Implementation Process for this Programmatic Biological Opinion

This biological opinion is effective for five (5) calendar years from the date of its issuance. During this period, Caltrans will meet with the Service at least three times (every six months after the date of issuance of this biological opinion) to discuss whether the avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures are adequately addressing the biological needs of the species. Based on new information including, but not limited to, delisting or listing of new species, the Service, FHWA, or Caltrans may need to reinitiate this consultation. The FHWA and Caltrans shall also reinitiate consultation if they anticipate any changes in the project description.

The following process shall be used to append proposed projects under this biological opinion:

1. The FHWA shall submit a letter to the Service requesting that the proposed project (inclusive of appropriate compensation, based on the project level effect and compensation criteria above) be appended to this programmatic biological opinion and also provide the Service with a brief biological assessment. The biological assessment will include, at minimum, the following information:

   a. a description of the project, including potential borrow sites, if any
   b. a vicinity map
   c. a legal location description
   d. a map showing known listed plant populations and listed animal sightings, from CNDDB and other sources, present and within 16 km (10 mi) of the project
   e. if available, a map showing the general types of habitat within 16 km (10 mi) of the project, and information related to proximity of nearby natural lands, and grasslands
   f. the results of project species surveys, if any
   g. a map (scale 1" =100' or 1"=200') delineating the major vegetation communities present on the project site and immediately adjacent to it
   h. color photographs of the major vegetation communities present on the project site, with the locations of the photographs presented on the vegetation map
   i. a geographic information systems (GIS) computer document and digital file showing the project site, points or polygons of observations of listed species at and adjacent to the site.

2. The Service shall review the proposed project to determine if the proposed projectis appropriate to append to this programmatic biological opinion; or needs an individual biological opinion.

3. For projects that qualify for appending to this biological opinion, the Service shall evaluate the anticipated effects and the adequacy of the proposed compensation and provide formal comments to the FHWA if the review reveals inadequacies.

4. Upon receipt of the FHWA's letter, the Service shall formally append the project to this biological opinion and specify the amount of incidental take exempted, if any, in a letter to the FHWA with copies to the appropriate Caltrans office.

The Service shall give priority to completing appended consultations on the minor transportation projects considered herein over other Caltrans projects, as requested by Caltrans and the FHWA. The Service shall respond in writing to requests to append projects to this programmatic biological opinion. The Service's response will be made within 60 days or as soon thereafter as practicable once all the information listed above has been received. No projects can be appended to this biological opinion without written concurrence from the Service.

Annually from the date of issuance of this biological opinion, Caltrans shall report to the Service the following information:

1. The projected start date of construction of each project.

2. The progress made to date on meeting each of the compensation requirements for each project.

3. The FHWA and Caltrans shall provide a cumulative tally and description of all projects that have been appended to this programmatic biological opinion.. The description shall include a GIS file and hard copy map depicting projects for which incidental take has been issued, the total acres affected by each project, the type and category of each project, and the correlating compensation lands, if any, that have been acquired for each project.

4. The first report is due in January 2006.

Status of the Species/Environmental Baseline

San Joaquin Kit Fox

The San Joaquin kit fox was listed as an endangered species on March 11, 1967 (Service 1967) and was listed by the State of California as a threatened species on June 27, 1971. The Recovery Plan includes this canine (Service 1998).

In the San Joaquin Valley before 1930, the range of the San Joaquin kit fox extended from southern Kern County north to Tracy, San Joaquin County, on the west side, and near La Grange, Stanislaus County, on the east side (Grinnell *et al.* 1937; Service 1998). Historically, this species occurred in several San Joaquin Valley native plant communities. In the southernmost portion of the range, these communities included Valley Sink Scrub, Valley Saltbush Scrub, Upper Sonoran Subshrub Scrub, and Annual Grassland. San Joaquin kit foxes also exhibit a capacity to utilize habitats that have been altered by man. The animals are present in many oil fields, grazed pasturelands, and "wind farms" (Cypher 2000). Kit foxes can inhabit the margins and fallow lands near irrigated row crops, orchards, and vineyards, and may forage occasionally in these agricultural areas (Service 1998). The San Joaquin kit fox seems to prefer more gentle terrain and decreases in abundance as terrain ruggedness increases (Grinnell *et al.* 1937; Morrell 1972; Warrick and Cypher 1998).

The kit fox is often associated with open grasslands, which form large contiguous blocks within the eastern portions of the range of the animal. The listed canine also utilizes oak savanna and some types of agriculture (e.g. orchards and alfalfa), although the long-term suitability of these habitats is unknown (Jensen 1972; Service 1998). In eastern Merced County, the lands between the urban corridor along Highway 99 and the open grasslands to the east are a mixture of orchards and annual crops, mostly alfalfa. Orchards occur in large contiguous blocks in the northwest portions of the study area and at scattered locations in the southwest portions. Orchards sometimes support prey species if the grounds are not manicured; however, denning potential is typically low and kit foxes can be more susceptible to coyotes predation within the orchards (Orloff 2000). Alfalfa fields provide an excellent prey base (Woodbridge 1987; Young 1989), and berms adjacent to alfalfa fields sometimes provide good denning habitat (Orloff 2000). Kit foxes often den adjacent to, and forage within, agricultural areas (Bell 1994; Scott-Graham 1994). Although agricultural areas are not traditional kit fox habitat and are often highly fragmented, they can offer sufficient prey resources and denning potential to support small numbers of kit foxes.

Adult San Joaquin kit foxes are usually solitary during late summer and fall. In September and October, adult females begin to excavate and enlarge natal dens (Morrell 1972), and adult males join the females in October or November (Morrell 1972). Typically, pups are born between February and late March following a gestation period of 49 to 55 days (Egoscue 1962; Morrell 1972; Spiegel and Tom 1996; Service 1998). Mean litter sizes reported for San Joaquin kit foxes include 2.0 on the Carrizo Plain (White and Ralls 1993), 3.0 at Camp Roberts (Spencer *et al.* 1992), 3.7 in the Lokern area (Spiegel and Tom 1996), and 3.8 at the Naval Petroleum Reserve (Cypher *et al.* 2000). Pups appear above ground at about age 3-4 weeks, and are weaned at age 6-8 weeks. Reproductive rates, the proportion of females bearing young, of adult San Joaquin kit foxes vary annually with environmental conditions, particularly food availability. Annual rates range from 0-100%, and reported mean rates include 61% at the Naval Petroleum Reserve (Cypher *et al.* 2000), 64% in the Lokern area (Spiegel and Tom 1996), and 32% at Camp Roberts (Spencer *et al.* 1992). Although some yearling female kit foxes will produce young, most do not reproduce until age 2 years (Spencer et al. 1992; Spiegel and Tom 1996; Cypher *et al.* 2000). Some young of both sexes, but particularly females may delay dispersal, and may assist their parents in raising in the following year's litter of pups (Spiegel and Tom 1996). The young kit foxes begin to forage for themselves at about four to five months of age (Koopman *et al.* 2000; Morell 1972).

Although most young kit foxes disperse less than 5 miles(Scrivner *et al.* 1987a), dispersal distances of up to 76.3 miles have been documented for the San Joaquin kit fox (Scrivner *et al.* 1993; Service 1998). Dispersal can be through disturbed habitats, including agricultural fields, and across highways and aqueducts. The age at dispersal ranges from 4-32 months (Cypher 2000). Among juvenile kit foxes surviving to July 1 at the Naval Petroleum Reserve, 49% of the males dispersed from natal home ranges while 24% of the females dispersed (Koopman *et al.* 2000). Among dispersing kit foxes, 87% did so during their first year of age. Most, 65.2%, of the dispersing juveniles at the Naval Petroleum Reserve died within 10 days of leaving their natal home den (Koopman *et al.* 2000). Some kit foxes delay dispersal and may inherit their natal home range.

Kit foxes are reputed to be poor diggers, and their dens are usually located in areas with loose-textured, friable soils (Morrell 1972; O'Farrell 1983). However, the depth and complexity of their dens suggest that they possess good digging abilities, and kit fox dens have been observed on a variety of soil types (Service 1998). Some studies have suggested that where hardpan layers predominate, kit foxes create their dens by enlarging the burrows of California ground squirrels (*Spermophilus beecheyi*) or badgers (*Taxidea taxus*)(Jensen 1972; Morrell 1972; Orloff *et al.* 1986). In parts of their range, particularly in the foothills, kit foxes often use ground squirrel burrows for dens (Orloff *et al.* 1986). Kit fox dens are commonly located on flat terrain or on the lower slopes of hills. About 77 percent of all kit fox dens are at or below midslope (O'Farrell 1983), with the average slope at den sites ranging from 0 to 22 degrees (California Department of Fish and Game 1980; O'Farrell 1983; Orloff *et al.* 986). Natal and pupping dens are generally found in flatter terrain. Common locations for dens include washes, drainages, and roadside berms. Kit foxes also commonly den in human-made structures such as culverts and pipes (O'Farrell 1983; Spiegel *et al.* 1996a).

