

HABITAT CONNECTIVITY + WILDLIFE CORRIDOR STAKEHOLDER MEETING

6/8/2017

Obj: Minimize Indirect Barriers

— LIGHTING —

- S Paraskii: Intro of collaboration of COLAB and TNC. wrt lighting, avoid lighting spill over and focusing lighting on structures and work areas. For large structures, (i.e. stadiums) limit by time.

(LIGHTING CONT'D)

• S. Paroski: importance of intensity of lighting matters, as does direction, wrt shielding, ... what does County consider "low intensity"

- KP: No definition at this time.

- Ron V. Dyck: Noted inability to use wattage.

- Paroski + RVD

• T. Cohen: Noted use of lighting to enhance reproductive cycles ~~as part of~~ ~~some~~. Noted lighting in open pastures to monitor pregnant mares.

• H. Gonzales: Question to whether or not new std's would be retroactive

KP: Not intending to be retroactive.

Stated importance of timeline and how these standards would be implemented

• N. McGuire: Lighting, spill-over, and height restrictions. If poles could go higher, light could be focused to minimize spill over

C. Collier: State-level lighting req.'s tied to Safety, wrt oil/gas

- SS: Are there shielding req.'s?
- CC: Stated he would look into it.
- Staff request for sharing of req.'s

L. Woodburn: Concerns w/security lighting. Need clarity on how to protect areas + assets. Both temporal and intensity is a concern.

- SS: Motion detector?

- L. Lampara: Request for USFWS on impact of motion lights.

H. Gonzales: Is this limited to stationary lights?

- S. Paroski: How would this interact w/new state req.'s that → night fumigation.

US FWS: Stated as currently unfamiliar w/impacts
wrt motion-activated lights

S. Bradley/NPS: Observations about constant
vs. motion-activated light. Addition re:
fumigation lights being temporary

RVD/GSA: Statements related to lighting ~~sig~~ site
mapping and how low-intensity lighting can be
use in tandem w/lumen levels + photometric
Site mapping.

A. Convery: How difficult is it

RVD: ~~There~~ Statement about it being an
availab Service

- Group concerns related to costs
and small projects.

W. Wilkinson: noted it being a current
Std. in discretionary projects.

(Lighting cont'd)

S. Paroski: Asked about variable lighting std's in some areas (i.e. chokepoints) rather than a "one size fits all" lighting std.

N. McGuire: wrt lighting in Riparian, Are there specific species that are more sensitive?

A. Convery: Stated that research has shown that greater amounts of wildlife migration occurs in riparian & ridgelines.

USFWS: Statement related to additional vulnerability exposure caused by lighting.

H. Gonzalez: Statement related to how enforcement will work and who pays for those related costs.

- KP: Stated that enforcement and its costs will be part of what needs to be included. Welcomed comments and knowledge of how to deal w/issue.

Obj. Minimize Direct Barriers

FENCING

- Presentation included fencing design submitted jointly by CoLAB + TNC
- EJ Remson: Noted differing fencing (Perimeter, pasture, etc.). Noted importance of not fencing certain areas (such as underpasses).
- S. Paroski: Stated that in areas near roads, importance of including a place specifically for animal passage while maintaining security
- = Additional examples (MT, LA County, Butte County)
- S. Paroski: Q re: height and limit of 48"
 - A. Convery: Stated that it is wrt rangeland
 - EJ. Remson: Stated that it is not "security fencing"

T. Cohen: Statements about 60" obligations related to cattle (i.e. must exclude from adjacent non-cattle property). Obligations for 8' fence around beehives (i.e. bears "do not even acknowledge a 60" fence).

- Bud Sloan: "CA is a fence-in state", Stated that submitted fence design stems from NRCS. Noted that a 16" fence allows lots of things to pass. Noted that 5-wire necessary for maintaining animals in an area. But barb wire not being something capable of stopping all traffic ("virtual barrier"). Stated that 16" from ground is really stretching it. Stated that 60" height is pretty standard.

FENCING

(cont'd) noted that bottom wire w/o barbs is likely acceptable.

- T. Cohen: Noted bottom wire barbs being good for excluding people. Noted that areas w/limited human interaction, barbless bottom wire is fine, but barbs w/areas that needs certain types of exclusion (i.e. people in hi traffic areas, deer in orchards w/new saplings)

- H. Gonzales: Food Safety. Would like to make sure this is considered. Gave example of wild pigs.

- B. Sloan: Noted use of "Field Fencing". Concurred w/T. Cohen that in some areas there is a hi need to exclude animals, would like to see those areas protected adequately.

