State of California – Natural Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, CA 92123
(858) 467-4201
wildlife.ca.gov

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director

March 15, 2024

Dana Eady
City of Santa Maria
110 South Pine Street, Suite 101
Santa Maria, CA 93458
deady@cityofsantamaria.org

SUBJECT: PARTIALLY RECIRCULATED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE RICHARDS RANCH ANNEXATION PROJECT; SCH #2022020194; SANTA BARBARA COUNTY, CA

Dear Dana Eady:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has reviewed the Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (PREIR) for the Richards Ranch Annexation Project (Project) made available for public review by the City of Santa Maria (City) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines. This PREIR replaces portions of Section 4.3, Biological Resources, and Chapter 5, Alternatives Analysis of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) previously circulated for this Project. CDFW reviewed the previous DEIR and submitted a comment letter to the City on March 14, 2023 (Wilson-Olgin 2023).

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and recommendations regarding those activities involved in the Project that may affect California fish and wildlife.

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 agency environmental review efforts, focusing specifically on Projects and related activities that have the potential to adversely affect fish and wildlife resources.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Applicant: Richards Ranch, LLC

Objective: The Project's purpose is the pre-zoning of four parcels located in unincorporated Santa Barbara County by the City, and annexation of the property to within City limits. The parcels will be pre-zoned and developed with high density residential (27.4 acres) and general commercial uses (16.35 acres). The Project would require approval from the Santa Barbara County Local Agency Formation Commission (SBLAFCO) for the annexation of the parcels.

Location: The Project is located in Santa Barbara County, in the community of Orcutt, adjacent to the southeastern City limits and within the City's Sphere of Influence. The Project site includes four parcels – Assessor's Parcel Numbers 107-250-19, 107-250-20, 107-250-21, and 107-250-22. The parcels total 43.75 acres and are situated to the northeast and southeast of the intersection of State Route 135 and Union Valley Parkway.

Project Description: The Applicant has developed a conceptual plan for future development. The conceptual development plan includes retail commercial, mini-storage, and high-density residential uses. This conceptual plan shows the potential future development that could occur consistent with the Project's proposed pre-zone designations and provides the basis for the environmental evaluations in the DEIR and the PRDEIR. The conceptual development plan would allow a maximum buildout of 106,800 square feet of commercial uses and a 39,500-square-foot mini-storage complex on 16.35 acres of the Project site, as well as 400 apartments and 95 townhomes on the remaining 27.40 acres. Future Project buildout of any of these uses within the Project site would require individual Planned Development Permit applications for development of each of the proposed residential and commercial Projects. Only if the City and SBLAFCO approve the annexation would the Planned Development Permit applications be discretionarily reviewed by the City.

Biological Setting: The Project site topography is mostly flat, gently sloping from east to west, with manufactured embankments and fill slopes from adjacent residential and road development. Surrounding land uses to the north generally include residential uses with limited commercial uses along Orcutt Road. Airport facilities and runways for the Santa Maria Airport are located to the northwest along with active agricultural lands, some of which have been recently approved for commercial development as part of the Santa Maria Airport Business Park Project.

Vegetation communities and land cover types within the Project footprint include eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus* spp.) tree stands (7.637 acres), disturbed coastal scrub – coyote

brush scrub/silver bush lupine scrub (4.150 acres), ornamental tree stands (2.393 acres), wild oats non-native grassland (32.490 acres), and developed (4.490 acres).

The stand of eucalyptus is an important inland overwintering grove of the western monarch butterfly (monarchs; *Danaus plexippus plexxipus*) and has a high conservation value. It is identified by The Xerces Society as Western Monarch Overwintering Site #2688.