Natal and pupping dens may include from two to 18 entrances and are usually larger than dens that are not used for reproduction (O'Farrell *et al.* 1980; O'Farrell and McCue 1981). Natal dens may be reused in subsequent years (Egoscue 1962). It has been speculated that natal dens are located in the same location as ancestral breeding sites (O'Farrell 1983). Active natal dens are generally 1.2 to 2 miles from the dens of other mated kit fox pairs (Egoscue 1962; O'Farrell and Gilbertson 1979). Natal and pupping dens usually can be identified by the presence of scat, prey remains, matted vegetation, and mounds of excavated soil (i.e. ramps) outside the dens (O'Farrell 1983). However, some active dens in areas outside the valley floor often do not show evidence of use (Orloff *et al.* 1986). During telemetry studies of kit foxes in the northern portion of their range, 70 percent of the dens that were known to be active showed no sign of use (e.g., tracks, scats, ramps, or prey remains)(Orloff *et al.* 1986). In another more recent study in the Coast Range, 79 percent of active kit fox dens lacked evidence of recent use other than signs of recent excavation (Jones and Stokes Associates 1997).

A kit fox can use more than 100 dens throughout its home range, although on average, an animal will use approximately 12 dens a year for shelter and escape cover (Cypher *et al.* 2001). Kit foxes typically use individual dens for only brief periods, often for only one day before moving to another den (Ralls *et al.* 1990). Possible reasons for changing dens include infestation by ectoparasites, local depletion of prey, or avoidance of coyotes (*Canis latrans*). Kit foxes tend to use dens that are located in the same general area, and clusters of dens can be surrounded by hundreds of hectares of similar habitat devoid of other dens (Egoscue 1962). In the southern San Joaquin Valley, kit foxes were found to use up to 39 dens within a denning range of 320 to 482 acres (Morrell 1972). An average den density of one den per 69 to 92 acres was reported by O'Farrell (1984) in the southern San Joaquin Valley.

Dens are used by kit foxes for temperature regulation, shelter from adverse environmental conditions, and escape from predators. Kit foxes excavate their own dens, use those constructed by other animals, and use human-made structures (culverts, abandoned pipelines, and banks in sumps or roadbeds). Kit foxes often change dens and may use many dens throughout the year;

however, evidence that a den is being used by kit foxes may be absent. San Joaquin kit foxes have multiple dens within their home range and individual animals have been reported to use up to 70 different dens (Hall 1983). At the Naval Petroleum Reserve, individual kit foxes used an average of 11.8 dens per year (Koopman *et al.* 1998). Den switching by the San Joaquin kit fox may be a function of predator avoidance, local food availability, or external parasite infestations (e.g., fleas) in dens (Egoscue 1956).

The diet of the San Joaquin kit fox varies geographically, seasonally, and annually, based on temporal and spatial variation in abundance of potential prey. In the portion of their geographic range that includes Merced County, known prey species of the kit fox include white-footed mice (*Peromyscus* spp.), insects, California ground squirrels, kangaroo rats (*Dipodomys* spp.), San Joaquin antelope squirrels, black-tailed hares (*Lepus californicus*), and chukar (*Alectoris chukar*) (Jensen 1972, Archon 1992), listed in approximate proportion of occurrence in fecal samples. Kit foxes also prey on desert cottontails (*Sylvilagus audubonii)*, ground-nesting birds, and pocket mice (*Perognathus* spp.).

The diets and habitats selected by coyotes and kit foxes living in the same areas are often quite similar. Hence, the potential for resource competition between these species may be quite high when prey resources are scarce such as during droughts, which are quite common in semi-arid, central California. Competition for resources between coyotes and kit foxes may result in kit fox mortalities. Coyote-related injuries accounted for 50-87 per cent of the mortalities of radio collared kit foxes at Camp Roberts, the Carrizo Plain Natural Area, the Lokern Natural Area, and the Naval Petroleum Reserves (Cypher and Scrivner 1992; Standley *et al.* 1992).

San Joaquin kit foxes are primarily nocturnal, although individuals are occasionally observed resting or playing (mostly pups) near their dens during the day (Grinnell *et al.* 1937). Kit foxes occupy home ranges that vary in size from 1.7 to 4.5 square miles (White and Ralls 1993). A mated pair of kit foxes and their current litter of pups usually occupy each home range. Other adults, usually offspring from previous litters, also may be present (Koopman *et al.* 2000), but individuals often move independently within their home range (Cypher 2000). Average distances traveled each night range from 5.8 to 9.1 miles and are greatest during the breeding season (Cypher 2000).

Kit foxes maintain core home range areas that are exclusive to mated pairs and their offspring (White and Ralls 1993, Spiegel 1996, White and Garrott 1997). This territorial spacing behavior eventually limits the number of foxes that can inhabit an area owing to shortages of available space and per capita prey. Hence, as habitat is fragmented or destroyed, the carrying capacity of an area is reduced and a larger proportion of the population is forced to disperse. Increased dispersal generally leads to lower survival rates and, in turn, decreased abundance because greater than 65 percent of dispersing juvenile foxes die within 10 days of leaving their natal range (Koopman *et al.* 2000).

Estimates of fox density vary greatly throughout its range, and have been reported as high as 1.3 animals per square mile in optimal habitats in good years (Service 1998). At the Elk Hills in Kern County, density estimates varied from 1.86 animals per square mile in the early 1980s to

0.03 animals per square mile in 1991 (Service 1998). Kit fox home ranges vary in size from approximately 1 to 12 square miles(Spiegel *et al.* 1996b; Service 1998). Knapp (1978) estimated that a home range in agricultural areas is approximately 1 square mile. Individual home ranges overlap considerably, at least outside the core activity areas (Morrell 1972; Spiegel *et al.* 1996b).

Mean annual survival rates reported for adult San Joaquin kit foxes include 0.44 at the Naval Petroleum Reserve (Cypher *et al.* 2000), 0.53 at Camp Roberts (Standley *et al.* 1992), 0.56 at the Lokern area (Spiegel and Disney 1996), and 0.60 on the Carrizo Plain (Ralls and White 1995). However, survival rates widely vary among years (Spiegel and Disney 1996; Cypher *et al.* 2000). Mean survival rates for juvenile San Joaquin kit foxes (<1 year old) are lower than rates for adults. Survival to age 1 year was 0.14 at the Naval Petroleum Reserve (Cypher *et al.* 2000), 0.20 at Camp Roberts (Standley *et al.* 1992), and 0.21 on the Carrizo Plain (Ralls and White 1995). For both adults and juveniles, survival rates of males and females are similar. San Joaquin kit foxes may live to ten years in captivity (McGrew 1979) and 8 years in the wild (Berry et al. 1987), but most kit foxes do not live past 2-3 years of age.

The status (i.e., distribution, abundance) of the kit fox has decreased since its listing in 1967. This trend is reasonably certain to continue into the foreseeable future unless measures to protect, sustain, and restore suitable habitats, and alleviate other threats to their survival and recovery, are implemented. Threats that are seriously affecting kit foxes are described in further detail in the following paragraphs.

Loss of Habitat

Less than 20 percent of the habitat within the historical range of the kit fox remained when the subspecies was listed as federally-endangered in 1967, and there has been a substantial net loss of habitat since that time. Historically, San Joaquin kit foxes occurred throughout California's Central Valley and adjacent foothills. Extensive land conversions in the Central Valley began as early as the mid-1800s with the Arkansas Reclamation Act. By the 1930's, the range of the kit fox had been reduced to the southern and western parts of the San Joaquin Valley (Grinnell *et al.* 1937). The primary factor contributing to this restricted distribution was the conversion of native habitat to irrigated cropland, industrial uses (e.g., hydrocarbon extraction), and urbanization (Laughrin 1970, Jensen 1972; Morrell 1972, 1975). Approximately one-half of the natural communities in the San Joaquin Valley were tilled or developed by 1958 (Service 1980).

This rate of loss accelerated following the completion of the Central Valley Project and the State Water Project, which diverted and imported new water supplies for irrigated agriculture (Service 1995a). Approximately 1.97 million acres of habitat, or about 66,000 acres per year, were converted in the San Joaquin region between 1950 and 1980 (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection 1988). The counties specifically noted as having the highest wildland conversion rates included Kern, Tulare, Kings and Fresno, all of which are occupied by kit foxes. From 1959 to 1969 alone, an estimated 34 percent of natural lands were lost within the then-known kit fox range (Laughrin 1970).

