

HABITAT CONNECTIVITY

WILDLIFE CORRIDOR MEETING

8/8/17

Introductions - ORGANIZATIONS

AERA ENERGY

City of Camarillo

CA D.F.W.

COLAB

TIERRA REJADA FARMS

US Fish + Wildlife Service

OJAI VALLEY L

PADRE ASSOCIATES

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

THE NATURE CONSERVANCY

FARM BUREAU OF VC

AUDUBON

NPS - San

VC AG. ASSOC.

WOMEN FOR AG.

CATTLEMEN ASSOC.

RANCHO TEMESCAL

SUPERVISORS OFFICES

J. HARNISH: Meeting outline

S. Sussman: Introduction to Critical ~~habitat~~ ^{landscape} and connectivity features. Introduction to Ministerial permits.

↳ S. Paroski: Question related to ability to differentiate between different types of Zoning Clearances and projects. (slide #11)

S. Sussman: Introduced basic provisions for fencing.

Also presented proposed exemptions, design standards, standards for livestock,

FENCING

T. Cohen: Regarding 50% of fence. Noted recent fires and existing 22 miles of fencing. Is it 50% of owned fencing? On a given parcel?

↳ S. Sussman: Is there a better threshold? ₂

K. Prillhart - Q for design for livestock.

↳ T. Cohen: Noted problems w/ bottom wire spacing as (1) young/offspring escape (2) predator vulnerability/permeability.

KRISTINE - Needs greater distinguishing between types of fences such as general and specific uses. For livestock predator safe enclosures.

Bud Sloan - Noted differences between types of livestock such as horse v. cattle. Need to be careful about lumping things together.
- Made observation about ongoing/maintenance replacements and forced replacements.

Sean Paroski: What is the need for the 50% threshold if it is gradually being replaced anyway?

↳ S. Sussman: Noted the 50% compliance threshold as used in existing development standards w/respect to buildings and replacement.

Jamie Jackson ~~###~~/CDFW: Asked about wildlife observations on ranches.

↳ Rich Atmore: Daily observations of large number of animals including bobcat, badgers, and others

T. Cohen: Noted that fencing differs for different animals.

- With respect to 50%, does threshold meet or help meet the goal?

J. Harinish: How can the County think about fence types?

↳ S. Paroski: Noted that some types of livestock, such as goats and sheep not addressed. Requires "Woven Wire" type in most cases.

B. Bigger - Doubts that the Proposed Design Standards will not meet State Standards

S. Suss. → Noted the fed + state reg.'s are exempted.

KRISTINE: Feels the 50% threshold is unnecessary if wildlife permeable is required as replaced.

Kim Prillhart: How many types of wildlife permeable fences?

→ EJ: Recommend defining "wildlife permeable" and "wildlife non-permeable"

→ H. Gonzales: Noted that state and federal may refer to "best management practices" or "standard practices", how would that be addressed?

J. Harnish: Noted staff as open to continued discussion in targeted topics.

Loise Lampara/AERA: What is "temporary" gave example of restoration projects w/exclosure fencing for spans up to 4 or 5 ~~year~~ years.

LOUISE LAMPARA/AERA: Theft + Security needs further clarification

Mark Ogonowski/USFWS: Noted issues w/various wildlife species. Question about 60' Standard and barbs on top wire.

↳ Bud Sloan: Noted the standard materials.

↳ M. Ogonowski: Note observations of wildlife hung up in fences. as reported to USFWS.

↳ B. Sloan: Noted it as ~~unlikely~~ unlikely.

R. Atmore: Noted that lack of tails creates loosening of wires, and this is the situation which is dangerous to wildlife.

Ken G. / PADRES: QUESTION related to feral Swine.

T. Cohen: Request for addition of "livestock" to exemptions.

LIGHTING

S. Sussman: Presented information related to exterior lighting including definitions, basic approach, exemptions, lighting fixture standards, Asked about special considerations

J. Harnish: Asked for input on the proposed exemptions.

→ EJ/TNC: Asked about regulations between certain hours.

↳ R. Van Dyck/GSA: Stated that "dusk" as a standard is arbitrary.

Kim Prillhart: Do you have any activities that must be "up-lit"?

JAMIE KING/State Parks: Noted filming as a large impact

~~Land would have~~

↳ JAMIE JACKSON/CDFW: Noted interest in regulating impacts of film-related activities.

JAMIE KING: Noted support of exemption for filming activities.

JAMIE JACKSON: Noted that temporary activities can have impact and need further review.

Kristine: Support of security lighting and motion sensitive lighting for security purposes

A. Convery: Broached issue of acceptability of temporary activities

→ NPS: Issue of SCOPE. May be unacceptable in chokepoints, but other areas would have less overall impact.

S. Sussman: Follow-up items for lighting.

- Filming
- Agri. Considerations

INVASIVE PLANTS + NOISE

S. Susman: Presented information on approach.

Supervisor Parks: Recommendation to connect hours of operation std's for noise w/that of lighting.

D. Barringer/Audobon: Should restrict invasive plants countywide.

H. Gonzales: Which "list" are we using to determine "invasive" plant species?

H.G.: Noted CA Dept. Food/Ag or CalIPC

↳ Convery: Noted that LCP uses CalIPC

↳ H.G.: Noted that would be good to remain consistent

Jamie Jackson: Noted Mercury Anuerosa "Mercury Plant" observed in Northern CA.