In the DEIR, the City proposed mitigation measures that prohibit use of invasive plants in landscape plans (BIO/mm-1.1), require a biological monitor during Project construction (BIO/mm-1.2), require environmental training for workers (BIO/mm-1.3), prevent entrapment of wildlife in excavations (BIO/mm1.4), require erosion control products be biodegradable (BIO/mm-1.5), require eucalyptus removal occur outside monarch overwintering season or surveys for and avoidance of individual monarchs (BIO/mm-2.1), require surveys for and relocation of northern California legless lizards (*Anniella pulchra*; BIO/mm-3.1), require avoidance of bird nesting season or surveys for nesting birds (BIO/mm-4.1), require surveys for and avoidance of roosting bats (BIO/mm-5.1), and require a tree protection, replacement, and monitoring plan (BIO/mm-11.1).

In the PREIR, the City added requirements for native nectar-producing landscaping plants and funding to an organization involved in monarch conservation to BIO/mm-2.1.

Background: During the initial public review process for the DEIR for this Project, CDFW emphasized the importance of the eucalyptus grove as monarch overwintering habitat, and as a result is now recirculating those portions of the document related to monarchs. The City is revising its findings regarding the existing 7.63-acre overwintering site that is within the Project site boundaries. Because of the new information provided, the City has made revisions to the recommended mitigation measures for the monarchs. Also, the conclusion regarding the impacts following implementation of the mitigation measures has been revised. Development of the proposed Project, or any Project similar in density to the proposed Project, would necessitate the removal of the overwintering habitat that exists on the Project site. The City determined that removal of this habitat would create a significant and unavoidable impact that cannot be fully mitigated. The City also determined that feasible mitigation measures are not available to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Thus, residual impacts to monarchs would continue to be significant and unavoidable with development of the proposed Project or any Project on the Project site similar in density to the proposed Project. The changes to the biological resources analysis and conclusions also necessitated changes to the Alternatives analysis.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CDFW appreciates the City's recognition of the importance of the eucalyptus grove and the changes incorporated into the PRDEIR. We appreciate the opportunity to provide

additional guidance to improve the document and strengthen the protections to monarch overwintering habitat.

The City has requested that commenters limit their written comments to the new information regarding biological resources and the considered alternatives presented in the PRDEIR, so our comments in this letter are focused on monarch impacts.

COMMENT #1: Mitigation Measure BIO/mm 2.1

Issue: While CDFW maintains our position that the City does not approve Projects that result in the removal of the eucalyptus groves, we recommend that mitigation measures in the PRDEIR be improved to further reduce impacts to monarchs.

Specific impact: As discussed in the PRDEIR, even with the proposed mitigation, the loss of the monarch overwintering habitat will not be mitigated to a less than significant level. With additional mitigation measures, the impacts can, however, be substantially lessened.

Why impact would occur: The PRDEIR contains a five-part mitigation measure related to monarch impacts (BIO/mm 2.1). Parts (a) and (b) reduce the likelihood of the Project resulting in direct injury or mortality to monarch individuals. They require work outside the monarch overwintering season (BIO/mm 2.1(a)) or, if work occurs within that time frame, focused surveys with work only occurring if monarchs are not detected (BIO/mm 2.1(b)). We have no changes to suggest for these sub-measures.

Part (c) calls for milkweed (*Asclepias* spp.) to be excluded from landscaping plans, and for the planting of native nectar-producing plant species. Part (d) requires the development of a monarch habitat enhancement plan to be included in the Project's future landscaping plans. While we support the use of native nectar-producing plants as a way that homeowners and businesses can provide benefit to monarchs and other pollinators, landscaping within a developed area does not provide compensatory mitigation for Project impacts. Although doing so is a good best practice, native plants in landscaping do not offset the impacts of the Project in a biologically meaningful way.

Part (e) states,

> *Prior to the approval of a Planned Development permit, the developer shall identify appropriate local land management conservation organizations and provide a donation to assist with the organization's overwintering monarch butterfly conservation goals. This donation may be for conservation activities for known and mapped overwintering sites in the immediate vicinity of the Project site, or a donation may be provided to a local non-profit organization focused on monarch butterfly conservation. The developer will work with the City and local conservation organizations to provide funding for 5*

years of conservation research and/or maintenance and management activities for an area equivalent to that impacted on the Project site (approximately 7.6 acres).