By 1979, only approximately 370,000 acres out of a total of approximately 8.5 million acres on the San Joaquin Valley floor remained as non-developed land (Williams 1985, Service 1980). Data from the CDFG (1985) and Service file information indicate that between 1977 and 1988, essential habitat for the blunt-nosed leopard lizard, a species that occupies habitat that is also suitable for kit foxes, declined by about 80 percent – from 311,680 acres to 63,060 acres, an average of about 22,000 acres per year (Biological Opinion for the Interim Water Contract Renewal, Ref. No. 1-1-00-F-0056, February 29, 2000). Virtually all of the documented loss of essential habitat was the result of conversion to irrigated agriculture.

During 1990 to 1996, a gross total of approximately 71,500 acres of habitat were converted to farmland in 30 counties (total area 23.1 million acres) within the Conservation Program Focus area of the Central Valley Project. This figure includes 42,520 acres of grazing land and 28,854 acres of "other" land, which is predominantly comprised of native habitat. During this same time period, approximately 101,700 acres were converted to urban land use within the Conservation Program Focus area (California Department of Conservation 1994, 1996, 1998). This figure includes 49,705 acres of farmland, 20,476 acres of grazing land, and 31,366 acres of "other" land, which is predominantly comprised of native habitat. Because these assessments included a substantial portion of the Central Valley and adjacent foothills, they provide the best scientific and commercial information currently available regarding the patterns and trends of land conversion within the kit fox's geographic range.

In summary, more than one million acres of suitable habitat for kit foxes have been converted to agricultural, municipal, or industrial uses since the listing of the kit fox. In contrast, less than 500,000 acres have been preserved or are subject to community-level conservation efforts designed, at least in part, to further the conservation of the kit fox (Service 1998).

Land conversions contribute to declines in kit fox abundance through direct and indirect mortalities, displacement, reduction of prey populations and denning sites, changes in the distribution and abundance of larger canids that compete with kit foxes for resources, and reductions in carrying capacity. Kit foxes may be buried in their dens during land conversion activities (C. Van Horn, Endangered Species Recovery Program, Bakersfield, personal communication to S. Jones, Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento, 2000), or permanently displaced from areas where structures are erected or the land is intensively irrigated (Jensen 1972, Morrell 1975). Furthermore, even moderate fragmentation or loss of habitat may significantly impact the abundance and distribution of kit foxes. Capture rates of kit foxes at the Naval Petroleum Reserve in Elk Hills were negatively associated with the extent of oil-field development after 1987 (Warrick and Cypher 1998). Likewise, the California Energy Commission found that the relative abundance of kit foxes was lower in oil-developed habitat than in nearby undeveloped habitat on the Lokern (Spiegel 1996). Researchers from both studies inferred that the most significant effect of oil development was the lowered carrying capacity for populations of both foxes and their prey species owing to the changes in habitat characteristics or the loss and fragmentation of habitat (Spiegel 1996, Warrick and Cypher 1998).

Dens are essential for the survival and reproduction of kit foxes that use them year-round for shelter and escape, and in the spring for rearing young. Hence, kit foxes generally have dozens of dens scattered throughout their territories. However, land conversion reduces the number of typical earthen dens available to kit foxes. For example, the average density of typical, earthen kit fox dens at the Naval Hills Petroleum Reserve was negatively correlated with the intensity of petroleum development (Zoellick *et al.* 1987), and almost 20 percent of the dens in developed areas were found to be in well casings, culverts, abandoned pipelines, oil well cellars, or in the banks of sumps or roads (Service 1983). These results are important because the California Energy Commission found that, even though kit foxes frequently used pipes and culverts as dens in oil-developed areas of western Kern County, only earthen dens were used to birth and wean pups (Spiegel 1996). Similarly, kit foxes in Bakersfield use atypical dens, but have only been found to rear pups in earthen dens (P. Kelly, Endangered Species Recovery Program, Fresno, personal communication to P. White, Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento, April 6, 2000). Hence, the fragmentation of habitat and destruction of earthen dens could adversely affect the reproductive success of kit foxes. Furthermore, the destruction of earthen dens may also affect kit fox survival by reducing the number and distribution of escape refuges from predators. Land conversions and associated human activities can lead to widespread changes in the availability and composition of mammalian prey for kit foxes. For example, oil field disturbances in western Kern County have resulted in shifts in the small mammal community from the primarily granivorous species that are the staple prey of kit foxes (Spiegel 1996), to species adapted to early successional stages and disturbed areas (e.g., California ground squirrels)(Spiegel 1996). Because more than 70 percent of the diets of kit foxes usually consist of abundant leporids (*Lepus*, *Sylvilagus*) and rodents (e. g., *Dipodomys* spp.), and kit foxes often continue to feed on their staple prey during ephemeral periods of prey scarcity, such changes in the availability and selection of foraging sites by kit foxes could influence their reproductive rates, which are strongly influenced by food supply and decrease during periods of prey scarcity (White and Garrott 1997, 1999).

Extensive habitat destruction and fragmentation have contributed to smaller, more-isolated populations of kit foxes. Small populations have a higher probability of extinction than larger populations because their low abundance renders them susceptible to stochastic (i.e., random) events such as high variability in age and sex ratios, and catastrophes such as floods, droughts, or disease epidemics (Lande 1988, Frankham and Ralls 1998, Saccheri *et al.* 1998). Similarly, isolated populations are more susceptible to extirpation by accidental or natural catastrophes because their recolonization has been hampered. These chance events can adversely affect small, isolated populations with devastating results. Extirpation can even occur when the members of a small population are healthy, because whether the population increases or decreases in size is less dependent on the age-specific probabilities of survival and reproduction than on raw chance (sampling probabilities). Owing to the probabilistic nature of extinction, many small populations will eventually lose out and go extinct when faced with these stochastic risks (Caughley and Gunn 1995).

Oil fields in the southern half of the San Joaquin Valley also continue to be an area of expansion and development activity. This expansion is reasonably certain to increase in the near future owing to market-driven increases in the price of oil. The cumulative and long-term effects of oil extraction activities on kit fox populations are not fully known, but recent studies indicate that moderate- to high-density oil fields may contribute to a decrease in carrying capacity for kit foxes owing to habitat loss or changes in habitat characteristics (Spiegel 1996, Warrick and Cypher 1998). There are no limiting factors or regulations that are likely to retard the development of additional oil fields. Hence, it is reasonably certain that development will continue to destroy and fragment kit fox habitat into the foreseeable future.

Competitive Interactions with Other Canids

Several species prey upon San Joaquin kit foxes. Predators (such as coyotes, bobcats, non-native red foxes, badgers, and golden eagles [*Aquila chrysaetos*]) will kill kit foxes. Badgers, coyotes, and red foxes also may compete for den sites (Service 1998). The diets and habitats selected by coyotes and kit foxes living in the same areas are often quite similar (Cypher and Spencer 1998). Hence, the potential for resource competition between these species may be quite high when prey resources are scarce such as during droughts (which are quite common in semi-arid, central California). Land conversions and associated human activities have led to changes in the distribution and abundance of coyotes, which compete with kit foxes for resources.

Coyotes occur in most areas with abundant populations of kit foxes and, during the past few decades, coyote abundance has increased in many areas owing to a decrease in ranching operations, favorable landscape changes, and reduced control efforts (Orloff *et al.* 1986, Cypher and Scrivner 1992, White and Ralls 1993, White *et al.* 1995). Coyotes may attempt to lessen resource competition with kit foxes by killing them. Coyote-related injuries accounted for 50-87 percent of the mortalities of radio collared kit foxes at Camp Roberts, the Carrizo Plain Natural Area, the Lokern Natural Area, and the Naval Petroleum Reserves (Cypher and Scrivner 1992, Standley *et al.* 1992, Ralls and White 1995, Spiegel 1996). Coyote-related deaths of adult foxes appear to be largely additive (i.e., in addition to deaths caused by other mortality factors such as disease and starvation) rather than compensatory (i.e., tending to replace deaths due to other mortality factors; White and Garrott 1997). Hence, the survival rates of adult foxes decrease significantly as the proportion of mortalities caused by coyotes increase (Cypher and Spencer 1998, White and Garrott 1997), and increases in coyote abundance may contribute to significant declines in kit fox abundance (Cypher and Scrivner 1992, Ralls and White 1995, White *et al.* 1996). There is some evidence that the proportion of juvenile foxes killed by coyotes increases as fox density increases (White and Garrott 1999). This density-dependent relationship would provide a feedback mechanism that reduces the amplitude of kit fox population dynamics and keeps foxes at lower densities than they might otherwise attain. In other words, coyote-related mortalities may dampen or prevent fox population growth, and accentuate, hasten, or prolong population declines.

