SECTION B

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Job:	CUP-4045 Mod. 5	**Requester:**	Lisa Woodburn
Applicant:	Pan Am Sat/Fillmore Teleport	**Date:**	January 2, 1998
Survey Type:	Field	**Rationale:**	Sensitive habitat

Site Description: A field visit of the site (portion of parcel no. 041-0-250-180) was conducted on December 31, 1997. The parcel is located east of Fillmore on the south-facing foothills near the eastern terminus of the Santa Ynez Mountains. The site is surrounded by avocado orchards to the north, west and south. Venturan coastal sage scrub, dominated by California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*) and purple sage (*Salvia leucophylla*) occurs to the east of the site. The site supports an existing satellite communication complex, including an equipment/office building, satellite dishes and an emergency generator.

	Project Impact Degree of Effect*				**Cumulative Impact Degree of Effect***			
	N	**LS**	**S**	**U**	**N**	**LS**	**S**	**U**
6. Biological Resources								
a. endangered, threatened, or rare species	X				X			
b. wetland habitat	X				X			
c. coastal habitat	X				X			
d. migration corridors	X				X			
e. locally important species/communities		X				X		

*N No impact
LS Less than significant impact
S Significant impact
U Impact unknown

SECTION C

DISCUSSION OF RESPONSES

a. Plant or animal species listed under either the Federal or California Endangered Species Acts reported in the vicinity of the parcel (Fillmore 7.5' quadrangle map, California Natural Diversity Data Base, 1997) include:

- Least Bell's vireo (*Vireo belli pusillus*, Federal and State Endangered)-reported from Fillmore Fish Hatchery, 1 mile to the southeast; and

- Southern steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*, Federal Endangered)-reported from Sespe Creek, 2.5 miles to the southwest.

The parcel does not provide suitable habitat for these or other rare, threatened, or endangered species known from the region and the proposed addition of 20 more satellite dishes would not adversely affect rare, threatened or endangered species. Therefore, no impacts to rare, threatened, or endangered species are expected.

b. The site and vicinity does not support wetlands. Therefore, no impacts to wetlands are expected.

c. The parcel is located approximately 24 miles north of the coastal zone and coastal resources do not occur in the vicinity of the site. Coastal resources are not expected to be adversely affected by further development of the site.

d. Access to habitat in the project area is relatively unrestricted such that no concentrated movement corridors are expected to occur. However, the ridgeline immediately north and east of the project site may be used as a local movement corridor by wildlife foraging in avocado orchards. The proposed facilities would be located sufficiently distant from this ridgeline that the project is not expected to reduce the value of this potential local wildlife movement corridor.

e. Southwestern pond turtle (*Clemmys marmorata pallida*), yellow warbler (*Dendroica petechia brewsteri*), Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperi*), and Santa Ana sucker (*Catostomus santaanae*) have been reported from the Santa Clara River about 1 mile south of the project site. Two-striped garter snake (*Thamnophis hammondii*) has been reported from Maple Creek, about 6 miles to the north. The project site does not provide suitable habitat for these species and no impacts are expected.

Special-status plant species that may occur in coastal sage scrub on the project site are limited to Catalina mariposa lily (*Calochortus catalinae*). This species is on the California Native Plant Society watch list (List 4), which indicates that its distribution is limited, but vulnerability or susceptibility to threat appears low at this time (Skinner and Pavlik, 1994). Catalina mariposa lily was not observed in the project vicinity during the winter site visit, but may occur in low numbers. Since the threat of regional extirpation of this species is low, project impacts are considered less than significant.

The California Department of Fish and Game does not presently track Venturan coastal sage scrub as a sensitive community. However, coastal sage scrub communities are becoming increasingly rare throughout their range and are considered endangered by much of the scientific community (Westman, 1981; Westman, 1986; Atwood, 1990). Davis et al. (1995) consider coastal sage scrub a natural community at risk because less than five percent of this community is protected in parks, reserves, and conservation easements. Furthermore, the historical extent of coastal sage scrub has been reduced substantially. Therefore, Venturan coastal sage scrub will be considered a sensitive community for the purposes of this initial study.

The Ventura County Fire Protection District would require removal of all Venturan coastal sage scrub within 100 feet of all structures. This would result in the loss of about 0.2 acres of this community. The reader should note that about one-half of this area has already been cleared, apparently as a result of geotechnical investigations. Given the small amount of loss and many thousands of acres of this community present in the region, this impact is considered less than significant.

References:

Atwood, J.L. 1990. *Status Review of the California Gnatcatcher (Polioptila californica*). Manomet Bird Observatory.

Davis, F.W., P.A. Stine, D.M. Stoms, M.I. Borchart, and A.D. Hollander. 1995. Gap analysis of the actual vegetation of California, 1. Southwestern bioregion. *Madrono* 42(1):40-78.

Skinner, Mark W. and Bruce M. Pavlik. 1994. *Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California.* Special Publication No. 1. California Native Plant Society. Sacramento, CA.

Westman, W.E. 1981. Diversity relations and succession in California coastal sage scrub. *Ecology* 62:170.

Westman, W.E. 1986. Implications of ecological theory for rare plant conservation in coastal sage scrub. In: *Conservation and Management of Rare and Endangered Plants*. California Native Plant Society. Sacramento, CA.

SECTION D

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on the information contained within Sections B and C:	YES/MAYBE	NO
1. Does the project have the potential to significantly 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, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	___	X
2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts will endure well into the future).	___	X
3. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (Several projects may have relatively small individual impacts on two or more resources, but the total of those impacts on the environment is significant).	___	X
4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	___	X

SECTION E

DETERMINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☒ I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION should be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measure(s) described below will be applied to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION should be prepared.

☐ I find the proposed project, individually and/or cumulatively MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature of Preparer Date