CDFW is unable to evaluate the adequacy of this sub-measure to mitigate impacts to monarchs without additional information as to the amount of the funding, the organization(s) being considered, and the activities the funding will cover. In addition, the term "donation" implies a free contribution or gift to an organization, which makes it unclear if this is an enforceable requirement imposed through the Lead Agency. Finally, the measure provides temporary research, maintenance, or management activities for 5 years only, while the loss of the habitat is permanent. Compensation for permanent loss should be equally permanent, and so the measure as written does not offset the impact.

Evidence impacts would be significant: As we discussed in our previous comment letter, and as the City has acknowledged in the PRDEIR, loss of this eucalyptus grove is a significant impact on monarchs. During the last three decades, the western migratory monarch population that overwinters along the California coast has declined by more than 99% (Marcum and Darst 2021). Habitat loss and fragmentation, including grove senescence, are among the primary threats to the population (Thogmartin et al. 2017).

According to The Western Monarch Butterfly Conservation Plan, "[t]he overwintering stage is regarded by species experts as the most vulnerable stage of the monarch's life cycle (Pyle and Monroe 2004) given many of the population aggregates within a narrowly defined area of suitable habitat in coastal California. Conservation of overwintering sites is crucial for the continuity of the migratory phenomenon and long-term survival of the western population of monarchs." Protecting and restoring existing overwintering habitat is a vital part of the western monarch population's recovery (WAFWA 2019).

CEQA requires that if specific details of a mitigation measure will be developed after Project approval, the lead agency must (1) commit itself to the mitigation; (2) adopt specific performance standards the mitigation will achieve; and (3) identify the type(s) of potential action(s) that can feasibly achieve that performance standard that will be considered, analyzed, and potentially incorporated in the mitigation measure (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.4).

Recommendation #1.1

CDFW recommends BIO/mm 2.1(e) be rewritten to describe the proposed mitigation more specifically. A proposal to give an unspecified amount of money for unspecified tasks to an unspecified organization does not reduce impacts to monarchs in any meaningful way. The measure should, at a minimum, identify the organization(s) being considered as recipient of the funding, discuss their qualifications relative to management of lands for the benefit of monarchs, identify specific tasks or actions to be performed, and quantify the amount of

the funding and specify how the amount was calculated. Furthermore, the proposed 1:1 mitigation-to-impact ratio will not offset the impacts of removing the grove. CDFW recommends the calculations be based on a ratio of 2:1, at the very least, and potentially higher depending on the tasks or actions the funding will support.

COMMENT #2: Unexplored Mitigation Option

Issue: Potentially feasible mitigation exists that is not analyzed in the PREIR.

Specific Impact: CDFW disagrees with the City's determination that no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce potentially significant impacts to the monarch to a less than significant level.

Why impact would occur: The PREIR discusses the City's reasoning in dismissing the creation of a new grove to replace the grove on the Project site, but it does not provide an analysis of the possibility of preserving an existing grove off site. Preservation and active management of an existing monarch grove is a meaningful conservation path that should be considered and analyzed in the environmental document.

Evidence impacts would be significant: The City has a duty to avoid or minimize environmental damage where feasible and should not approve a Project as proposed if there are feasible mitigation measures available that would substantially lessen any significant effects that the Project would have on the environment (CEQA Guidelines § 15021). By not evaluating the conservation of an existing grove as mitigation for impacts to the monarch overwintering habitat at the Project site, analysis of feasible measures is not complete.

Recommendation #2.1: Conservation of Existing Grove

The City should evaluate existing groves for purchase and conservation. The grove(s) should provide mitigation at a preservation-to-impact ratio of 2:1, at the very least, and potentially higher depending on the quality of the habitat. The location(s) of groves should be identified in the PREIR. A land manager with experience managing property for the benefit of monarchs should be identified. A biological conservation easement should be recorded over any land proposed for conservation. The easement should run with the land, and it should preclude any activities inconsistent with the conservation goals of the site. A long-term management plan should be developed, and management should be funded in perpetuity.