Land-use changes also contributed to the expansion of nonnative red foxes into areas inhabited by kit foxes. Historically, the geographic range of the red fox did not overlap with that of the San Joaquin kit fox. By the 1970's, however, introduced and escaped red foxes had established breeding populations in many areas inhabited by San Joaquin kit foxes (Lewis *et al.* 1993). The larger and more aggressive red foxes are known to kill kit foxes (Ralls and White 1995), and could displace them, as has been observed in the arctic when red foxes expanded into the ranges of smaller arctic foxes (Hersteinsson and Macdonald 1982). The increased abundance and distribution of nonnative red foxes will also likely adversely affect the status of kit foxes because they are closer morphologically and taxonomically, and would likely have higher dietary overlap than coyotes; potentially resulting in more intense competition for resources. Two documented deaths of kit foxes due to red foxes have been reported (Ralls and White 1995), and red foxes appear to be displacing kit foxes in the northwestern part of their range (Lewis *et al.* 1993). At Camp Roberts, red foxes have usurped several dens that were used by kit foxes during previous years (California Army National Guard, Camp Roberts Environmental Office, unpubl. data). In fact, opportunistic observations of red foxes in the cantonment area of Camp Roberts have increased 5-fold since 1993, and no kit foxes have been sighted or captured in this area since October 1997. Also, a telemetry study of sympatric red foxes and kit foxes in the Lost Hills area has detected spatial segregation between these species, suggesting that kit foxes may avoid or be excluded from red fox-inhabited areas (P. Kelly, Endangered Species Recovery Program, Fresno, pers. comm. to P. White, Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento, April 6, 2000). Such avoidance would limit the resources available to local populations of kit foxes and possibly result in decreased fox abundance and distribution.

Disease

Wildlife diseases do not appear to be a primary mortality factor that consistently limits kit fox populations throughout their range (McCue and O'Farrell 1988, Standley and McCue 1992). However, central California has a high incidence of wildlife rabies cases (Schultz and Barrett 1991), and high seroprevalences of canine distemper virus and canine parvovirus indicate that kit fox populations have been exposed to these diseases (McCue and O'Farrell 1988; Standley and McCue 1992). Hence, disease outbreaks could potentially cause substantial mortality or contribute to reduced fertility in seropositive females, as was noted in closely-related swift foxes (*Vulpes velox*).

For example, there are some indications that rabies virus may have contributed to a catastrophic decrease in kit fox abundance at Camp Roberts, San Luis Obispo County, California, during the early 1990's. San Luis Obispo County had the highest incidence of wildlife rabies cases in California during 1989 to 1991, and striped skunks (*Mephitis mephitis*) were the primary vector (Barrett 1990, Schultz and Barrett 1991, Reilly and Mangiamele 1992). A rabid skunk was trapped at Camp Roberts during 1989 and two foxes were found dead due to rabies in 1990 (Standley *et al.* 1992). Captures of kit foxes during annual live trapping sessions at Camp Roberts decreased from 103 to 20 individuals during 1988 to 1991. Captures of kit foxes were positively correlated with captures of skunks during 1988 to 1997; suggesting that some factor(s) such as rabies virus was contributing to concurrent decreases in the abundances of these species. Also, captures of kit foxes at Camp Roberts were negatively correlated with the proportion of skunks that were rabid when trapped by County Public Health Department personnel two years previously. These data suggest that a rabies outbreak may have occurred in the skunk population and spread into the fox population. A similar time lag in disease transmission and subsequent population reductions was observed in Ontario, Canada, although in this instance the transmission was from red foxes to striped skunks (Macdonald and Voigt 1985).

Pesticides and Rodenticides

Pesticides and rodenticides pose a threat to kit foxes through direct or secondary poisoning. Kit foxes may be killed if they ingest rodenticide in a bait application, or if they eat a rodent that has consumed the bait. Even sublethal doses of rodenticides may lead to the death of these animals by impairing their ability to escape predators or find food. Pesticides and rodenticides may also indirectly affect the survival of kit foxes by reducing the abundances of their staple prey species.

For example, the California ground squirrel, which is the staple prey of kit foxes in the northern portion of their range, was thought to have been eliminated from Contra Costa County in 1975, after extensive rodent eradication programs. Field observations indicated that the long-term use of ground squirrel poisons in this county severely reduced kit fox abundance through secondary poisoning and the suppression of populations of its staple prey (Orloff *et al.* 1986).

Kit foxes occupying habitats adjacent to agricultural lands are also likely to come into contact with insecticides applied to crops owing to runoff or aerial drift. Kit foxes could be affected through direct contact with sprays and treated soils, or through consumption of contaminated prey. Data from the California Department of Pesticide Regulation indicate that acephate, aldicarb, azinphos methyl, bendiocarb, carbofuran, chlorpyrifos, endosulfan, s-fenvalerate, naled, parathion, permethrin, phorate, and trifluralin are used within one mile of kit fox habitat. A wide variety of crops (alfalfa, almonds, apples, apricots, asparagus, avocados, barley, beans, beets, bok choy, broccoli, cantaloupe, carrots, cauliflower, celery, cherries, chestnuts, chicory, Chinese cabbage, Chinese greens, Chinese radish, collards, corn, cotton, cucumbers, eggplants, endive, figs, garlic, grapefruit, grapes, hay, kale, kiwi fruit, kohlrabi, leeks, lemons, lettuce, melons, mustard, nectarines, oats, okra, olives, onions, oranges, parsley, parsnips, peaches, peanuts, pears, peas, pecans, peppers, persimmons, pimentos, pistachios, plums, pomegranates, potatoes, prunes, pumpkins, quinces, radishes, raspberries, rice, safflower, sorghum, spinach, squash, strawberries, sugar beets, sweet potatoes, Swiss chard, tomatoes, walnuts, watermelons, and wheat), as well as buildings, Christmas tree plantations, commercial/industrial areas, greenhouses, nurseries, landscape maintenance, ornamental turf, rangeland, rights of way, and uncultivated agricultural and non-agricultural land, occur in close proximity to San Joaquin kit fox habitat.

Efforts have been underway to reduce the risk of rodenticides to kit foxes (Service 1993). The Federal government began controlling the use of rodenticides in 1972 with a ban of Compound 1080 on Federal lands pursuant to Executive Order. Above-ground application of strychnine within the geographic ranges of listed species was prohibited in 1988. A July 28, 1992, biological opinion regarding the Animal Damage Control (now known as Wildlife Services) Program by the U.S. Department of Agriculture found that this program was likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the kit fox owing to the potential for rodent control activities to take the fox. As a result, several reasonable and prudent measures were implemented, including a ban on the use of M-44 devices, toxicants, and fumigants within the recognized occupied range of the kit fox. Also, the only chemical authorized for use by Wildlife Services within the occupied range of the kit fox was zinc phosphide, a compound known to be minimally toxic to kit foxes (Service 1993).

Despite these efforts, the use of other pesticides and rodenticides still pose a significant threat to the kit fox, as evidenced by the death of 2 kit foxes at Camp Roberts in 1992 owing to secondary poisoning from chlorophacinone applied as a rodenticide, (Berry *et al.* 1992, Standley *et al.* 1992). Also, the livers of 3 foxes that were recovered in the City of Bakersfield during 1999 were found to contain detectable residues of the anticoagulant rodenticides chlorophacinone, brodifacoum, and bromadiolone (California Department of Fish and Game 1999).

To date, no specific research has been conducted on the effects of different pesticide or rodent control programs on the kit fox (Service 1998). This lack of information is problematic because Williams (in lit., 1989) documented widespread pesticide use in known kit fox and Fresno kangaroo rat habitat adjoining agricultural lands in Madera County. In a separate report, Williams (in lit., 1989) documented another case of pesticide use near Raisin City, Fresno County, where treated grain was placed within an active Fresno kangaroo rat precinct. Also, farmers have been allowed to place bait on Bureau of Reclamation property to maximize the potential for killing rodents before they entered adjoining fields (Biological Opinion for the Interim Water Contract Renewal, Ref. No. 1-1-00-F-0056, February 29, 2000).

A September 22, 1993, biological opinion issued by the Service to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regarding the regulation of pesticide use (31 registered chemicals) through administration of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act found that use of the following chemicals would likely jeopardize the continued existence of the kit fox: (1) aluminum and magnesium phosphide fumigants; (2) chlorophacinone anticoagulants; (3) diphacinone anticoagulants; (4) pival anticoagulants; (5) potassium nitrate and sodium nitrate gas cartridges; and (6) sodium cyanide capsules (Service 1993). Reasonable and prudent alternatives to avoid jeopardy included restricting the use of aluminum/magnesium phosphide, potassium/sodium nitrate within the geographic range of the kit fox to qualified individuals, and prohibiting the use of chlorophacinone, diphacinone, pival, and sodium cyanide within the geographic range of the kit fox, with certain exceptions (e.g., agricultural areas that are greater than 1 mile from any kit fox habitat)(Service 1999).