- C. Collier: Noted resources for fencing options.

- J. Krist

- S. Paroski: Q about "No perimeter fencing". Expressed concerns about smaller sized lots and those closer to more populated/urban areas.

A. Convery: Noted statement coming from Coastal Commission.

- KP: wrt fencing around avocados, is it only for theft?

- Krist: "Human Exclusion"

- T. Cohen: Noted USDA requirements to include barriers to entry.

- Limoneira: Noted that the reg's come from FDA (not USDA) and that those standards have upcoming implementation/milestones.

(FENCING)

McGuire: What are the typical setback requirements in areas w/ no "no perimeter fencing"

S. Paroski: Noted that the corridors go through some heavy fly use areas.

Obj. Minimize Veg. Loss + Habitat Fragmentation

—— VEG. LOSS / FRAG. ——

- Remson: Request for access to presentation.
- Wobburn: ~~And~~ Noted existing policies related to setbacks in sensitive areas such as wetlands.

A. Convery: Stated that yes for wetlands and discretionary. Not riparian or ministerial or exempt use.

VEG Loss/FRAG.

H. Gonzales: Noted veg. clearing as an activity associated with creating additional agricultural production.

S. Paroski: Stated that it would be helpful to clarify "Critical Habitat Area"

Convery: Noted Riparian/Alluvial, Roadway Crossings, Ridgelines.

B. Sloan: Noted brush clearing as a necessity for agricultural activities, particularly w/ cattle ranching. Stated riparian as a ~~non~~ non-issue. Stated that restrictions on normal, customary activities it will force ranchers out.

Noted stocking rates already changed due to drought. Large wildlife cannot go thru dense brush anyway, they go where our animals go.

B. Deige/SPRCD:

VEG LOSS/FRAG

R. Atmore: Noted ranchers as "grass farmers" that need to manage woody species.

Statement of importance in managing areas such as sage-chaparral allowing for species such as native grasses to succeed as a result of land management.

Obj. PROTECT CORRIDOR ~~BY~~ widths and enhance function in Chokepoints

CHOKEPOINTS

S. Paroski: Need for specific standards in order to deal w/specific issues.

Noted idea of clustering; but recommending clustering of buildings w/in a parcel that allows for multiple associated parcels to be retained as conservation easement.

PAROSKI (cont'd): Feels that clustering across parcels of a single owner would allow flexibility that supports ↗ wildlife movement.

WW: Importance of recognizing the important passages for wildlife in these areas.

T. Cohen: Q about fencing thru a riparian habitat.

A. Convery:

Woodburn: Noted that perhaps that additional standards should only be applied to checkpoints.

S. Paroski: Noted significant differences between issues w/ urban-urban interface vs. managing cattle in large open space areas.

SS: Request ~~from~~ that City contacts inform County of the best way to have this conversation w/Cities.

————— ADDITIONAL Q's —————

C. Collier: DCGGB + AB60 Regulations determine brush clearing + veg. removal req.s. Will share.

L. Lampara: Q's w/Noise; more info?

SS: Stated that we do not currently have lots of info. Interest~~ion~~ in issues related to ongoing noise issues that should be addressed and looked into.

USFWS: Who will county use to identify and ID criticality of chokepoints?

- A. Convery

- SS: Hope to find consult w/SME's
as more research is done

- H. Gonzales: Noted Ag. Uses
of noise such as Boom
Cannons as standard management
and practice.

McGuire

T. Cohen: Noted Wind Machines

SS: Temp. Noise

TC: Temp. Noise, Perm. Structure

S. Paroski: Noted presence of development
in Corridor in Ojai area.

H. Gonzales: Noted preference to receive presentation in advance of future meetings.

SS: Is this a forum and format that works?
Request for feedback.

H. Gonzales: Bigger room. One that is easier to find.

C. Collier: Industry-specific breakouts. Noted oil/gas & Ag./Cattle

EJ Remson: Is this the feedback - info you wanted?

SS: Noted yes, but stated that County will likely need to follow up w/ specific stakeholders & experts as proj. moves forward.

KP: Noted obligations associated w/ BOS timelines.

McGuire: CEA from Planning perspective.

- KP: Will depend on the shape + scope of the project as it continues to move forward.

H. Gonzalez: Q's related to cost and when that will be looked into. Who will be paying and what the level of cost will be.

Bradley/NPS: Expressed feeling that there is a lot of potential for this to be an example across the country + the state.

— END MEETING —