COMMENT #3: Tree Preservation and Reduced Housing Density Alternative

Issue: Indirect impacts are not analyzed in Alternative 2.

Specific Impact: CDFW has concerns with aspects of the depicted design in Alternative 2. Alternative 2 envisions a reduced development footprint that allows for the retention of the eucalyptus grove. The discussion of Alternative 2 does not address the potential effects of the alternative on the suitability of the remaining trees as overwintering habitat. While retaining the grove reduces the impact of the Project, significant impacts to monarchs may still result due to Project-related changes in the habitat quality of the grove. The PREIR does not include mitigation measures that will protect the habitat value of the grove during the life of the Project. Without inclusion of these mitigation measures, the Project could result in the loss of overwintering habitat for monarchs.

Why impact would occur: Overwintering groves provide protection from inclement weather and possess suitable vegetation and microclimate conditions for monarchs in the form of roosting trees, wind protection, dappled sunlight, nectar sources, water and/or dew for hydration, high humidity, and an absence of freezing temperatures (Marcum and Darst 2021). Monarch overwintering sites have specific microclimate conditions that are influenced by the configuration of trees and other foliage near the site (Griffiths and Villablanca 2015). The grove must be dense enough to provide protection from strong winds and winter storms, as well as contain canopy gaps (Leong 1990a; Leong et al. 1991; Weiss et al. 1991). Trees or structures that provide windbreaks can be located more than 110 yards (100 m) from what may appear to be the habitat boundary (Weiss 1998). Alteration of the site and surrounding areas could impact microclimate conditions, thereby reducing the suitability of the site for monarchs (Weiss et al. 1991).

Vegetation management within the eucalyptus grove, for fuel modification, recreational access, public hazard management, maintenance of water quality facilities, or other activities associated with the adjacent residential development has the potential to significantly impact monarchs by reducing possible overwintering habitat or altering habitat climatic conditions.

The figure for Alternative 2 shows basins within the eucalyptus grove, while the figure for Alternative 3 shows a basin in the area occupied by ornamental trees. CDFW is concerned that directing the Project's stormwater to the eucalyptus grove could change the hydrology of the site and result in decreased health or mortality of trees. Furthermore, the periodic maintenance of the facilities could disrupt overwintering monarchs.

The figure of Alternative 2 shows two parks, one within the eucalyptus grove and one immediately adjacent to it. CDFW is concerned that allowing active park uses within the grove will negatively affect the suitability of the grove as habitat for overwintering monarchs. The PREIR does not go into detail as to the nature of the parks, but parks in general can introduce noise, lighting, changes to vegetation communities and composition, and insecticides, herbicides, and nutrients used to maintain turf areas.

Evidence impacts would be significant: CEQA requires the PREIR to include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed Project. The PREIR should discuss significant effects of the alternative (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6).

Recommended Potentially Feasible Mitigation Measures

CDFW agrees with the City's determination that alternatives that do not involve direct removal of the eucalyptus grove (such as Alternative 2) are environmentally superior to alternatives that propose development of much of the site. CDFW believes Project impacts can be further reduced through additional mitigation measures.

Recommendation #3.1: Project Design Considerations

CDFW recommends the City, if it approves a Project that retains the grove, considers the following design elements to reduce the indirect effects of the Project:

a. adjacent development should be sited and designed to prevent impacts that would degrade the habitat value of the eucalyptus grove;
b. the entire footprint of the Project should occur outside the outer dripline of the eucalyptus trees;
c. all facilities associated with the stormwater system and low impact development should be contained within the development footprint, outside the limits of the eucalyptus grove;
d. development should be sited such that any fuel modification zones are outside the limits of the eucalyptus grove;
e. park uses should be moved to the location of the ornamental trees, or elsewhere within the development footprint, and preclude recreational uses within the eucalyptus grove; and
f. the grove should be protected by fencing and educational signage, alerting residents to the importance of the grove and the sensitivity of monarchs.