Endangered Species Act Section 9 Violations and Noncompliance with the Terms and Conditions of Existing Biological Opinions

The intentional or unintentional destruction of areas occupied by kit foxes is an issue of serious concern. Section 9 of the Act prohibits the "take" (e.g., harm, harass, pursue, injure, kill) of federally-listed wildlife species. "Harm" (i.e., "take") is further defined to include habitat modification or degradation that kills or injures wildlife by impairing essential behavioral patterns including breeding, feeding, or sheltering. Congress established two provisions (under sections 7 and 10 of the Act) that allow for the "incidental take" of listed species of wildlife by Federal agencies, non-Federal government agencies, and private interests. Incidental take is defined as "incidental to, and not the purpose of, the carrying out of an otherwise lawful activity." Such take requires a permit from the Secretary of the Interior that anticipates a specific level of take for each listed species. If no permit is obtained for the incidental take of listed species, the individuals or entities responsible for these actions could be liable under the enforcement provisions of potential section 9 of the Act if any unauthorized take occurs. There are numerous examples of section 9 violations and noncompliance with the terms and conditions of existing biological opinions on file at the Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office. The most egregious violations, and those with the most evidence, are being pursued when Service Law Enforcement and California Department of Fish and Game Enforcement are able to do so.

Risk of Chance Extinction Owing to Small Population Size, Isolation, and High Natural Fluctuations in Abundance

Historically, kit foxes may have existed in a metapopulation structure of core and satellite populations, some of which periodically experienced local extinctions and recolonization (Service 1998). Today's populations exist in an environment drastically different from the historic one, however, and extensive habitat fragmentation will result in geographic isolation, smaller population sizes, and reduced genetic exchange among populations; all of which increase the vulnerability of kit fox populations to extirpation. Populations of kit foxes are extremely susceptible to the risks associated with small population size and isolation because they are characterized by marked instability in population density. For example, the relative abundance of kit foxes at the Naval Petroleum Reserves, California, decreased 10-fold during 1981 to 1983, increased 7-fold during 1991 to 1994, and then decreased 2-fold during 1995 (Cypher and Scrivner 1992, Cypher and Spencer 1998).

Many populations of kit fox are at risk of chance extinction owing to small population size and isolation. This risk has been prominently illustrated during recent, drastic declines in the populations of kit foxes at Camp Roberts and Fort Hunter Liggett. Captures of kit foxes during annual live trapping sessions at Camp Roberts decreased from 103 to 20 individuals during 1988 to 1991. This decrease continued through 1997 when only three kit foxes were captured (White *et al.* 2000). A similar decrease in kit fox abundance occurred at nearby Fort Hunter Liggett, and only 2 kit foxes have been observed on this installation since 1995 (L. Clark, Wildlife Biologist, Fort Hunter Liggett, pers. comm. to P. White, Service, Sacramento, February 15, 2000). It is unlikely that the current low abundances of kit foxes at Camp Roberts and Fort Hunter Liggett will increase substantially in the near future owing to the limited potential for recruitment. The chance of substantial immigration is low because the nearest core population on the Carrizo Plain is distant (greater than 16 miles) and separated from these installations by barriers to kit fox movement such as roads, developments, and irrigated agricultural areas. Also, there is a relatively high abundance of sympatric predators and competitors on these installations that contribute to low survival rates for kit foxes and, as a result, may limit population growth (White *et al.* 2000). Hence, these populations may be on the verge of extinction.

The destruction and fragmentation of habitat could also eventually lead to reduced genetic variation in populations of kit foxes that are small and geographically isolated. Historically, kit foxes likely existed in a metapopulation structure of core and satellite populations, some of which periodically experienced local extinctions and recolonization (Service 1998). Preliminary genetic assessments indicate that historic gene flow among populations was quite high, with effective dispersal rates of at least one to 4 dispersers per generation (M. Schwartz, University of Montana, Missoula, pers. comm. on March 23, 2000, to P. White, Service, Sacramento, California). This level of genetic dispersal should allow for local adaptation while preventing the loss of any rare alleles. Based on these results, it is likely that northern populations of kit foxes were once panmictic (i.e., randomly mating in a genetic sense), or nearly so, with southern populations. In other words, there were no major barriers to dispersal among populations.

Current levels of gene flow also appear to be adequate, however, extensive habitat loss and fragmentation continues to form more or less geographically distinct populations of foxes, which could potentially reduce genetic exchange among them. An increase in inbreeding and the loss of genetic variation could increase the extinction risk for small, isolated populations of kit foxes by interacting with demography to reduce fecundity, juvenile survival, and lifespan (Lande 1988, Frankham and Ralls 1998, Saccheri *et al.* 1998).

An area of particular concern is Santa Nella in western Merced County where pending development plans threaten to eliminate the little suitable habitat that remains and provides a dispersal corridor for kit foxes between the northern and southern portions of their range. Preliminary estimates of expected heterozygosity from foxes in this area indicate that this population may already have reduced genetic variation.

Other populations that may be showing the initial signs of genetic isolation are the Lost Hills area and populations in the Salinas-Pajaro River watershed (i.e., Camp Roberts and Fort Hunter Liggett). Preliminary estimates of the mean number of alleles per locus from foxes in these populations indicate that allelic diversity is lower than expected. Although these results may, in part, be due to the small number of foxes sampled in these areas, they may also be indicative of an increase in the amount of inbreeding due to population subdivision (M. Schwartz, University of Montana, Missoula, pers. comm. on March 23, 2000, to P. J. White, Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento, California). Further sampling and analyses are necessary to adequately assess the effects of these potential genetic bottlenecks.

Arid systems are characterized by unpredictable fluctuations in precipitation, which lead to high frequency, high amplitude fluctuations in the abundance of mammalian prey for kit foxes (Goldingay *et al.* 1997, White and Garrott 1999). Because the reproductive and neonatal survival rates of kit foxes are strongly depressed at low prey densities (White and Ralls 1993; White and Garrott 1997, 1999), periods of prey scarcity owing to drought or excessive rain events can contribute to population crashes and marked instability in the abundance and distribution of kit foxes (White and Garrott 1999). In other words, unpredictable, short-term fluctuations in precipitation and, in turn, prey abundance can generate frequent, rapid decreases in kit fox density that increase the extinction risk for small, isolated populations.

The primary goal of the recovery strategy for kit foxes identified in the Recovery Plan is to establish a complex of interconnected core and satellite populations throughout the species' range. The long-term viability of each of these core and satellite populations depends partly upon periodic dispersal and genetic flow between them. Therefore, kit fox movement corridors between these populations must be preserved and maintained. In the northern range, from the Ciervo Panoche in Fresno County northward, kit fox populations are small and isolated, and have exhibited significant decline. The core populations are the Ciervo Panoche area, the Carrizo

Plain area, and the western Kern County population, as shown on Figure 10 (enclosed). Satellite populations are found in the urban Bakersfield area, Porterville/Lake Success area, Creighton Ranch/Pixley Wildlife Refuge, Allensworth Ecological Reserve, Semitropic/Kern National Wildlife Refuge (NWR), Antelope Plain, eastern Kern grasslands, Pleasant Valley, western Madera County, Santa Nella, Kesterson NWR, and Contra Costa County. Major corridors connecting these population areas are on the east and west side of the San Joaquin Valley, around the bottom of the Valley, and cross-valley corridors in Kern, Fresno, and Merced Counties.

In response to the drastic loss of habitat and steadily increasing fragmentation, Caltrans and the Service convened a San Joaquin Kit Fox Conservation and Planning Team to address the rapid decline of kit fox habitat in the northern range, and increasing barriers to kit fox dispersal. Consisting of Federal, State, and local agencies, local land trusts, environmental groups, researchers, and other concerned individuals, the goal of this team was to coordinate agency actions that will recover the species, and troubleshoot threats to San Joaquin kit foxes as they emerge. Between the years 2001-2003, the team addressed connectivity issues at specific points along the west-side corridor north of the Ciervo Panoche core population.

There has never been a comprehensive survey of San Joaquin kit foxes or their habitat except for one core population in western Kern County. What is known comes from incidental sightings, local surveys, research projects, and aerial photos. There are more than several hundred recorded sightings of San Joaquin kit foxes in the San Joaquin Valley (CNDDB 2004). Given the biology and ecology of the animal (San Joaquin kit foxes have been documented to move 9 miles or more in a single night), the kit fox is highly likely to inhabit the action area. Areas of suitable habitat that exist within the potential Caltrans project footprints and adjacent to the projects include scrub lands, other less disturbed natural lands, grasslands, ruderal lands, row cropland, and orchards. Ruderal lands, row cropland, fallow fields, and orchards provide denning and foraging habitat, although farming activities have likely reduced denning opportunities and prey base. Kit foxes are able to travel through fallow and active agricultural fields, seasonal wetland areas, and old orchards for both local movement and long distance dispersal. Seasonal wetlands may also provide amphibian prey for kit foxes. Many of the potential Caltrans project sites are within 9 miles of these incidental sightings, and contain habitat components that can be used by the kit fox for feeding, resting, mating, other essential behaviors, or as movement corridors.

