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated”** applies where the incorporation of off-setting mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.”

- **“Potentially Significant Impact”** is appropriate where there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. Significant impacts can be reduced to “less than significant” levels by incorporating off-setting mitigation measures.

### 4.1 - Threshold 1

Significance threshold: impacts would be considered significant if the Project were to 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 CDFW or USFWS.

The project is not anticipated to have direct or indirect impacts on special-status plants or wildlife. In regard to the significance criterion, the project is anticipated to have no 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 CDFW or USFWS.

While the project site is disturbed, it supports vegetation (ornamental trees) that could potentially provide cover, foraging, and nesting habitat for resident and migratory birds that have adapted to urban areas, such as rock pigeons (*Columba livia*), mourning doves (*Zenaida macroura*), and American crows (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*). These birds are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), and/or the California Fish and Game Code (Sections 3503, 3503.5, 3513, and 3800), which render it unlawful to take native breeding birds, and their nests, eggs, and young. The project will remove these ornamental trees; therefore, the project has the potential to result in direct impacts on breeding birds, if project activities occur during the breeding bird season and birds are nesting within the project site and/or immediate vicinity at that time. Temporary direct impacts on breeding birds could occur from increased noise, vibration, and dust during construction, which could adversely affect the breeding behavior of some birds, and lead to the loss (take) of eggs and chicks, or nest abandonment.

The project will comply with the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code by conducting pre-construction breeding bird surveys. This will result in a less than significant impact on breeding birds. Implementation of regulatory compliance measure (RCM) BIO-1 would help to avoid, eliminate or reduce impacts on breeding birds. Upon compliance with the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code, the project would not 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 CDFW and USFWS: 

Less Than Significant Impact.

4.2 - Threshold 2

Significance threshold: impacts would be considered significant if the Project were to have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by CDFW or USFWS.

Habitats, vegetation, and non-vegetated features would be removed within the project footprint. Sensitive plant communities (sensitive habitats) are communities that are of limited distribution statewide or within a county or region and are often vulnerable to environmental impacts of projects (CDFG 2009). Ruderal/disturbed habitats are the only land types located within the project footprint; therefore, direct impacts on non-sensitive vegetation communities are anticipated as a result of project implementation.

Riparian habitats are those on, relating to, or near the banks of a river, stream, creek, spring, seep, pond or lake. The project site is completely dry and does not support aquatic features, natural or man-made water bodies, wetlands, or jurisdictional areas necessary to support riparian vegetation.

The project is not anticipated to have direct or indirect impacts on riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities; therefore, the project is anticipated to have no substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by CDFW or USFWS: 

No Impact.

4.3 - Threshold 3

Significance threshold: impacts would be considered significant if the Project has 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.

The project site is completely dry and does not support aquatic features, natural or man-made water bodies, wetlands or jurisdictional areas; therefore, the project is not anticipated to have direct or indirect impacts on jurisdictional wetlands, waters, or habitats that are subject to jurisdictional authority of the USACE, RWQCB, or CDFW. The project is anticipated to have no 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: 

No Impact.
4.4 - Threshold 4

Significance threshold: The Project would 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 native wildlife nursery sites.

The project site does not contain and is not connected to an established wildlife corridor; therefore, the project is not anticipated to have direct or indirect impacts on wildlife corridors or wildlife movement. The project site does not support resident or migratory fish species or wildlife nursery sites; therefore, the project is not anticipated to have direct or indirect impacts on wildlife nursery sites. The project is not anticipated to 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 native wildlife nursery sites: **No Impact.**

4.5 - Threshold 5

Significance threshold: impacts would be considered significant if the Project would conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

The project site is not located with the City of Anaheim’s Scenic Corridor Overlay Zone; therefore, the project would not be in conflict with the City’s tree preservation ordinance.

The project proposes to plant/remove/replace/alter several trees on City property. These trees would be subject to the provisions of Title 13 (Parks and Boulevards), Chapter 13.12 (Street Trees), § 13.12.060 (Interference with Street Trees—Permission Required) of the Anaheim Municipal Code. The code states that no person shall top or in any other manner injure or damage any street tree. As a part of the development permit approval, the Applicant would have to implement the standard condition (SC) BIO-1. This will result in a less than significant impact on the City’s street trees. Upon compliance with the Municipal Code, the project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. **Less Than Significant Impact.**

4.6 - Threshold 6

Significance threshold: the Project would conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or state HCP.