Recommendation #3.2: Additional Mitigation Measures

In addition to the mitigation measures proposed in the PRDEIR, CDFW recommends that the City include the following measures that reduce the effects of the adjacent development on the habitat quality of the eucalyptus grove and provide for its continued protection. CDFW also recommends the City include mitigation measures designed to protect the root system of trees in the eucalyptus grove to prevent injury or mortality resulting from Project construction adjacent to the grove.

Mitigation Measure #3.1: Monarch Butterfly Habitat Assessment

The Applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a habitat assessment, which shall be completed a minimum of 60 days prior to Project implementation. The qualified biologist shall assess habitat following the Xerces Management Guidelines for Monarch Butterfly Overwintering Habitat (Xerces 2017) or other protocols with prior approval by CDFW. The habitat assessment shall be conducted in consultation with site monitors with knowledge of the history of the grove to determine primary roosting trees and other structural components or flora integral to maintaining microclimate conditions. These plants shall be marked and avoided during Project activities.

Mitigation Measure #3.2: Monarch Habitat Management Plan

The Applicant should be responsible for the development of a Monarch Habitat Management Plan, in consultation with CDFW, prior to Project implementation. The information gathered during the monarch habitat assessment (Mitigation Measure #3.1, above) should be used to develop the plan following the guidance in the Xerces Management Guidelines for Monarch Butterfly Overwintering Habitat (Xerces 2017) or other protocols with prior approval by CDFW. The plan should be adaptive, with specific goals and objectives, continued monitoring, and refinement over time. The plan should include as an objective that the baseline population/individual occurrence numbers should not decrease due to Project activities and should include adaptive and contingent measures to ensure this objective is met. The plan should consider removal or trimming of hazard trees, removal or trimming of trees to create appropriate solar radiation patterns, a long-term tree planting strategy, and shrub and forb management. Trees within core overwintering habitat should not be cut or trimmed except for specific grove management directed by the plan. Management activities in groves should only be conducted between March 16 and September 14.

Mitigation Measure #3.3 Monarch Grove Protection

The Applicant should provide for the protection and management of the eucalyptus grove in perpetuity. The site should be protected by fencing or educational signage alerting residents to the importance of the grove and the sensitivity of monarch butterflies. A conservation easement or other special designation or deed restriction should be recorded over the site. The easement should run with the land, and it should preclude activities inconsistent with the conservation goals of the grove. The site should be managed pursuant to a long-term management plan by an organization with experience managing property for the benefit of monarchs. The management of the land should be funded in perpetuity by a non-wasting endowment.

Mitigation Measure #3.4: Protecting Trees from Encroachment

The Applicant should comply with the following tree protection measures:

- Grading plans should be adjusted to avoid the critical root zone of eucalyptus grove trees. If some or all these trees are still considered candidates for encroachment upon final approval of the grading plans, temporary staking or flagging should be placed along the grading limits prior to initiation of construction for clear identification and to ensure tree impacts are minimized.
- Tree protection areas should be marked in the field in collaboration with a certified arborist or qualified biologist using fencing and/or flagging, which may coincide or overlap with the staked/flagged grading limits.
- All ground disturbance within 10 feet of the canopy dripline of affected trees should be monitored by a certified arborist or qualified biologist with tree care experience.
- The staging of equipment and vehicles should be located outside of the tree protection areas. Placement of heavy equipment for earthwork should be as far away from the tree protection zones as feasible and should never be less than 6 feet from the trunk of each specimen tree.
- Overhead branches that conflict with Project activities should only be pruned by a qualified tree trimmer according to International Society of Arboriculture pruning standards.
- If cutting of roots is required, roots shall be saw-cut to avoid tearing, and cutting should occur as far from the trunk as possible.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

