

Kit Fox Habitat Evaluation Form

Project Name : Estrella Ranch

Date: April 24, 2020

Project Location* Estrella Ranch – 5165 Estrella Rd, Paso Robles

*{include project vicinity map and project boundary on copy of U.S.G.S. 7.5 minute map (size may be reduced)}

U.S.G.S. Quad Map Name ___ Estrella _____

Lat/Long or **UTM coordinates** (if available) ___ 0723356 / 3950850 _____

Project Description: ___

Cannabis Farm development within fenced out-door roping arena.

Project Size: ___3___ Acres Amount of Kit Fox Habitat Affected: ___0___ Acres

Quantity of WHR Habitat Types Impacted (ie. -2 acres annual grassland, 3 acres blue oak woodland)

WHR type ___ None _____ ___ 0 ___ Acres

WHR type _____ Acres

WHR type _____ Acres

WHR type _____ Acres

Comments: See attached letter.

Form Completed By: Mike McGovern, 1788 Corbett Highlands Pl. Arroyo Grande, CA 93420

San Joaquin Kit Fox Habitat Evaluation Form

Is the project area within 10 miles of a recorded San Joaquin kit fox observation or within contiguous suitable habitat as defined in Question 2(A-E)?

YES - Continue with evaluation form

NO - Evaluation form/surveys not necessary.

1. Importance of the project area relative to *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (Williams et al., 1998).

A. Project would block or degrade an existing corridor linking core populations or a core population to a subpopulation (20)

B. Project is within core population (15)

C. Project area is identified within satellite population (12)

D. Project area is within a corridor linking satellite populations (10)

E. Project area is not within any of the previously described areas but is within known kit fox range (5)

2. Habitat characteristics of project area.

A. Annual grassland or saltbush scrub present >50 % of site (15)

B. Grassland or saltbush scrub present but comprises <50% of project area (10)

C. Oak savannah present on >50 % of site (8)

D. Fallow ag fields or grain/alfalfa crops (7)

E. Orchards/vineyards (5)

F. Intensively maintained row crops or suitable vegetation absent (0)

3. Isolation of project area.

A. Project area surrounded by contiguous kit fox habitat as described in

Question 2a-e (15)

B. Project area adjacent to at least 40 acres of contiguous habitat or part of an existing corridor (10)

C. Project area adjacent to <40 acres of habitat but linked by existing corridor (i.e.-river, canal, aqueduct) (7)

D. Project area surrounded by ag but less than 200 yards from habitat (5)

E. Project area completely isolated by row crops or development and is greater than 200 yards from potential habitat (0)

4. Potential for increased mortality as a result of project implementation. Mortality may come from direct (e.g. - construction related) or indirect (e.g. - vehicle strikes due to increases in post development traffic) sources.

A. Increase mortality likely (10)

B. Unknown mortality effects (5)

C. No long-term effect on mortality (0)

5. Amount of potential kit fox habitat affected

- A. > 320 acres (10)
- B. 160 - 319 acres (7)
- C. 80 - 159 acres (5)
- D. 40 - 79 acres (3)
- E. 1 - 40 acres (1)
- F. 1- 3 acre (0)**

6. Results of project implementation.

- A. Project site will be permanently converted and will no longer support foxes (10)
- B. Project area will be temporarily impacted but will require periodic disturbance for ongoing maintenance (7)
- C. Project area will be temporarily impacted and no maintenance necessary (5)
- D. Project will result in changes to agricultural crops (2)
- E. No habitat impacts (0)**

7. Project Shape

- A. Single block (10)**
- B. Linear with >40 foot right-of-way (5)
- C. Linear with <40 foot right-of-way (3)

8. Have San Joaquin kit foxes been observed within 3 miles of the project area within the last 10 years?

- A. Yes (10)**
- B. No (0)

Scoring

1. Recovery importance	___10___
2. Habitat condition	_____
3. Isolation	_____
4. Mortality	_____
5. Quantity of habitat impacted	_____
6. Project results	_____
7. Project shape	___10___
8. Recent observations	___10___
 TOTAL	 ___30___

The attached kit fox habitat evaluation form deserves some explanation. After examining the property in question, it appeared that the form is ill suited for this project. The proposed project is for the development of a cannabis farm that intends to have operations within already established horse arenas on Estrella Ranch near Whitley Gardens. A variety of other facilities are adjacent or nearby the horse stalls. No additional degradation of habitat will occur. Thus question 2 on the form was marked as answer F (suitable vegetation absent).

Question three also had to be marked as E because it is distant from appropriate habitat. Also, the amount of traffic will be reduced from what was and is presently happening as a working ranch. It is expected that there will be one transportation van per day as opposed to multiple vehicles entering and exiting the property by workers on the ranch. Delivery of supplies will be infrequent. Reduced traffic suggests that there will be a decrease in potential mortality of wildlife by traffic.

The total project will be within 130,680 square feet of already disturbed habitat (fenced out-door roping arena). Also it is difficult to know what to do with question 7 related to project shape. The closest choice for question 7 is A, a single block.

In summary, the project proposed is within already existing arenas, relatively distant from appropriate kit fox habitat, existing structures and disturbed areas. In addition, traffic to the site and traffic leaving or arriving on the site will be significantly reduced.