Giant Kangaroo Rat

The giant kangaroo rat was federally listed as endangered on January 5, 1987 (Service 1087) and was listed by the State of California as endangered on October 2, 1980. The Recovery Plan includes the giant kangaroo rat (Service 1998). The giant kangaroo rat was distributed historically from southern Merced County, south through the San Joaquin Valley, to southwestern Kern County and northern Santa Barbara County. Significant populations survive only in a few areas of remaining habitat, including the Panoche Hills, Cuyama Valley, Carrizo and Elkhorn Plains, and the Lokern area.

The preferred habitat of giant kangaroo rats is annual grassland on gentle slopes of generally less than 10 degrees, with friable, sandy-loam soils. However, most remaining populations are on poorer and marginal habitats which include shrub communities on a variety of soil types and on slopes up to about 22 degrees. Completion of the San Luis Unit of the Central Valley Project and the California Aqueduct of the State Water Project resulted in rapid cultivation and irrigation of natural communities that had provided habitat for giant kangaroo rats along the west side of the San Joaquin Valley (Williams 1992, Williams and Germano 1993). Between about 1970 and 1979, almost all the natural communities on the western floor and gentle western slopes of the Tulare Basin were developed for irrigated agriculture, restricting occurrence of most species of the San Joaquin saltbush and valley grassland communities, including the giant kangaroo rat. This rapid habitat loss was the main reason for its listing as endangered.

Up until the 1950s, colonies of giant kangaroo rats were spread over hundreds of thousands of acres of continuous habitat in the western San Joaquin Valley, Carrizo Plain, and Cuyama Valley (Grinnell 1932a; Shaw 1934; Hawbecker 1944, 1951). The causes of decline of the giant kangaroo rat are similar to those discussed above for the kit fox. The decline of giant kangaroo rats is attributed primarily to habitat loss from the conversion of native scrub and grasslands to agriculture (Service 1998). An estimated 1.8 percent of the giant kangaroo rat's historical habitat remains extant (Williams 1992). Habitat destruction resulting from the development of small cities and towns along the western edge of the San Joaquin Valley between Coalinga and Maricopa, as well as development of the infrastructures for petroleum and mineral exploration and extraction, roads and highways, energy and communications infrastructures, and agriculturally related industrial developments collectively have contributed to the endangerment of the giant kangaroo rat. Widespread use of rodenticides and rodenticide-treated grain to control ground squirrels and kangaroo rats may also have contributed to the decline of giant kangaroo rats in some areas.

Populations within remaining habitat fluctuate widely in response to changing weather patterns (Williams 1992, Service 1998). Since listing as endangered, conversion of habitat for giant kangaroo rats has slowed substantially, because most tillable land has already been brought into cultivation, and because of a lack of water for additional irrigated ac. However, during and following the 1994-1995 winter, biologists noted a decline in abundance of kangaroo rats in the southern San Joaquin Valley. Decreased sign of activity and lower than expected trapping results were observed at several dispersed sites. Dramatic declines were noted for short-nosed, Tipton, and Heermann's kangaroo rats, although only modest reductions were noted for giant kangaroo rat populations on the valley floor (Single et al. 1996).

Urban and industrial developments, roads, petroleum and mineral exploration and extraction, new energy and water conveyance facilities, and construction of communication and transportation infrastructures continue to destroy habitat for giant kangaroo rats and increase the threats to the species by reducing and further fragmenting populations. Rodent control programs have also contributed to the species' decline. Habitat degradation due to lack of appropriate habitat management on conservation lands, especially lack of grazing or fire to control density of vegetation (including shrubs) may be an additional threat to giant kangaroo rats (Williams and Germano 1993). Though many recent and future habitat losses will be mitigated for by protecting habitat elsewhere, they still result in additional loss and fragmentation of habitat.

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), in cooperation with species experts, has initiated giant kangaroo rat population monitoring studies in the Lokern and CPNA areas. There have been significant declines in giant kangaroo rat numbers on BLM lands in response to both drought and above average rainfall conditions. While these fluctuations have been drastic in nature, the giant kangaroo rats have rebounded from low population numbers following the drought. Since the 1993 rebound, numbers have declined to various levels. Wildfire and prescribed burn monitoring has indicated that this species responds positively to fire (Germano and Saslaw, 1999, unpublished data).

The decline in kangaroo rat abundance and distribution has been well documented in the southern San Joaquin Valley (Single et al. 1996). In the Lokern area, the decline in giant kangaroo rats may have been caused by the combination of an extremely hot fire that occurred in spring 1997 that burned approximately 5800 acres, and several years of heavier than normal precipitation. Because of the small, isolated nature of many remaining populations, their lack of genetic diversity, and low dispersal capability, giant kangaroo rats are especially vulnerable to local extirpation from random environmental events such as fires, flooding, or unpredictable land use changes.

In 1995, the most recent year in which substantial information is available, the giant kangaroo rat was believed to be present in only a few remaining isolated populations: Cuyama Valley, San Juan Creek Valley, and the Carrizo Plan in San Luis Obispo County; the Panoche Hills on the Fresno-San Benito County line; in the Kettleman Hills of Kings County; and in western Kern County, as shown on Figure 39 of the Recovery Plan. Proposed projects presented on maps by Caltrans, as potential projects to append to this biological opinion in Fresno, Kings, and Kern County (Figures 6, 7, and 9) are in the vicinity of known occurrences of giant kangaroo rats (CDFG 2002) and could affect the type of habitat in which this animal occurs (Caltrans 2000).

Tipton Kangaroo Rat

The Tipton kangaroo rat was federally listed as endangered on August 8, 1988 (Service 1988), and was listed by the State of California as endangered on June 11, 1989. The Recovery Plan includes the Tipton kangaroo rat (Service 1998). The Recovery Plan calls for (1) research to determine how to manage natural lands to reduce the frequency and severity of population crashes, and (2) consolidation and protection of blocks of suitable habitat to minimize the effects of random catastrophic events on their populations.

Tipton kangaroo rats inhabit saltbush scrub and alkali sink scrub communities in the southern San Joaquin Valley. The historical geographic range of Tipton kangaroo rats was over 1.7 million acres. Its distribution was limited to arid-land communities occupying the valley floor of the Tulare Basin in level or nearly level terrain. By 1985, the inhabited area had been reduced, primarily by cultivation and urbanization, to about 60,000 acres. In 1997, the Service estimated that Tipton kangaroo rats inhabited approximately 4 percent of their historic range (Service 1998). Current occurrences are limited to scattered, isolated areas. In the southern San Joaquin Valley, this includes the Kern National Wildlife Refuge, Delano, and other scattered areas within Kern County.

The preferred location for Tipton kangaroo rat burrows typically involves alluvial fans and flood plains and includes fine, highly alkaline sands and, to a lesser degree, alkaline sandy loams. Burrow systems are usually in open areas but may occur in areas of thick scrub. They are typically simple, but may include interconnecting tunnels. Most are less than 10 inches deep. They are commonly in slightly elevated mounds, the berms of roads, canal embankments, railroad beds, and bases of shrubs and fences where wind-blown soils accumulate above the level of surrounding terrain. Terrain not subject to flooding is essential for permanent occupancy by Tipton kangaroo rats.

The construction of dams and canals, which made a dependable supply of water available and allowed the cultivation of the alkaline soils of the saltbush, valley sink scrub, and relictual dune communities, was principally responsible for the decline and endangerment of the Tipton kangaroo rat. Widespread, unrestricted use of rodenticides to control California ground squirrels probably contributed to the decline or extirpation of small populations. Urban and industrial development and petroleum extraction all have contributed to habitat destruction. Except for small, isolated populations, predation is unlikely to threaten Tipton kangaroo rats. The increasing fragmentation of the range of Tipton kangaroo rats, however, increases the vulnerability of small populations to predation. Current threats of habitat destruction or modifications come primarily from industrial and agriculturally-related developments, cultivation, and urbanization, and secondarily from flooding.

The causes of decline of the Tipton kangaroo rat are similar to those discussed above for the giant kangaroo rat and for the kit fox. Conversion of native habitats to agricultural production is considered the primary reason for the Tipton kangaroo rat's population decline (Service 1988). Construction of canals, roads, highways, railroads, and buildings and the use of rodenticides have probably also accelerated this subspecies' population decline. Because of the small, isolated nature of many remaining populations, their lack of genetic diversity, and low powers of dispersal, Tipton kangaroo rats are especially vulnerable to local extirpation from random environmental events such as flooding or unpredictable land use changes.