CDFW recommends the City consider conducting a City-wide overwintering grove assessment and develop and implement long-term grove management plans. A City-wide plan will allow the City to approach impacts to the species from a regional perspective, better identify cumulative impacts, and develop more meaningful mitigation strategies through conservation of existing groves. The plan should consider trees and shrubs outside overwintering groves that provide a buffer to preserve the microclimate conditions within groves, enhancing roosting trees within overwintering groves and within ½ mile of groves by planting trees (e.g., Monterey pine (*Pinus radiata*), Monterey cypress (*Cupressus macrocarpa*), coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*), coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), Torrey pine (*Pinus torreyana*), western sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*), bishop pine (*Pinus muricata*), and others, as appropriate for location) (Marcum and Darst 2021). The plan should also include protection for monarchs, other pollinators, and their habitats from insecticides and herbicides.

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 California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). Instructions for submittal are available online at https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB.Additionally, information on special status native plant populations and sensitive natural communities should be submitted to CDFW's Vegetation Classification and Mapping Program. Instructions for submittal are available online at https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/VegCAMP/Natural-Communities/Submit

FILING FEES

The Project, as proposed, would have an impact on fish and/or wildlife, and assessment of 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 fee is required for the underlying Project approval to be operative, vested, and final. (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 PRDEIR to assist the City in identifying and mitigating Project impacts on biological resources.

Questions regarding this letter or further coordination should be directed to Kelly Fisher at (858) 354-5083 or Kelly.Fisher@wildlife.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:
5991E19EF8094C3...

Victoria Tang
Environmental Program Manager
South Coast Region

EC: California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Steve Gibson, Senior Environmental Scientist (Supervisory)
Jennifer Turner, Senior Environmental Scientist (Supervisory)

Cindy Hailey, Staff Services Analyst

Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse, Sacramento – State.Clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov

The Xerces Society
Emma Pelton – Emma.Pelton@xerces.org

REFERENCES

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). 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.

California Office of Planning and Research. 2009 or current version. CEQA: California Environmental Quality Act. Statutes and Guidelines, § 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines, § 15097, §15126.4(2).

Griffiths, J. & Villablanca, F. (2015). Managing monarch butterfly overwintering groves: Making room among the eucalyptus. *California Fish and Game, 101*(1), 40-50.

Leong, K. L. H. 1990. Microenvironmental factors associated with the winter habitat of the monarch butterfly (Lepidoptera: Danaidae) in central California. Annals of the Entomological Society of America 83:906–910.

Leong, K. L. H., D. Frey, G. Brenner, S. Baker, and D. Fox. 1991. Use of multivariate analyses to characterize the monarch butterfly (Lepidoptera: Danaidae) winter habitat. Annals of the Entomological Society of America 84:263–267.

Marcum, S., & Darst, C. (2021). Western Monarch Butterfly Conservation Recommendations.

Pyle, R. M., and M. Monroe. 2004. Conservation of western monarchs. *Wings: Essays on Invertebrate Conservation* 27:13-17.

Thogmartin, W. E., Wiederholt, R., Oberhauser, K., Drum, R. G., Diffendorfer, J. E., Altizer, S., Taylor, O. R., Pleasants, J., Semmens, D., Semmens, B., Erickson, R., Libby, K., & Lopez-Hoffman, L. (2017). Monarch butterfly population decline in north America: Identifying the threatening processes. Royal Society Open Science, 4(9). https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.170760

Weiss, S. B., RICH, P. M., MURPHY, D. D., CALVERT, W. H., & EHRLICH, P. R. (1991). Forest Canopy Structure at Overwintering Monarch Butterfly Sites: Measurements with Hemispherical Photography. Conservation Biology, 5(2), 165–175. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.1991.tb00121.x

Weiss, S.B. 1998. Habitat suitability, restoration, and vegetation management at Monarch Grove Sanctuary, Pacific Grove, CA, TRA Environmental Report.

Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (2019). Western Monarch Butterfly Conservation Plan.