Jamie King: Supports an invasive plant policy w/ "teeth"

J. Jackson: Noted study by CDFW's Mary Meyer recently releasing a study of noise impact thresholds on wildlife and will share the study.

M. Ogonowski/USFWS: What development doesn't require compliance w/State's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

R. Van Dyck: Noted that the noise thresholds that go into effect from 9PM → 5PM.

↳ K. Prillhart: Noted that such standard is related to Urban.

↳ B. Bigger: Noted Right to Farm Ordinance and allow for Agriculture activities.

A. Convery: Presented information of Veg. Loss and Habitat Fragmentation. Discussed edge effects, landscape matrix, Connectivity features (ridgelines, water courses), and findings from scientific research. Presented existing regulatory conditions. Introduced potential approaches to maintain natural connectivity features.

LOUISE LAMPARA/AERA: What about fire code?

↳ A. Convery: This is only prospective.

↳ S. PAROSKI: Asked if existing structures in this area of features would trigger discretionary?

↳ Yes if it expands the brush clearance into the ESHA/connectivity feature.

JAMIE KING: Stated need for simple and understandable.

Kristine: Supported looking into use of flood plain map.

JAN:

R. Atmore: All structures larger than 10x10' would require weed abatement and brush clearance.

T. Cohen: Does not support use 100yr flood plain

Jamie Jackson: Perhaps needs clarification between nursery and agriculture uses. Stated that Agriculture uses are not exempt from alteration to streams and riparian.

CDFW: Repeated issue of scope and stated that in some circumstances identical locations could be more or less important depending on the surrounding area and habitat.

S. Paroski: Asked clarification on a definition of a "water feature." Is this an expansion of what is proposed for application of setbacks.

M. Ogonowski/USFWS: Only considering water features and ridgelines for ~~set~~ vegetation clearing?

↳ Convery: Yes, for this mechanism. Chokepoints are separate. 12

M. Ogonowski/USFWS: Noted that this mechanism could be expanded because of the range of species and activities affected by clearing of vegetation. Noted pollinators, ground-nesting birds and numerous other species.

↳ Convery + Ogonowski: Discussion of gaps w/species by species protection and feature-based protections.

H. Gonzales: Question related to remaining option for an applicant whose ministerial application is denied.

↳ Kim Prillhart: Discussion of remaining discretionary options

S. Proski: Clarified w/USFWS, is a corridor-wide brush clearance buffer being proposed?

↳ Ogonowski/USFWS: Not proposed as a blanket statement or policies. However, thinks it needs to be considered in order fill in the gaps in the effort to harmonize activities and ~~the~~ habitat connectivity.

CHOKEPOINTS

W. Wilkinson: Introduces concepts around chokepoints

as $(\text{FRAGMENTATION}) + (\text{Direct Barrier}) + (\text{Indirect Barriers}) = \boxed{\text{CHOKEPOINT}}$

- Research on chokepoints and connectivity with respect to functionality. Issues on roadway crossing structures.
- Identification of chokepoints
- Provided Chokepoint Examples.
- Potential Management Approaches.

S. Paroski: Vague terms, request for clarification.

For chokepoints & crossing structures still ~~has~~ have dg. + related exemptions, or are there additional requirements.

- About "structures" - are they structures?

↳ W. Wilkinse: Bridges, culverts, ect.

- But a "chokepoint" is not necessarily a structure?

↳ W. Wilkenson: Correct

S. Paroski: Request for definition of "chokepoints" and "crossing structures". Expressed concern over vague definitions, additional restrictions that could occur, ~~and~~ and that "chokepoints" can change over time as stated in presentation.

↳ Convery: Noted that the "chokepoint" as discussed is dynamic.

Kristine/Wildlands: Noted objective as ~~maintaining~~ maintaining, not creating connectivity.

T. Cohen: Still does not see how the County will define issue. How will the County apply the same rules to a 6,000 acre open space owner as a 1 acre owner.

Louise Lampara/Aera: Asked about expectations in complying with state and federal laws. Asked about proposed incentive program.

JAMIE KING: Asked about possibility of applying a % coverage for maximum coverage of structure + fuel modification.

↳ S. Paroski: Noted already existing 5% maximum lot coverage

↳ K. Prillhart: Further statements about 5% coverage plus ancillary development.

Kristine: Recommended LA County "SEA TAC"
(^{"Significant Ecological Advisory Technical Advisory Committee"})
as a process to be considered, particularly in a
broader range of representatives is included.

JAMIE JACKSON/CDFW: Noted "Safe Harbor" program as an incentive
program model. Suggested the "NCC" program as an additional
model to look into. Offers \$ incentives and streamlining incentives.

M. Ogonowski/USFWS: Felt clustering is an important incentive to
consider. Is there something like a "connectivity easement".
Noted importance of land conservation. What are the
options for the county to consider acquiring or
banking some of these areas.

Sup. Parks: Likes idea of leveraging the Williamson Act if
possible. Supports idea of prioritizing areas such
as chokepoints

S. Sussman: Items for follow-up after meeting:

- Fencing
- Lighting - Filming
- Veg. Clearing
- Defining Checkpoints

— END MEETING —