The project site is not located within the boundary of and does not contain undeveloped natural lands subject to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) or other approved local, regional, or state HCP; therefore, the project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or state HCP: **No Impact.**
SECTION 5: PROTECTIVE MEASURES

5.1 - Regulatory Compliance Measures

RCM BIO-1  Construction during Breeding Season and Pre-construction Breeding Bird Surveys

To be in compliance with the MBTA and the California Fish and Game Code, and to avoid and reduce direct and indirect impacts on migratory non-game breeding birds, and their nests, young, and eggs, the Applicant will implement the following measures prior to project construction set up and implementation. The Applicant will provide a letter/memo to the City indicating compliance with this measure:

- Project activities that would remove or disturb potential nest sites would be scheduled outside the breeding bird season, if feasible. The breeding bird nesting season is typically from February 15 through September 15, but can vary slightly from year to year, usually depending on weather conditions. Removing all physical features that could potentially serve as nest sites outside of the breeding bird season also would help to prevent birds from nesting within the project site during the breeding season and during construction activities.

- If project activities that would remove or disturb potential nest sites cannot be avoided during February 15 through September 15, a qualified biologist would conduct a pre-construction clearance and nesting bird survey to search for all potential nesting areas, breeding birds, and active nests or nest sites within the limits of project disturbance up to seven days prior to mobilization, staging and other disturbances. It would end no more than three days prior to vegetation, substrate, and structure removal and/or disturbance.

- If no breeding birds or active nests are observed during the pre-construction survey, or if they are observed and would not be disturbed, then project activities may begin and no further mitigation would be required.

- If an active bird nest is located during the pre-construction survey and potentially would be disturbed, a no-activity buffer zone would be delineated on maps and marked (flagging or other means) up to 500 feet for special-status avian species and raptors, or 75 feet for non-special status avian species. The limits of the buffer would be demarcated so as to not provide a specific indicator of the location of the nest to predators or people. Materials used to demarcate the nests would be removed as soon as work is complete or the fledglings have left the nest. The biologist would determine the appropriate size of the buffer zone based on the type of activities planned near the nest and bird species because some bird species are more tolerant than others to noise and other disturbances. Buffer zones would not be disturbed until a qualified biologist determines that the nest is inactive. Additionally, the area would also not be disturbed until the young have fledged, the young are no longer being fed by the parents, the young have left the area, or the young would no longer be impacted by project activities.
• Birds or their active nests will not be disturbed, captured, handled or moved. Inactive nests may be moved by a qualified biologist, if necessary, to avoid disturbance by project activities.
• Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the applicant shall submit a report indicating the results of all completed surveys, any designated buffer zones and protection measures to the satisfaction of the Planning, Building and Code Enforcement Supervising Environmental Planner.

5.2 - Standard Conditions (SCs)

SC BIO-1 Street Trees Measures

As a part of the development permit approval, the Applicant would have to implement the following. No person shall cut, trim, prune, plant, remove, spray, or in any other manner interfere with any street tree within the City of Anaheim without first having secured written permission from the Director of Community Services or his or her designee. Any person obtaining written permission to cut, trim or prune a street tree shall do so in accordance with the standards adopted by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA). Any private business performing cutting, trimming or pruning operations on street trees shall employ an ISA certified arborist on staff and shall perform all work on street trees in accordance with the standards adopted by the ISA. Any street tree removed shall be replaced if a replacement is deemed possible. The replacement species shall be selected in accordance with the Official Tree Species List and Tree Master Plan (section 13.12.060. Street Tree Replacement Plan).
SECTION 6: REFERENCES
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Appendix A:
Site Photographs
Photograph 1: Site Entrance at northeast corner of project site on S. Anaheim Boulevard.

Photograph 2: View of southern corner of project site.

Photograph 3: View of northwestern project boundary.

Photograph 4: View of northeast corner of project site.
Photograph 5: View of northeastern corner of project site.

Photograph 6: Aerial from south looking north.

Photograph 7: Northeast Corner looking west.

Photograph 8: Site center looking northwest.
Photograph 9: Western edge looking south.
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