

-----Original Message-----

From: Lizette Longacre

Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2014 3:24 PM

To: Joseph Decruyenaere

Cc: Emma Howard; Carl Nadela; Susan Tae; Andrea Gullo

Subject: RE: SEA Appendix for part 28 - habitat type list and habitat value

I think if you include the caveat that ratios would be expected to increase in the event that mitigation for listed species is necessary, then I think you've addressed the Habitat Authority's concern on that item.

Thanks.

Lizette Longacre

Ecologist

Puente Hills Habitat Preservation Authority

7702 Washington Ave., Suite C

Whittier, CA 90602

-----Original Message-----

From: Joseph Decruyenaere

Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2014 3:21 PM

To: Lizette Longacre

Cc: Emma Howard; Carl Nadela; Susan Tae

Subject: RE: SEA Appendix for part 28 - habitat type list and habitat value

Hi Lizette,

Let me think about this some more and raise the discussion at my next meeting with Emma et al.

Part of the problem, I think, is that the habitat types as listed in the ratio tables are very broad. If CAGN were to be identified as being potentially impacted by a project we would be obliged to consider impacts to its habitat, and the mitigation for losses of CSS would scale up because of the imperiled nature of CAGN. However, that's not going to be the case for all types of CSS because CAGN uses a fairly narrow expression of CSS that's dominated by California sagebrush, with uncommon exceptions.

If I have any reluctance in changing the ratio it's because the ratios are supposed to represent an SEA-wide prescription which I don't think should be swayed by the dependence of CAGN on a relatively small set of a large category of vegetation associations. On the other hand, if the overwhelming majority of CSS within the SEA is of the appropriate type and can reasonably be expected to be used by CAGN, then the general prescription should reflect that. Does the PHHPA have a vegetation map of the area that shows alliances and associations? I think that would help considerably in determining the how much of the CSS in the SEA can be expected to be used by CAGN and based on that we could make a better generalization of its relative value.

I also think it would be a good idea to include a caveat in all of the ratio tables that ratios would be expected to increase in the event that mitigation for listed species is necessary, and I can bring this up with Emma et al. at our next discussion.

Thanks,
Joe

-----Original Message-----

From: Lizette Longacre

Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2014 1:56 PM

To: Joseph Decruyenaere

Subject: SEA Appendix for part 28 - habitat type list and habitat value

Hi Joe. Thanks for meeting with us yesterday and for your patience reviewing our comments and addressing our questions. We really appreciate the time and effort.

When speaking with Emma regarding the SEA, I raised a question regarding the habitat type list and habitat values assigned in the Appendix for Part 28 of the SEA. For example, under the Puente Hills SEA (#8), CSS is listed as having a habitat value of medium. Given that this habitat is critical habitat for the coastal California Gnatcatcher (CAGN), it seems like the habitat value should be high. In addition, since chaparral is a primary constituent element for CAGN, that value should be risen to medium; especially in areas in close proximity to CSS.

Please let me know the criteria used to make a valuation determination on the habitat types and if you agree with the above and will make the edits.

Thanks again.

Lizette Longacre
Ecologist
Puente Hills Habitat Preservation Authority
7702 Washington Ave., Suite C
Whittier, CA 90602