Wilson-Olgin, E. March 14, 2023. California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Letter Re: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Richards Ranch Annexation Project (AN2021-0001) Project #2128, SCH #2022020194, Santa Barbara County.

The Xerces Society. (2017). Protecting California's Butterfly Groves: Management Guidelines for Monarch Butterfly Overwintering Habitat.

ATTACHMENT A: DRAFT MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

CDFW provides the following language to be incorporated into the MMRP for the Project.

Biological Resources (BIO)		
Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
Mitigation Measure #3.1: Monarch Butterfly Habitat Assessment The Applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a habitat assessment, which shall be completed a minimum of 60 days prior to Project implementation. The qualified biologist shall assess habitat following the Xerces Management Guidelines for Monarch Butterfly Overwintering Habitat (Xerces 2017) or other protocols with prior approval by CDFW. The habitat assessment shall be conducted in consultation with site monitors with knowledge of the history of the grove to determine primary roosting trees and other structural components or flora integral to maintaining microclimate conditions. These plants shall be marked and avoided during Project activities.	Prior to Project Activities	Applicant
Mitigation Measure #3.2: Monarch Habitat Management Plan The Applicant shall be responsible for the development of a Monarch Habitat Management Plan, in consultation with CDFW, prior to Project implementation. The information gathered during the monarch habitat assessment (Mitigation Measure #3.1, above) shall be used to develop the plan following the guidance in the Xerces Management Guidelines for Monarch Butterfly Overwintering Habitat (Xerces 2017) or other protocols with prior approval by CDFW. The plan shall be adaptive, with specific goals and objectives, continued monitoring, and refinement over time. The plan shall include as an objective that the baseline	Prior to Project Activities	Applicant

population/individual occurrence numbers shall not decrease due to Project activities and shall include adaptive and contingent measures to ensure this objective is met. The plan shall consider removal or trimming of hazard trees, removal or trimming of trees to create appropriate solar radiation patterns, a long-term tree planting strategy, and shrub and forb management. Trees within core overwintering habitat shall not be cut or trimmed except for specific grove management directed by the plan. Management activities in groves shall only be conducted between March 16 and September 14.		
Mitigation Measure #3.3: Monarch Grove Protection The Applicant shall provide for the protection and management of the eucalyptus grove in perpetuity. The site shall be protected by fencing or educational signage alerting residents to the importance of the grove and the sensitivity of monarch butterflies. A conservation easement or other special designation or deed restriction shall be recorded over the site. The easement shall run with the land, and it shall preclude activities inconsistent with the conservation goals of the grove. The site shall be managed pursuant to a long-term management plan by an organization with experience managing property for the benefit of monarchs. The management of the land shall be funded in perpetuity by a non-wasting endowment.	Prior to Project Activities	Applicant
Mitigation Measure #3.4: Protecting Trees from Encroachment The Applicant shall comply with the following tree protection measures: • Grading plans shall be adjusted to avoid the critical root zone of eucalyptus grove trees. If some or all these trees are still considered candidates for encroachment upon final approval of the grading plans, temporary staking or flagging shall be placed along the grading limits prior to initiation of construction for clear identification and to ensure tree impacts are minimized.	During Project Construction	Applicant

• Tree protection areas shall be marked in the field in collaboration with a certified arborist or qualified biologist using fencing and/or flagging, which may coincide or overlap with the staked/flagged grading limits. • All ground disturbance within 10 feet of the canopy dripline of affected trees shall be monitored by a certified arborist or qualified biologist with tree care experience. • Staging of equipment and vehicles shall be located outside of the tree protection areas. Placement of heavy equipment for earthwork shall be as far away from the tree protection zones as feasible and shall never be less than 6 feet from the trunk of each specimen tree. • Overhead branches that conflict with Project activities may only be pruned by a qualified tree trimmer according to International Society of Arboriculture pruning standards. • If cutting of roots is required, roots shall be saw-cut to avoid tearing, and cutting shall occur as far from the trunk as possible.		