In 1995, the most recent year in which sufficient information is available, the Tipton kangaroo rat was believed to be present in only about 63,000 acres, or 3.7% of the historical range. Tipton kangaroo rats are found in Tulare County both east and west of State Route 99, in Kings County in the Tulare Lake Bed and Allensworth, and in Kern County in scattered populations across the valley floor from the California Aqueduct to several locations east of Bakersfield, as shown on Figure 45 of the Recovery Plan. Proposed projects presented on maps by Caltrans, as potential projects to append to this biological opinion in Tulare, Kings, and Kern County (Figures 7-9) are in the vicinity of known occurrences of Tipton kangaroo rats (CNDDB 2002) and could affect the type of habitat in which this animal occurs (Caltrans 2000).

<u>Blunt-nosed Leopard Lizard</u>

The blunt-nosed leopard lizard was federally listed as endangered on March 11, 1967 (Service 1967) and was listed by the State of California as endangered on June 27, 1971. A recovery plan for the blunt-nosed leopard lizard was first prepared in 1980, revised in 1985, and then superceded by the Recovery Plan (Service 1998). The recovery strategy requires that the Service (1) determine appropriate habitat management and compatible land uses for the blunt-nosed leopard lizard; (2) protect additional habitat for them in key portions of their range; and (3) gather additional data on population responses to environmental variation at representative sites in their existing geographic range (Service 1998).

The blunt-nosed leopard lizard was distributed historically throughout the San Joaquin Valley and adjacent interior foothills and plains, extending from central Stanislaus County south to extreme northeastern Santa Barbara County. Today its distribution is limited to scattered parcels of undeveloped land, with the greatest concentrations occurring on the west side of the valley floor and in the foothills of the Transverse Range. The blunt-nosed leopard lizard prefers open, sparsely vegetated areas of low relief and inhabits valley sink scrub, valley saltbush scrub, valley/plain grasslands, and foothill grasslands vegetation communities.

Adult lizards often seek safety in burrows, while immature lizards use rock piles, trash piles, and brush. The lizards use burrows constructed by mammals, such as kangaroo rats, for overwintering and estivation. Adult lizards hibernate during the colder months of winter, and are less active in the hotter months of late summer. Adults are active above ground from about March or April through September. Hatchlings are active until mid-October or November, depending on weather. Lizard habitat has been significantly reduced, degraded, and fragmented by roads, agricultural development, petroleum and mineral extraction, livestock grazing, pesticide application, and off-road vehicle use.

In Kern County, the blunt-nosed leopard lizard currently occupies scattered parcels of undeveloped land on the Valley floor, and occurs in the foothills of the Coast Range. While the blunt-nosed leopard lizard can occupy grassland used for grazing it prefers lands with scattered shrubs and sparse grass/forb cover. Habitat for the blunt-nosed leopard lizard has been lost or degraded due to oil development, urban development, row crops, pesticide application, and off-road vehicle use (Service 1998).

Habitat disturbance, destruction, and fragmentation continue as the greatest threats to blunt-nosed leopard lizard populations. Disturbances and modifications of habitats within areas of mineral and petroleum development pose lesser, but continuing threats as they degrade the habitat. Direct mortality occurs when animals are killed in their burrows during construction, killed by vehicle traffic, drowned in oil, or fall into excavated areas from which they are unable to escape. Displaced lizards may be unable to survive in adjacent habitat if it is already occupied or unsuitable for colonization.

Livestock grazing can result in removal of herbaceous vegetation and shrub cover and destruction of rodent burrows used by lizards for shelter. Unlike cultivation of row crops, which precludes use by leopard lizards, light or moderate grazing may be beneficial. The use of pesticides may directly and indirectly affect blunt-nosed leopard lizards. The insecticide Malathion has been used since 1969 to control the beet leafhopper, and its use may reduce insect prey populations. Fumigants such as methyl bromide are used to control ground squirrels.

Because leopard lizards often inhabit ground squirrel burrows, they may be inadvertently poisoned.

In recent years, above average precipitation seems to have increased the amount of vegetative cover. This increase in cover may be a factor in the low abundance of adult lizards seen during the population monitoring at the former Naval Petroleum Reserve in western Kern County in 1995 (U.S. Department of Energy and Chevron 1996).

The BLM has conducted surveys and compiled observational data from BLM lands in western Kern, Kings, and Fresno Counties. Currently, the BLM and USGS-Biological Research Division are conducting a 5- to 10-year research study in the Lokern Area to evaluate the effects of cattle grazing on blunt-nosed leopard lizards, giant kangaroo rat, San Joaquin antelope squirrel, other small mammals, and Kern mallow.

Extant populations of blunt-nosed leopard lizards are known from the Carrizo Plain, Elk Hills, around Taft, and at various other locations in the vicinity of the project area (Service 1998). There are numerous records from the vicinity in the NDDB and other sources. The McKittrick Valley area is included in one of several larger areas given highest priority for habitat protection for the blunt-nosed leopard lizard. The Lokern and Elk Hills areas have also been targeted for habitat protection for the species (Service 1998).

There has never been a comprehensive survey of the entire historical range of the blunt-nosed leopard lizard, and therefore less is known about this animal's distribution than giant and Tipton kangaroo rats (Service 1998). The currently known occupied range of the blunt-nosed leopard lizard is in scattered parcels of undeveloped land and margins of developed land on the Valley floor, and in the foothills of the Coast Range. Blunt-nosed leopard lizards occur from Merced and Madera Counties in the north, through Fresno, Kings, Tulare, and Kern Counties to San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura Counties in the south, as shown on Figure 49 of the Recovery Plan. Proposed projects presented on maps by Caltrans, as potential projects to append to this biological opinion in Merced, Madera, Tulare, Kings, and Kern Counties (Figures 4-9) are in the vicinity of known occurrences of the blunt-nosed leopard lizard (CNDDB 2002) and could affect the type of habitat in which this animal occurs (Caltrans 2000).

San Joaquin Antelope Squirrel

The San Joaquin antelope squirrel was removed as a Category 1 candidate for Federal listing in 1995 (Service 1995b) and is now considered a Species of Concern. It was listed by the State of California as threatened in 1980. Conservation of the San Joaquin antelope squirrel is addressed in the Recovery Plan (Service 1998). The Recovery Plan calls for protecting the two largest populations on the Carrizo Plain Natural Area and in western Kern County, as well as protecting additional populations in western Fresno and eastern San Benito counties, along the edge of the Valley between Fresno and Kern counties, and on the Valley floor. Protection and enhancement of habitat in the Semitropic Ridge area of Kern County is important to maintaining a population on the Valley floor. Protecting and restoring habitat in the area including Pixley National Wildlife Refuge and Allensworth Natural Area, encompassing all the natural and abandoned farm lands in the Allensworth-Delano area of Tulare and Kern counties, and reintroducing antelope squirrels to Pixley National Wildlife Refuge is necessary to secure a population in the eastern portions of the Valley.

Historically, the San Joaquin antelope squirrel occurred in the western and southern portions of the Tulare Basin and the contiguous areas to the west in the upper Cuyama Valley and on the Carrizo and Elkhorn plains. They ranged from western Merced County on the northwest, southward along the western side of the Valley to its southern end. They were distributed over the Valley floor in Kern County and along the eastern edge of the Valley northward to near Tipton, Tulare County. Since 1979, this species has disappeared from many of the smaller islands of habitat on the Valley floor, including Pixley National Wildlife Refuge, Tulare County; Alkali Sink and Kerman Ecological Reserves, Fresno County; and several areas within the Allensworth Conceptual Area of Tulare and Kern counties.

San Joaquin antelope squirrels inhabit arid annual grassland and shrubland communities in areas typically receiving less than 10 inches of mean annual precipitation. They are most numerous in areas with sparse-to-moderate cover of shrubs. Shrubless areas only have sparse populations, especially where giant kangaroo rats are uncommon or not present. This species requires areas free from flooding. Soils are friable and primarily loam and sandy-loam, but soils with a wide range of textures are used. Loss of habitat to agricultural developments, urbanization, and petroleum extraction is the primary cause for decline in numbers of antelope squirrels. Use of rodenticides and insecticides may also negatively impact the species.

The processes of habitat loss and fragmentation are expected to continue on a smaller scale than in the past, but the direct and indirect effects of these processes are expected to accelerate the decline of the species. One of the two largest populations and most important habitat areas, the Carrizo Plain Natural Area, is now mostly under public ownership. Potential protection is tenuous for the equally important population of in the Lokern-Elk Hills area of western Kern County. Another threat to the San Joaquin antelope squirrel on private land may be the long-term effects of excessive grazing by livestock. Elimination of shrubs and soil erosion from heavy use of rangeland communities, degrades their carrying capacities for most species. Substantial soil erosion has occurred on both public and private lands throughout the historical geographic range of the species (Williams et al. 1993).

The currently known occupied range of the San Joaquin antelope squirrel is in scattered parcels of undeveloped land and margins of developed land on the Valley floor, from Merced County south to Kern and San Luis Obispo Counties, as shown on Figure 57 of the Recovery Plan. Proposed projects presented on maps by Caltrans, as potential projects to append to this biological opinion in Merced, Fresno, Tulare, Kings, and Kern Counties (Figures 4, 6, 7, and 9) are in the vicinity of known occurrences of the blunt-nosed leopard lizard (CNDDB 2002).

<u>California Jewelflower</u>

The California jewelflower was listed as a federally endangered species in 1990 (Service 1990) and was listed as endangered by the State of California in January 1987. The Recovery Plan includes the California jewelflower (Service 1998). The recovery goal is to maintain self-sustaining populations in protected areas representative of the former geographic and topographic range of the species and in a variety of appropriate natural communities.

The primary reason for the decline of California jewelflower is habitat destruction. All the populations on the San Joaquin and Cuyama Valley floors have been eliminated. Conversion to agriculture accounts for the loss of most sites, but those closest to Bakersfield and Fresno were destroyed by urbanization. Oilfield activity may have eliminated a few sites in the foothills at the western margin of the San Joaquin Valley (Taylor and Davilla 1986). Potential threats to one or more of the remaining populations of California jewelflower include competition from exotic plants, the effects of certain insecticides on pollinators, and small population size (Service 1998). California jewelflower is an annual, meaning that each plant lives less than 1 year, and the entire life cycle from seed germination to seed set is completed in a single growing season. As is typical of annuals, both plant size and population size can vary dramatically, depending on site and weather conditions. California jewelflower probably forms a persistent seed bank. The presence of a seed bank would explain the reappearance of California jewelflower in uncultivated areas where it has not been observed for decades. In years of above-average rainfall during the growing season, 46 percent to 85 percent of plants in study areas on the Carrizo Plain survived long enough to produce seed. In years of below-average precipitation or above-average temperatures, all the plants may die before setting seed (Service 1998).

The historical distribution of the California jewelflower is known from seven counties. Occurrences were noted in Fresno, Kern, and Tulare counties and the Carrizo Plain (San Luis Obispo County) and the Cuyama Valley (Santa Barbara and Ventura counties). The species was also found in the Sierra Nevada foothills at the eastern edge of Kern County and in Kings County. By 1986, all occurrences on the San Joaquin and Cuyama Valley Floors had been extirpated, and the only known natural population still in existence was in Santa Barbara Canyon, which is adjacent to the Cuyama Valley in Santa Barbara County. A small, introduced population colony also existed at the Paine Preserve in Kern County at that time. Since 1986, several more introductions have been attempted, and a number of colonies were rediscovered in two other areas where the species had been collected historically. Populations of California jewelflower that are known to be extant are shown on Figure 6 in the Recovery Plan (Service 1998); within the action area of this biological opinion, California jewelflowers are found in the Kreyenhagen Hills in western Fresno County, and in Lost Hills in Kern County. At least one minor road project potentially could occur in the vicinity of Lost Hills, as shown on Figure 9.

<u>San Joaquin Woolly-threads</u>

San Joaquin woolly-threads, a member of the sunflower family (Asteraceae), was federally listed as endangered in 1990 (Service 1990). It has not been listed by the State of California. The Recovery Plan includes the San Joaquin woolly-threads (Service 1998). The recovery goal for this species is similar to that for other plant species discussed in the Service's 1998 Recovery Plan: to maintain self-sustaining populations in protected areas representative of the former geographic and topographic range of the species and in a variety of appropriate natural communities. The recovery task with the highest priority is to protect existing habitat within the San Joaquin Valley.

The historic range of San Joaquin woolly-threads included the Valley floor, the hills west of the valley, and the Cuyama Valley Occurrences were found in Fresno, Kings, Kern, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Barbara counties. Currently, populations can be found on the Carrizo Plain (San Luis Obispo County), near Lost Hills (Kern County), in the Kettleman Hills (Kings and Fresno counties), in the Jacalitos Hills and Panoche Hills (Fresno and San Benito counties, respectively), in the Bakersfield area (Kern County), and in the Cuyama Valley (San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara counties.)

San Joaquin woolly-threads occurs in grassland and scrubland habitats. The species generally occupies microhabitats with less than 10 percent shrub cover, although herbaceous cover may be sparse or dense, and cryptogamic crust may or may not be present. San Joaquin woolly-threads occurs on neutral to subalkaline soils. On the San Joaquin Valley floor, the species typically is found on sandy or sandy-loam soils, whereas on the Carrizo Plain it occurs on silty soils. The species frequently occurs on sand dunes and sandy ridges as well as along the high-water line of washes and on adjacent terraces. Habitat loss is the reason for the decline of the species on the floors of the San Joaquin and Cuyama valleys. Intensive agriculture led to the loss of the majority of the occurrences in the valleys, with other sites being destroyed by urban development in and around Bakersfield and intensive oilfield development between Lokern and Lost Hills.

The San Joaquin woolly-threads once ranged throughout the floor of the San Joaquin Valley from western Fresno County and eastern Tulare County south to the foothills of the Tehachapi Mountains, reaching into San Benito County (Taylor 1989). Four metapopulations and several small, isolated populations occur in the hills and plateaus west of the San Joaquin Valley. The largest metapopulation occurs on the Carrizo Plain, where the occupied habitat totaled over 1,100 hectares (2,800 acres) in 1993, a particularly favorable year. Much smaller metapopulations are found in Kern County near Lost Hills, in the Kettleman Hills of Fresno and Kings Counties, and in the Jacalitos Hills of Fresno County. Several isolated occurrences are known from the Panoche Hills in Fresno and San Benito Counties, the Bakersfield vicinity, and the Cuyama Valley (Service 1998). The species has been extirpated from Tulare County.

It appears to favor non-alkaline soils of sandy or silty sand texture and an arid climatic regime (Taylor 1989). It is thought to be a poor competitor with introduced annual grasses (Ibid), but specific competitive effects have not yet been documented by scientific study. Much of the habitat for San Joaquin woolly-threads has been eliminated by conversion of annual grassland sites to agriculture. It currently is known to occupy scattered areas that total approximately 3,000 acres of pastures in the Carrizo and Elkhorn Plains (Service 1998).

Bakersfield Cactus

Bakersfield cactus was listed as a Federal endangered species in 1990 (55 FR 29361) and as a State endangered species in January 1990 (Service 1990). The Recovery Plan issued by the Service in 1998 addresses the San Joaquin woolly-threads (Service 1998). The recovery goal for this species is similar to that for the other plant species discussed above: to maintain self-sustaining populations in protected areas representative of the former geographic and topographic range of the species and in a variety of appropriate natural communities. Habitat protection is an important action to prevent the extinction or irreversible decline of the Bakersfield cactus.

Bakersfield cactus is endemic to a limited area of central Kern County in the vicinity of Bakersfield. Approximately one-third of historical occurrences have been eliminated, and the remaining populations are highly fragmented. The range of Bakersfield cactus was extended to the south when several plants were found in south-central Kern County, just north of Wheeler Ridge.

Bakersfield cactus typically occurs on sandy soils although gravel, cobbles, or boulders may also be present. Known populations occur on flood plains, ridges, bluffs, and rolling hills. It typically is associated with saltbush scrub communities but may also be found in blue oak and riparian woodlands (Holland 1986). The primary reason for the decline of Bakersfield cactus is habitat loss. Populations near Edison and Lamont were destroyed by conversion to agriculture. Residential development eliminated numerous plants in northeast Bakersfield in recent years. Petroleum production, off-road vehicle activity, overgrazing, and flooding also have contributed to habitat loss and fragmentation and degradation of populations.

The Bakersfield cactus is found chiefly within annual grassland of the San Joaquin Valley on sandy to sandy-loam soils. This cactus historically grew atop the low hills northeast of Oildale, southeasterly along the valley floor to the low foothills of the Tehachapi Mountains southeast and southwest of Arvin in Kern County. Bakersfield cactus is a low-growing cactus that typically spreads to form extensive thickets. Agricultural land conversion, oil and gas development, sand mining, urbanization, and perhaps wildfire have reduced this formerly widespread species to numerous small, isolated colonies that can be divided into five general population areas: the oilfields northeast of Oildale, Kern River Bluffs northeast of Bakersfield, the bluffs and hills west and north of Caliente Creek east of Bakersfield, Comanche Point on the Tejon Ranch southeast of Arvin, and northwest of the community of Wheeler Ridge. Off-highway vehicle (OHV) use, proposed flood control basins, and activities previously referred to continue to threaten the remaining sites.

Effects of the Proposed Action

Overview of Potential Effects

Lists of potential projects that might be appended to this opinion are provided in Tables 1 through 7 (enclosed). Potential effects from these transportation projects are summarized below: