C.D. Michel – SBN 144258
Sean A. Brady – SBN 262007
Tiffany D. Cheuvront – SBN 317144
MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
180 East Ocean Blvd., Suite 200
Long Beach, CA 90802
Telephone: (562) 216-4444
Facsimile: (562) 216-4445
Email: cmichel@michellawyers.com

Attorneys for Petitioners Safari Club International; California Rifle & Pistol Association, Incorporated; California Bowmen Hunters/State Archery Association; HOWL for Wildlife, Inc.; California Deer Association; and Coalition to Save Catalina Island Deer

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
5/27/2026 7:07 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By E. Mayorga, Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

SAFARI CLUB INTERNATIONAL; CALIFORNIA RIFLE & PISTOL ASSOCIATION, INCORPORATED; CALIFORNIA BOWMEN HUNTERS/STATE ARCHERY ASSOCIATION; HOWL FOR WILDLIFE, INC.; CALIFORNIA DEER ASSOCIATION; and COALITION TO SAVE CATALINA ISLAND DEER,

Plaintiffs-Petitioners,

v.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE; CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE, SOUTH COAST REGION; and DOES 1-10,

Defendants-Respondents.

CATALINA ISLAND CONSERVANCY,

Real Party in Interest.

Case No.: 26STCP00987

DECLARATION OF SEAN A. BRADY WITH EXHIBITS K-P IN SUPPORT OF VERIFIED FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT & PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE OR OTHER APPROPRIATE RELIEF

DECLARATION OF SEAN A. BRADY

I, Sean Brady, hereby declare as follows:

1. I am a member of the bar of the State of California. I am an attorney at law duly licensed to practice in the State of California and before this court. I am counsel of record for the Petitioners Safari Club International, California Rifle & Pistol Association, Incorporated, California Bowmen Hunters/State Archery Association, HOWL for Wildlife, Inc., California Deer Association, and Coalition to Save Catalina Island Deer ("Petitioners") in the above-captioned matter. I submit this declaration in support of Petitioners' Verified First Amended Complaint & Petition for Writ of Mandate or Other Appropriate Relief (hereinafter the "Petition"). I have personal knowledge of the facts stated below and of the proceedings in this matter. If I were to be called as a witness, I could and would competently testify under oath as to the matters I have set forth below.

2. Due to the file size of Exhibits A to P to the Petition, the exhibits need to be filed as two separate documents.

3. True and correct copies of Exhibits K to P to the Petition are attached here.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 27th day of May 2026, in Huntington Beach, California.



Sean Brady
Declarant

EXHIBIT K

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road, San Diego CA 92123

CALIFORNIA RESTORATION MANAGEMENT PERMIT ACT
RESTORATION MANAGEMENT PERMIT
NO. RMP 2025-0017-R5
CATALINA ISLAND RESTORATION PROJECT

This Restoration Management Permit (RMP) is issued to Santa Catalina Island Conservancy (Permittee) by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) for the Catalina Island Restoration Project (Project) pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 1670 et seq. This RMP authorizes Permittee to take[1] or possess certain protected species while conducting the activities described below in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth below:

Permittee:	**Santa Catalina Island Conservancy**
Permittee Contact Information:	**320 Golden Shore, Suite 220** **Long Beach, CA 90802** **(310) 510-2595** **ldennhardt@catalinaconservancy.org**

Summary of Project Activities

The Project includes management or propagation activities intended to benefit native fish, wildlife, plants, or their habitat, or a combination thereof. CDFW expects the Project to benefit endemic species on Santa Catalina Island (Catalina) through a range of restoration activities as described in detail below.

Project Location and Size:
The 47,884-acre Project is located on Catalina, with approximate centroid coordinates of 33.383000, -118.433000. The Project is located in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. The Project area (Project Area) is depicted in Exhibit 1, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference. The Project Area includes the City of Avalon (Avalon).

Project Description:

The Project is designed to protect and enhance native endemic island species and their habitat. The Project intends to actively restore approximately 215 acres and enhance through biosecurity efforts approximately 47,884 acres of terrestrial habitat. Active restoration includes invasive plant control and management; native seed and plant material collection, bulking, and reseeding; and fence building. Biosecurity programs include a comprehensive

[1] Fish and Game Code section 86 defines “take” as “hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill.”

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

invasive plant program, annual Island fox monitoring and infectious disease surveillance, removal of mule deer, and island-wide biosecurity monitoring of vegetation and wildlife.

The Project will conserve, restore, protect, enhance, and assist in the recovery of California native wildlife, and the habitat upon which they depend. Mule deer are native to most of the state of California but were historically absent from Catalina and the other Channel Islands. Mule deer were intentionally introduced to Catalina in the 1920s. These introduced mule deer on Catalina have reduced Catalina rare and endemic vegetation cover due to mule deer selectively browsing on rare and endemic plants. This allows invasive plant species an opportunity to outcompete these rare and endemic plant species and contributes to habitat type conversion across Catalina.

Catalina endemic species will directly benefit through the restoration and enhancement of the island habitats through the activities carried out under this RMP. Species that will benefit from this Project include but are not limited to Island fox (*Urocyon littoralis*), which is listed as threatened under both the federal Endangered Species Act and the California Endangered Species Act (CESA)[2]; Catalina Island mountain-mahogany (*Cercocarpus traskiae*), which is listed as endangered under CESA; Catalina Hutton's vireo (*Vireo huttoni unitti*); Santa Catalina ironwood (*Lyonothamnus floribundus floribundus);* and island scrub oak (*Quercus pacifica*). Permittee conducted a full assessment of the best available science relating to the Project and submitted that assessment to CDFW as part of Permittee's Restoration Management Permit application package. That assessment, titled *Island Restoration Scientific Assessment*, dated December 2025 (Scientific Assessment), is attached hereto as Exhibit 2 and incorporated herein by this reference.

The Project, as proposed by the Permittee, is fully described in the Restoration Management Permit application, dated December 4, 2025 (RMP Application), and Catalina Island Restoration Project 10-Year Workplan (2026-2035), dated December 2025 (Workplan), which are attached hereto as Exhibits 3 and 4, respectively, and incorporated herein by this reference. The Habitat Restoration and Monitoring Plan: Landscape-Scale Adaptive Weed Management and Habitat Restoration Plan to Conserve the Biodiversity of Catalina Island (HRMP), which is attached hereto as Exhibit 5, and incorporated herein by this reference, provides supplemental information on the Project. Permittee submitted the RMP Application, Workplan and HRMP to CDFW as part of the application package that Permittee submitted to CDFW on December 4, 2025, for this RMP.

The remainder of this Summary of Project Activities section of this RMP provides a more detailed description of the Project's activities as they were proposed by the Permittee in the Permittee's application for this RMP. The Project activities covered by this RMP are those activities described in this Summary of Project Activities section of this RMP and further described in the RMP Application and Workplan, except as those Project activities are

[2] Only one of the six subspecies of Island fox, the Santa Catalina Island fox (*Urocyon littoralis catalinae*), is listed (as threatened) under the federal Endangered Species Act. The CESA listing for Island fox *(Urocyon littoralis)* includes all six subspecies of Island fox.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

expressly clarified or restricted by the terms and conditions of the CDFW approvals in this RMP (Covered Activities) (see the Terms and Conditions of Approval section of this RMP below).

I. Active Restoration

Active restoration efforts will occur in two main areas on Catalina as depicted in Exhibit 6, Exhibit 7, and Exhibit 8, which are attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

Native seed collection and bulking will be used to support native revegetation activities. Native seeds will be collected from native plant populations across Catalina. Timing of seed collection will be based on species-specific bloom and seed maturation (Workplan, pg. 10). These seeds will be used for revegetation seeding of active restoration sites and also propagation efforts (Workplan, pg. 8). The composition of species seed collected, collectively referred to as low diversity seed mix, may include yarrow (*Achillea millefolium*), Channel Island silver lotus (*Acmispon argophyllus var. argenteus*), island broom (*Acmispon dendroideus var. dendroideus*), coastal sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis ssp. consanguinea*), clustered tarweed (*Deinandra fasciculata*), red bush monkeyflower (*Diplacus puniceus*), bush sunflower (*Encelia californica*), Saint Catherine's lace (*Eriogonum giganteum var. giganteum*), red-flowered buckwheat (*Eriogonum grande var. grande*), coast goldernbush (*Isocoma menziesii*), Needlegrass (*Stipa spp*.) (Workplan pgs. 9-10). The composition of species seed collected, collectively referred to as high diversity seed mix, may include Channel Island silver lotus, wild onion (*Allium praecox*), Catalina manzanita (*Arctostaphylos catalinae*), mugwort (*Artemisia douglasii*), Catalina mariposa lily (*Calochortus catalinae*), island morning glory (*Calystegia macrostegia*), feltleaf ceanothus (*Ceanothus arboreus*), island bigpod ceanothus (*Ceanothus megacarpus var. insularis*), Catalina Island mountain mahogany, summer holly (*Comarostaphylis diversifolia ssp. planifolia*), Catalina silverlace (*Constancea nevinii*), island rush-rose (*Crocanthemum greenei*), California rockflower (*Crossosoma californicum*), island bush poppy (*Dendromecon harfordii*), blue dicks (*Dichelostemma capitatum*), southern monkeyflower (*Diplacus puniceus*), giant wild rye (*Elymus condensantus*), California fuchsia (*Epilobium canum*), Trask's yerba santa (*Eriodictyon traskiae*), Saint Catherine's lace, island buckwheat, golden yarrow (*Eriophyllum confertiflorum*), cliff spurge (*Euphorbia misera*), Catalina bedstraw (*Galium catalinense*), island snapdragon (*Gambelia speciosa*), toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*), heartleaf penstemon (*Keckeillia cordifolia*), fragrant pitcher sage (*Lepechinia fragrans*), giant coreopsis (*Leptosyne gigantea*), southern honeysuckle (*Lonicera subspicata var. subspicata*), lupine (*Lupinus spp*.), California boxthorn (*Lycium californicum*), Catalina Island bushmallow (*Malacothamnus fasciculatus var. catalinensis*), laurel sumac (*Malosma laurina*), southern islands mallow (*Malva assurgentiflora ssp. glabra*), bladderpod (*Cleomella arborea*), Lyon's pygmydaisy (*Pentachaeta lyonii*), island cherry (*Prunus ilicifolia ssp. lyonii*), Engelmann oak (*Quercus engelmannii*), island scrub oak (*Quercus pacifica*), island oak (*Quercus tomentella*), Macdonald oak (*Quercus x macdonaldii*), island redberry (*Rhamnus pirifolia*), lemonade berry (*Rhus integrifolia*), Catalina current (*Ribes viburnifolium*), white sage (*Salvia apiana*), black sage (*Salvia mellifera*), Catalina figwort (*Scrophularia villosa*), purple needle grass (*Stipa pulchra*),

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Catalina nightshade (*Solanum wallacei*), and mission manzanita (*Xylococcus bicolor*) (Workplan pgs. 13-14).

Collected seeds will be processed using species-appropriate methods, such as threshing, sieving, air-blowing, or rubber mat separation, or used immediately, as appropriate (Workplan, pg. 11). Seeds will be cleaned of inert materials and other plant materials to avoid rotting or molding, as appropriate based on harvest method (Workplan, pg. 11). Seed processing equipment may include Clipper Office Tester, Oregon seed blower, brush deawner, dissecting scope, mettle scale, precision hand tools, rock tumbler, blender, dough roller, wooden blocks with rubber, dehumidifier, and other miscellaneous equipment for seed processing, tracking, storage, and propagation (Workplan, pg. 11).

Propagation efforts will occur at Akerman Native Plant Nursery and Catalina Island Conservancy's Micropropagation lab, but may also occur through professional seed bulking off-island (Workplan, pg. 8). Propagation of Catalina Island mountain-mahogany may also occur at the University of California Berkeley Blake Garden and the California Botanic Garden (Workplan, pg. 15). These propagation efforts will support revegetation where seeding proves ineffective and will supplement these seeding with outplantings. Propagation efforts may also include cuttings, tissue culture, hydroponics, and air layering.

Seed collection will follow permit and access requirements, protocols and guidance from the Center for Plant Conservation and the California Botanic Garden (CPC, 2019; Workplan, pg. 9). Pre-field training will include educational workshops, naturalist training, review of standard procedures, and low-impact practices, such as limiting the percentage of seed collected, avoiding trampling, and protected species (Workplan, pg. 10). In-field learning will be supported by ID-guides, specimen collection, and supervision by staff (Workplan, pg. 10). No more than 10% of seed will be collected from a given population in a season, and less than 5% from CESA listed and/or rare plants from a given population in a season (Workplan, pg. 12).

Exclusion fencing will be installed at the active restoration sites to exclude mule deer (Workplan, pg. 5). Fencing is not intended to be permanent; fencing will be removed following the success of mule deer removal activities.

a. Initial 10-acre active restoration

i. <u>Three years of invasive vegetation removal</u>

The initial 10-acre active restoration site (see Exhibit 6) currently has a high density of annual grasses and will be used to test restoration management techniques used in subsequent active restoration sites. This site will undergo three years of invasive vegetation removal treatment. Treatment with herbicide will be applied using a Utility Terrain Vehicle. For application of herbicide, varying brands with active ingredients may be used to ensure effective treatment. This may include Poast®, Fusilade II, or utilization of a broad-spectrum herbicide if needed (Workplan, pg. 5). There will be multiple applications of herbicide each growing season for a consecutive three-year period

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

(Workplan, pg. 6). Application is expected to occur between February and May, but will vary based on natural conditions such as regrowth, precipitation, and conditions unsuitable for herbicide application (Workplan, pg. 5). A randomized experimental plot design will be used to evaluate post-treatment activities related to secondary succession of non-native vegetation (Workplan, pg. 6). A randomized block design with replication will be utilized to evaluate the effectiveness of different herbicide treatments, which will help inform treatment strategies (Workplan, pg. 6).

Herbicide will be applied by trained applicators who possess a Qualified Applicator License (QAL) or have been trained by a QAL holder, consistent with label instructions, and in accordance with California Department of Pesticide Regulation and the County of Los Angeles Agricultural Commissioner regulations (Workplan, pg. 5).

ii. Three years of seeding – low diversity seed mix

Low diversity seed mix will be applied to the 10-acre active restoration site, at an approximate rate of 35 lbs/acre (approximately yielding 100 seeds/sq ft) (Workplan. pg. 12). The application and maintenance period for the low diversity seed mix will be over three years. Application rates will be adjusted using pure live seed calculations based on lab testing and matched to individual species and composition of the low diversity seed mix (Workplan, pg. 12). Installation of seed may include drill seeding, imprint seeding, broadcast seeding, hydroseeding, and seed ball technique. Installation method will be determined based on site conditions and accessibility (Workplan. pg. 12). Areas with sensitive species may be seeded by hand or hand operated disperser or seed ball (Workplan. pg. 12). Application of seed will be done in conjunction with precipitation cycles to facilitate germination, and monitored for desired species composition (Workplan, pg. 12).

After the invasive vegetation removal, application of the low diversity seed mix and maintenance period, high diversity seed mix will be applied to the 10-acre active restoration site, at an approximate rate of 35 lbs/acre (approximately yielding 100 seeds/sq ft) (Workplan, pg. 12). Application rates will be adjusted using pure live seed calculations based on lab testing and matched to individual species and composition of the low diversity seed mix (Workplan, pg. 12). Installation of seed may include drill seeding, imprint seeding, broadcast seeding, hydroseeding, and seed ball technique. Installation methods will be determined based on site conditions and accessibility (Workplan, pg. 12). Areas with sensitive species may be seeded by hand or hand operated disperser or seed ball (Workplan, pg. 12). Application of seed will be done in conjunction with precipitation cycles to facilitate germination, and monitored for desired species composition (Workplan, pgs. 12 and 14). Plants that are too difficult to seed may be added to the landscape in ‘nodes’, watered for the first two years after planting when there is no precipitation, and specifically monitored for success (Workplan, pg. 14).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

b. 105- and 100-acre active restoration sites

Active restoration activities will commence in the 105-acre active restoration site (see Exhibit 7) once the most effective management strategies and methodologies have been determined based on monitoring results at the 10-acre active restoration site. The 100-acre active restoration site (see Exhibit 8) will commence after initial phases of the 105-acre active restoration site (Workplan, pgs. 14-15). These subsequent active restoration sites will follow that same phasing from the 10-acre active restoration site: three years of invasive vegetation removal, three years of low diversity native seed mix application and maintenance, and high diversity seed mix application (Workplan, pgs. 14-15). Additionally, the application of herbicide for the 105- and 100-acre active restoration sites may include helicopter-based application, when appropriate. (Workplan, pg. 15). Aerial applications of herbicide will be in consultation with the Los Angeles County Agricultural Commissioner. Applicators shall hold both a QAL and a Pest Control Aircraft Pilot certification (Workplan, pg. 15).

II. Biosecurity - Island Wide Restoration

a. Mule deer removal activities

Mule deer removal shall occur across the island over multiple years. Removal will be conducted by ground-based specialists using rifles. Baiting will be used to ensure predictable locations of removal and to ensure safety for the public (Workplan, pg. 23). Mule deer carcasses near roads, trails, or public areas will be removed, and meat may be provided to the California Condor Recovery Program and/or tribal partners. Mule deer carcasses will be gathered and stored in a freezer and shipped off island (Workplan, pg. 23). Before any mule deer carcasses leave the island, testing will be done for chronic wasting disease.

Table 1. Estimated Timeline of Mule Deer Removal Effort as Proposed by Permittee. Permittee may shift the timing of the Project's mule deer removal efforts due to weather, effectiveness of the removal efforts, obtaining appropriate authorizations, and other factors (Workplan pg. 24).

Year	Estimated Dates	Primary Activities	Activities Occurring in Avalon	Activities Occurring Outside Avalon
Pre-Removal Assessment	Sept-Oct 2026	Baiting sites and mobile shooting	No	Yes
Year 1	Jun–Oct 2027	Professional shooting with bait/water sites	No	Yes

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Year 1	Nov 2027–April 2028	Nocturnal ground shooting with drone support	No	Yes
Year 2	Sept/Oct 2028	Aerial net-capture	No	Yes
Year 2	Nov 2028–March 2029	Ground shooting with detection dogs – Helicopter support	No	Yes
Year 3	April/May 2029	Capture, sterilization, and release of sentinel deer	Yes	Yes
Year 3	Jul–Aug 2029	Initial sentinel tracking	No	Yes
Year 3	Sept 2029–Jan 2030	Continued sentinel tracking breeding season	No	Yes
Year 3	Dec 2029–April 2030	Avalon mule deer removal and sterilization	Yes	No
Year 4	Aug 2030–Jan 2031	Continued sentinel tracking	No	Yes
Year 5	Aug 2031–Jan 2032	Continued sentinel tracking	No	Yes

The mule deer population will continue to be monitored to assess the overall Project success by employing spotlighting and drone thermal cameras (Workplan, pg. 28). Data collected by these methods will be used to assess progress of mule deer removal efforts, efficacy of bait stations, demographic changes in the population, and island population distribution (Workplan, pg. 28).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

i. Outside Avalon

Management strategies for removal of the entire mule deer population will include baiting, day and night shooting by specialists, surgical sterilization, net capture, sentinel deer collaring, and detection dogs (Workplan, pg. 24). Helicopters may be used to support activities for detection and net capture but will not be used as a platform to shoot from (Workplan, pg. 24). Sentinel deer will be collared, sterilized, and used to help locate any remaining non-sentinel mule deer across the island. Sentinel deer may be captured and relocated by helicopter (Workplan, pg. 24).

Initial mule deer removal will be by the attraction of individuals to easily accessible locations in the interior of the island and removal by shooting. This will be accomplished by attraction to baited or watering stations (Workplan, pg. 25). The next phase of mule deer removal will occur utilizing night shooting. Thermal sensing technology, including drones, will be used to assist in the locating of mule deer for removal. In remote locations, mule deer may be netted by helicopter and dispatched on the ground (Workplan, pg. 25). The next phase of mule deer removal will rely upon detection dogs to locate the last few dozen individuals. Detection dogs will remain under the control of the handler by voice command. Detection dogs will only detect mule deer and will not chase. They will be trained to indicate mule deer location either by barking or 'pointing'. The last phase of the mule deer removal will utilize sentinel deer. Mule deer selected for the sentinel phase will be caught, sterilized, and fitted with a GPS collar. Sentinel deer will then be released to help locate the last remaining mule deer population.

ii. In Avalon

Mule deer removal work in Avalon will consist of using bait to attract mule deer and using air rifles to shoot mule deer with tranquilizer darts to capture mule deer, followed by either surgical sterilization or euthanasia of mule deer.[3] This surgical sterilization or euthanasia may occur in Avalon or outside of Avalon (Workplan, pg. 27). Some mule deer may be sterilized, tagged, and released in Avalon; these mule deer will not be utilized as sentinel deer (Workplan, pg. 27). Permittee will allow a local veterinarian or their designee to be present for mule deer removal or management activities in Avalon.

Mule deer removal shall occur under strict safety protocols. Detection dogs will be trained in advance to target only mule deer. Detection dogs will be vaccinated for canine distemper virus, rabies, kennel cough, and treated for parasites prior coming to the island (Workplan, pg. 26). Dogs will be inspected for any plant seeds in their coat to avoid invasive species

[3] Section II(7)(e) of this RMP restricts this activity as follows: "Permittee shall not use any Shooting Device [as defined in Section II(7)(c) of this RMP] in Avalon unless Permittee has obtained any applicable and legally required permit from the City of Avalon for the use of a Shooting Device in Avalon and provided a copy of such permit to CDFW at least thirty days before using a Shooting Device in Avalon. If Permittee obtains such permit from the City of Avalon for the use of a Shooting Device in Avalon, Permittee shall comply with all restrictions on the use of a Shooting Device in Avalon that are included in such permit from the City of Avalon."

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

introduction. Dogs that exhibit signs of deviation from targeting mule deer will be assessed and given further training until they are capable of avoiding non-target species or will not be utilized (Workplan, pg. 26). Any surgical operations on mule deer will be performed by a licensed veterinarian. Mule deer removal methods will follow American Veterinary Medical Association's (AVMA) guidelines. No mule deer will be shot from helicopters. No snares or poison will be used to remove mule deer. Every effort will be made to remove mule deer with one shot. Any wounded mule deer will be followed and immediately dispatched (Workplan, pg. 27). Temporal and biological data will be collected from each mule deer after removal. This data will be used to adapt Project effectiveness to on-the-ground circumstances (Workplan, pg. 27).

iii. Mule deer removal safety protocols

Mule deer removal will include general safety protocols, protocols for work within Avalon, protocols for night shooting, and specific shooting procedures (Workplan, pgs. 28-31). All personnel will be required to possess certification as a Level 3-Urban Sharpshooter per standards set forth by the National Wildlife Operators Association. Safety standards will also be used from the United States Department of Agriculture and CDFW (USDA, 2023; USDA 2018; CDFW 2021) These protocols will include but are not limited to:

General Safety Protocols (Workplan, pgs. 28-29)

1. All specialists will possess proof of firearms safety certification such as the National Rifle Association certification.
2. Specialists will complete all Permittee-required training necessary for the Project, including wildlife safety (rattlesnakes, bison, yellow jackets), poison oak identification, VHF radio use, heat illness prevention, four-wheel-drive training, and incident reporting.
3. Specialists will coordinate with the Permittee and local law enforcement when operating near Avalon to identify safe, discreet removal locations and appropriate start times.
4. Specialists will utilize the four primary rules of firearm safety – 1) always keep firearm pointed in a safe direction, 2) treat all guns as if they are loaded, 3) keep your finger off the trigger until you are ready to shoot, and 4) always be sure of your target and what's beyond.
5. Specialists will only engage a deer when there is a safe earthen backdrop, an area without humans, and no dogs, cats, or bison are detected.
6. Specialists will use high-quality, fully functional equipment that is inspected and maintained daily. Required equipment includes firearms, scopes, night-vision optics, thermal devices, lights, communication devices, and GPS units.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

7. Specialists will follow strict target-identification procedures, engaging animals only after positive identification in clear visibility. Specialists will be trained to identify all potential non-targets (humans, domestic dogs, bison, Island foxes, and feral cats). If any non-target species is present, no shot will be taken.
8. Specialists will enhance safety through teamwork, maintaining clear communication regarding target identification, including a standardized system of signals indicating when a shot is about to occur.
9. Specialists will maintain a safety-first mindset at all times, including calm and deliberate decision-making under pressure.
10. Specialists will live on-site and develop strong environmental awareness, scouting areas during daylight hours to familiarize themselves with terrain, vegetation, hiding spots, and human infrastructure. Specialists will identify landmarks visible in low light to ensure safe navigation during operations.
11. Specialists will wear reflective vests or clothing to ensure visibility to team members and will wear proper footwear with good traction to prevent falls.
12. Specialists will carry first-aid kits, maintain a clearly defined emergency response plan, and keep all essential first-responder radio channels and telephone numbers on their person.
13. Shooting will never be aimed toward a road during any stage of the plan.
14. Notices of night shooting will be posted at all site access points, including trailheads and roads.

Avalon Safety Protocols (Workplan, pgs. 29-30)

1. Within Avalon, the use of firearms, center-fire rifles, and rimfire rifles are prohibited.[4]
2. All operations in Avalon will be closely coordinated with local law enforcement and designated city officials (e.g., the City Manager). Weekly operational plans will be communicated to a designated Permittee contact to address implementation

[4] Section II(7)(e) of this RMP restricts the use of any Shooting Device in Avalon. Section II(7)(c) of this RMP defines Shooting Device as any firearm, air rifle, dart gun, or any other device that shoots a bullet, dart, or any other projectile through the air. As used in this RMP's definition of Shooting Device, firearm includes but is not limited to any device that meets the definition of firearm in Penal Code section 16520, subdivision (a): "a device, designed to be used as a weapon, from which is expelled through a barrel, a projectile by the force of an explosion or other form of combustion."

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

challenges. The Permittee will work collaboratively with Avalon city officials to adjust operations based on community concerns to the extent practicable.

3. Specialists will not enter nor conduct operations on private or city property without permission.

Safety Protocols for Night Shooting in the Interior (Workplan, pg. 30)

1. All personnel will be trained specialists with Level 3 Urban Sharpshooter certification per NWCOA standards and a minimum of four years of depopulation experience.
2. Specialists will work exclusively in teams to ensure mutual safety and oversight.
3. A pre-operation safety briefing covering the operational plan and all safety protocols will be required each day.
4. All firearm use during night operations will incorporate thermal or night-vision optics.
5. Positive species identification will be required before any animal is engaged.
6. No shots will be taken at movement, heat signatures, silhouettes, or sounds alone.
7. Pre-mapped shooting zones will be developed and shared weekly with Permittee leadership, and if relevant, the Avalon city officials.
8. Shots will only be taken when a known, safe backstop exists and area is deemed safe to shoot with no people present between shooter and target.
9. A minimum buffer of 150 yards will be maintained from residences and occupied areas, and all shots will be taken away from buildings.
10. Teams will use radios on designated channels to maintain communication throughout operations.
11. Regular check-ins will occur between all teams daily.
12. In the event of an emergency, first responders (911) will be contacted immediately, followed by the field lead, who will notify Permittee leadership.
13. Clear and visible signage will be placed around the Island to alert the public to ongoing operations.
14. Deer will only be engaged when the specialist is certain a safe and humane kill can be achieved.
15. All personnel will wear identifiable reflective gear.
16. Real-time GPS tracking will be used to monitor the location of specialists in the field.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Specific Shooting Procedures (Workplan, pgs. 30-31)

1. Prior to initiating any field activities, the target area(s) and surrounding properties will be thoroughly surveyed using digital aerial imagery and active aerial drones followed by field confirmation. By knowing the location of every occupied structure and areas of human use the specialists will be better able to work safely, discreetly, and efficiently.
2. Field operations will occur during hours of lowest human activity. In addition, during culling operations the specialists will search intensively for people and non-target animals to avoid unsafe conditions. Areas surrounding operations will be continuously surveyed using handheld thermal optics to search for humans and non-target animals.
3. During deer removal operations, continuous open communication will occur between the Permittee, local law enforcement, and the specialists to keep people well informed regarding field activities to avoid conflicts.
4. Once the decision to engage a deer is made, the shooter will take the firearm out of safe state (safety OFF, bolt/action engaged) and engage select animals at their discretion, while ensuring maximum safety, in a manner that conforms with the goal of efficiently reducing the herd without educating remaining individual deer. Once firing has ceased, the firearm will be returned to a safe state (safety ON, action open).
5. Proper topography or elevation will always be used to provide a safe earthen backdrop.
6. Shooting operations will cease immediately if unsafe conditions are encountered and will not be resumed until conditions are deemed safe.

b. Monitoring

i. Island Fox

Island fox monitoring will occur annually over a six-week period utilizing up to 216 trap locations across the island. The traps will be arranged across six traplines between 32 and 41 traps per line. Traps may be active for four consecutive nights before being closed and sterilized (Workplan, pg. 20). Targeted trapping may also occur in locations across the island as appropriate. Island foxes shall be captured using modified Tomahawk #106 single-door live traps and baited. Traps shall be outfitted with bite bars, shade cloths, and fine mesh to avoid injury to Island fox.

Captured Island foxes are processed in under 20 minutes, without sedation, and released at the capture site. Individuals shall be marked with a passive integrated transponder (PIT) and evaluated for health and other biological characteristics (Workplan, pg. 20.). Island foxes may also receive blood draws for disease surveillance and collaborative population research. Island foxes may also be vaccinated for canine distemper virus and rabies and receive topical treatment for ear mites.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Island foxes may be fitted with radio collars and used for the sentinel monitoring program for early detection of disease emergence within the population (Workplan, pg. 21). The radio collars will monitor the individual for signs of mortality. If a mortality signal is detected, the carcass will be recovered to assess the cause of death. The carcass may be sent to the California Animal Health and Food Safety Laboratory at UC Davis. Continuous infectious disease monitoring of five canine pathogens will occur annually from a subset of Island foxes. These pathogens include canine distemper virus, canine adenovirus, canine parvovirus, canine coronavirus, and canine herpesvirus. Blood samples may be collected for these pathogens and sent to the New York State Animal Health Diagnostic Laboratory at Cornell University for testing (Workplan, pg. 22).

ii. Lepidoptera

Lepidoptera monitoring will occur across the island, replicating methodological approaches from other island-wide lepidoptera surveys (Powell, 2012). These surveys will inform the conditions of vegetation recovery, through climate response, habitat integrity, and ecosystem productivity (Workplan, pg. 34). Daytime butterfly transect surveys and nocturnal UV-light trapping for moths may occur at 20 locations across major vegetation types. Capture and DNA sampling of Monarch Butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*) may occur (Workplan, pg. 34). Nocturnal trapping will start at dusk, for 4-5 hours per site, and use fixed wattage UV light (Workplan, pg. 35). Captured moths will be frozen and returned to the lab to be pinned and spread. Moths may be photographed and DNA samples taken. Specimens will be identified at a species level when possible. Surveys will also collect information on presence of caterpillars. Caterpillars will be photographed and may also be collected and stored for DNA analysis. Surveys will occur in spring (March-May) and in fall (September-November), commencing in 2026 and every third year thereafter (Workplan, pg. 34).

iii. Birds

Monitoring of avian species by acoustic surveys will be done annually to document changes in bird community composition and abundance (Workplan, pg. 37). Acoustic surveys will be conducted at up to 35 stations, with supplementation in areas with current or planned habitat restoration activities. Sites are selected through stratified random sampling, to cover multiple habitat types and restoration phases (Workplan, pg. 37). A recorder will be placed at each site, mounted on a pole. Recorders will run from 5:00am to 9:00am and 7:00pm to 12:00am. Audio files will be processed using BirdNET (BirdNET 2025). The monitoring will focus on ground, mid story, and canopy nesting species, and aim for guild-level analysis based on nesting height and habitat reliance. Habitat data will also be recorded at each site, including vegetation structure and cover data (e.g., canopy height, understory density, shrub cover, and ground vegetation) (Workplan pg. 38). Monitoring will occur beginning in early May and be conducted over a four-week sampling period (Workplan pg. 38).

iv. Shrew

Monitoring of the Santa Catalina Ornate shrew (*Sorex ornatus willetti*) will be conducted as an indicator of the health of ground-layer ecosystems. Monitoring efforts will include camera trapping but may also include Sherman traps and pitfall traps (Workplan, pg. 38). Traps will

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

be opened in the evening and checked at defined intervals. All captures will be released at the point of capture. This monitoring effort may operate seasonally or year-round in appropriate microhabitats (Workplan, pg. 39).

v. Small Mammals

Monitoring of small mammals will occur to detect trends in response to Project activities. Monitoring small mammals will be conducted by mark-recapture grids, opportunistically. Efforts may use both Sherman traps and Tomahawk island wide. Traps will be baited and will contain bedding material (Workplan, pg. 41). Mark-recapture may use non-toxic paint or marker, fur clippings, PIT tags, metal ear tags, and VHF/GPS collars. Biological data and samples may be taken from each capture (Workplan, pg. 41). All captures will be released at the point of capture.

vi. Reptiles and Amphibians

Monitoring of reptiles and amphibians will occur to track trends in populations, as a result of Project activities, as well as threats to species, such as disease and impacts from invasive species. These surveys will be conducted by methods including systematic coverboard surveys, pitfall traps, funnel traps, dip nets, opportunistic surveys, and hand or lasso catching. Traps may be baited, contain shelter, a wet sponge, and be regularly checked (Workplan, pg. 42). Biological data will be gathered from captured individuals. Captures may also be marked, swabbed for DNA and disease purposes, and biological samples may be taken from individuals.

vii. Vegetation

Active restoration site vegetation monitoring will guide adaptive herbicide use, readiness for native seeding, and effectiveness of native seeding methods (Workplan, pg. 33). Monitoring will use line-belt transects systematically across the active restoration sites. Monitoring will occur before and after treatments and will collect data on percent cover of native versus non-native species, species richness, and dominance. (Workplan, pg. 33). Additional methods will include photo point monitoring, drone imagery, and may include soil condition monitoring such as soil compaction, organic matter, or erosion metrics (Workplan, pg. 33).

Vegetation monitoring will also include monitoring of 60 legacy vegetation plots that have been historically surveyed (Workplan, pg. 36) Each plot will be surveyed using a point-intercept method, recording vegetation at fixed intervals, to generate estimates of species cover, richness, and composition (Workplan, pg. 36). Monitoring will occur between late winter and early summer, depending on weather variables and plant phenology (Workplan, pg. 37).

Monitoring will also occur to detect and stop invasive vegetation introductions under the Catalina Island Invasive Plant Program (CIPP; Workplan, pg. 19; Knapp, 2007). This monitoring will include Early Detection and Rapid Response, to detect monitor and eradicate new invasive vegetation introductions on the Island. Efforts will be made to control and reduce spread of invasive species that are too common to eradicate (Workplan, pg. 19-20).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

viii. Adaptive Management

Data collected from all monitoring efforts will be used to inform adaptive management efforts across the island. This will include annual data review, adjustments to restoration methods, reporting, and record keeping (Workplan pg. 35)

RMP Authorizations

CDFW may issue a restoration management permit to authorize take, possession, import, or export of any species or subspecies of fish, wildlife, or plant in association with a qualifying restoration project and to authorize any impacts to fish and wildlife resources as a result of activities otherwise subject to Fish and Game Code section 1602, all pursuant to terms and conditions determined by CDFW. (Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (a).)

This RMP includes the following specific types of CDFW authorizations:

1. Take Authorization for Species Designated Pursuant to CESA (Fish & G. Code, § 2050 et seq.)

   Pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 1672, subdivision (b), CDFW may authorize the take, possession, import, or export of any endangered species, threatened species, or candidate species designated pursuant to CESA for management or propagation purposes, including scientific or educational purposes related to management or propagation, through a restoration management permit for a qualifying restoration project.[5]

2. Take Authorization for Species Not Designated as Endangered, Threatened, Candidate, Fully Protected, or Rare

   Pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 1672, subdivision (e), CDFW may authorize the take, possession, import, or export of any fish, amphibian, reptile, mammal, bird, or the nests or eggs thereof, or any other form of plant or animal life not subject to Fish and Game Code section 1672, subdivisions (b) through (d), inclusive, for management or propagation purposes, including scientific or educational purposes related to management or propagation, through a restoration management permit for a qualifying restoration project.

[5] Catalina Island mountain-mahogany (*Cercocarpus traskiae*) and San Clemente Island lotus (*Acmispon dendroideus var. traskiae*) are listed as endangered pursuant to both CESA and the Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA). This RMP authorizes take of Catalina Island mountain-mahogany and San Clemente Island lotus pursuant to both CESA and the NPPA.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Covered Species Subject to RMP Take Authorization

This RMP authorizes take or possession of the species listed below in Table 2 (Covered Species) subject to the terms and conditions of this RMP.[6] For the purposes of this RMP, "Covered Species" shall mean every species listed in Table 2. Individual Covered Species may be referred to in this RMP by the common name used for them in Table 2. Groups of Covered Species may be referred to by the Covered Species Group name used for them in Table 2 (Covered Reptiles and Amphibians, Covered Small Mammals, Covered Invertebrates, or Covered Plants.

[6] This RMP supersedes and replaces the following two permits previously issued by CDFW to Permittee: (1) Scientific Collecting Permit Number S-220560001-22059-001, Two-striped garter snake presence/absence survey, issued by CDFW on July 15, 2024; and (2) Scientific, Educational, or Management Permit No. 2081(a)-22-005-RP, Amendment 1, Catalina Island Mountain-Mahogany Propagation and Reintroduction Project, issued by CDFW on October 15, 2025.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 2. Covered Species

Common Name	Scientific Name	Covered Species Group	Protected Status	Source of RMP Authorization
Island fox	*Urocyon littoralis*	none	CESA threatened species (Fish & G. Code, § 2050 et seq.; Cal Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.5, subd. (b)(6)(F))	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (b)
California kingsnake	*Lampropeltis californiae*	Covered Reptiles and Amphibians	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)
California mountain kingsnake	*Lampropeltis zonata*	Covered Reptiles and Amphibians	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)
Western skink	*Plestiodon skiltonianus*	Covered Reptiles and Amphibians	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)
San Bernardino ring-necked snake	*Diadophis punctatus*	Covered Reptiles and Amphibians	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)
San Diego alligator lizard	*Elgaria multicarinata webbii*	Covered Reptiles and Amphibians	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)
Two-striped gartersnake	*Thamnophis hammondii*	Covered Reptiles and Amphibians	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Southern pacific rattlesnake	*Crotalus oreganus helleri*	Covered Reptiles and Amphibians	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)
Western side-blotched lizard	*Uta stansburiana*	Covered Reptiles and Amphibians	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)
Baja California treefrog	*Pseudacris hypochondriaca*	Covered Reptiles and Amphibians	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)
Garden slender salamander	*Batrachoseps major*	Covered Reptiles and Amphibians	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)
Arboreal salamander	*Aneides lugubris*	Covered Reptiles and Amphibians	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)
Catalina Island ground squirrel	*Otospermophilus beecheyi nesioticus*	Covered Small Mammals	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)
Santa Catalina Island shrew	*Sorex ornatus willetti*	Covered Small Mammals	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)
Santa Catalina Island deer mouse	*Peromyscus maniculatus catalinae*	Covered Small Mammals	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Santa Catalina harvest mouse	*Reithrodontomys megalotis catalinae*	Covered Small Mammals	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)
Mojave dotted-blue butterfly	*Euphilotes mojave*	Covered Invertebrates	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)
Crotch's bumble bee	*Bombus crotchii*	Covered Invertebrates	CESA candidate species (Fish & G. Code, § 2050 et seq.)[7]	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (b)
Monarch butterfly	*Danaus plexippus*	Covered Invertebrates	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)
Catalina mountain snail	*Radiocentrum avalonense*	Covered Invertebrates	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)
Santa Catalina lancetooth snail	*Haplotrema catalinense*	Covered Invertebrates	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)
Mule deer	*Odocoileus hemionus*	none	Fish & G. Code, § 2000	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (e)

[7] The protected status of and source of take authorization for Crotch's bumble bee may change following the decision of the Fish and Game Commission (Commission) on whether to designate the species as a threatened or endangered species under CESA, but Crotch's bumble bee will remain a Covered Species under this RMP. If the Commission decides not to designate Crotch's bumble bee as a threatened or endangered species under CESA, the species will be protected under Fish and Game Code section 2000 and California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 650, and the source of take authorization for the species in this RMP will then be Fish and Game Code section 1672, subdivision (e).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Catalina Island mountain-mahogany	*Cercocarpus traskiae*	Covered Plants	NPPA and CESA endangered species (Fish & G. Code, §§ 1900 et seq. and 2050 et seq.; Cal Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.2, subd. (a)(31)(A))	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (b)
Lyon's pentachaeta	*Pentachaeta lyonii*	Covered Plants	CESA endangered species (Fish & G. Code, § 2050 et seq.; Cal Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.2, subd. (a)(3)(Q))	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (b)
Beach spectacle pod	*Dithyrea maritima*	Covered Plants	CESA threatened species (Fish & G. Code, § 2050 et seq.; Cal Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.2, subd. (b)(4)(A))	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (b)
San Clemente Island lotus	*Acmispon dendroideus var. traskiae*	Covered Plants	NPPA and CESA endangered species (Fish & G. Code, §§ 1900 et seq. and 2050 et seq.; Cal Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.2, subd. (a)(16)(C))	Fish & G. Code, § 1672, subd. (b)

Take of individuals of the Covered Species in the form of mortality ("kill") may occur as a result of Covered Activities as specified in Table 3. Non-lethal take of individuals of the Covered Species in the form of pursue, catch, capture, or attempt to do so may also occur as a result of Covered Activities as specified in Table 3. The Project is authorized to take

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

individuals of the Covered Species as specified in Table 3.

Permittee shall not engage in any Project-related activities that result in take that exceeds the amount described below in Table 3 of this RMP, if specific take limits are provided, without prior written approval from CDFW. If Permittee anticipates Project-related activities may cause take that exceeds the amount described in Table 3 of this RMP, Permittee shall cease all Project-related activities that could result in take that exceeds the amount described in Table 3 of this RMP and consult with CDFW. CDFW may approve an increased take limit for the Project by email without amending this RMP in accordance with Section VII (Amendment) of this RMP.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 3 Authorized Take Level

Covered Species or Covered Species Group (see Table 2)	Authorized Activities	Authorized Take Limit	Individuals Authorized to perform Covered Activities
Island fox	Pursue and capture using baited and unbaited traps, nets, and hand capture. Measure, weigh, insert passive integrated transponder (PIT) tags, affix GPS and radio collars, vaccinate, collect biological samples (blood, non-invasive swab), transport, maintain in captivity for medical reasons such as wound care, release to the wild, and chemically euthanize for humane reasons when necessary.	All individuals encountered may be pursued and captured No more than 5 individuals annually may be killed via humane euthanasia when necessary	Designated Island Fox Biologist
Covered Reptiles and Amphibians	Pursue and capture using hand capture, lasso, cover boards, pitfall and funnel traps, and nets. Measure, weigh, take non-invasive swabs, toe clippings, and tail tissue samples. Apply temporary external color markings.	All individuals encountered may be pursued and captured No more than 5 individuals of each Covered Species captured annually may be killed via accidental mortality during capture	Designated Reptile and Amphibian Biologist

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Covered Small Mammals	Pursue and capture using baited box or cage (e.g. Sherman, Tomahawk) traps, pitfall traps, cover boards, and hand capture. Affix metal ear tags, PIT tags, and temporary external color marks. Measure, weigh, and take samples (fur, whisker, feces, and non-invasive swabs).	All individuals encountered may be pursued and captured No more than 5 individuals of each Covered Species captured annually may be killed via accidental mortality during capture	Designated Small Mammal Biologist
Covered Invertebrates	Pursue and capture using nets, night lights, and spotlights. Measure, weigh, and collect samples.	No more than 5 individuals of each Covered Species annually	Designated Invertebrate Biologist
Mule deer[8]	Hunt, pursue, capture, kill, and attempt to do so using bait, firearms (e.g., centerfire rifles and shotguns), air guns (e.g., air rifle and air pistol), net guns or drop nets (outside Avalon), night lights, spotlights, and detection dogs. Anesthetize and chemically immobilize. Humanely euthanize. Take blood samples. Apply ear tags and GPS collars.	All individuals encountered may be killed	Designated Mule Deer Biologist
Covered Plants	Capture via seed and vegetative collection. Possess for purposes of air layering, micropropagation, growing using hydroponics and aeroponics, seed storage, and outplantings.	Less than 5% of total from any individual plant	Designated Plant Biologist

[8] Section II(7)(e) of this RMP imposes specific restrictions on what Project mule deer removal activities may be conducted in Avalon.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Terms and Conditions of Approval

CDFW's issuance of this RMP is subject to Permittee's compliance with and implementation of the following terms and conditions of approval:

I. General Conditions of Approval

1. Legal Compliance. Except for the statement in footnote 11 of this RMP that CDFW's authorization of the Project in this RMP controls over any conflicting City of Avalon Code section 6-1.128 prohibitions, Permittee shall comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws in existence on the effective date of this RMP or adopted thereafter.

2. Compliance with Other Federal or State Permits or Authorizations. Permittee shall comply with the terms and conditions of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service federal Endangered Species Act section 10(a)(1)(A) recovery permit for Catalina Island fox (*Urocyon littoralis catalinae*), which was issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on February 24, 2023 (Permit Number ES090990).

3. Project Area Access. Permittee shall provide CDFW with reasonable access to the Project Area and shall cooperate fully with CDFW's efforts to verify compliance with or the effectiveness of this RMP.

4. RMP Compliance. Permittee shall make compliance with the terms, conditions, and requirements of this RMP a condition of all contracts and agreements that are made for the purpose of completing any Project-related activities. Permittee shall provide CDFW copies of any such contracts or agreements upon request.
5. Permittee Responsible for Authorized Personnel. Permittee, operating under the authority of this RMP, is responsible for the actions of non-permitted individuals assisting with management and monitoring activities as outlined in the Project description above.
6. Documentation at Project Area. Permittee or the Designated Biologist(s) (as defined in Section II of this RMP) shall have a copy of this RMP in their possession when undertaking the permitted activities.

II. Conditions of Approval for Covered Species During Work

1. Adherence to All Measures Submitted with Application. Permittee shall adhere to all of the standard and modified Covered Species protective measures described in the Workplan and HRMP, except as those Covered Species protective measures are expressly clarified, modified, or supplemented by CDFW in this RMP.

2. Designated Biologist Approval Process. For any person retained by Permittee as a Designated Biologist for any Covered Species or Covered Species Group, Permittee

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

shall submit to CDFW in writing the name, qualifications (including current and relevant certifications), business address, telephone number, and email address of the proposed Designated Biologist(s) for particular Covered Species at least five business days before commencing Project activities that could result in take of those Covered Species. CDFW shall provide written approval or denial of proposed Designated Biologist(s). Permittee shall also obtain CDFW written approval in advance if any Designated Biologist must be changed. Permittee shall allow the Designated Biologist(s) to communicate freely with CDFW. Permittee shall ensure that non-disclosure agreements or clauses that restrict communication with CDFW do not exist in any contracts or agreements between Permittee and Designated Biologist(s) related to the Project except as necessary to protect proprietary technology or proprietary information unrelated to fish and wildlife.

3. Island Fox.

    a. Permittee shall retain one or more Designated Island Fox Biologist(s) whose qualifications shall include expertise in Island fox biology, monitoring, and handling, including safe capture using baited and unbaited traps, nets, and hand capture; handling including measuring, weighing, inserting passive integrated transponder (PIT) tags, affixing GPS and radio collars, vaccinating, collecting biological samples (blood, non-invasive swab), basic wound care, and safely transporting Island foxes.

    b. The Project activities described in pages 21 through 24 of the Workplan (Annual Island-Wide Fox Monitoring 2026-2035, Infectious Fox Disease Surveillance, and Fox Mortality Monitoring and Threat Reduction) shall only be conducted by or under the supervision of the Designated Island Fox Biologist(s).

    c. Permittee may capture Island foxes on Catalina that show signs of injury or illness and either:

        i. transport them to another location on Catalina for medical evaluation by a licensed veterinarian; or

        ii. transport and transfer them to a wildlife rehabilitation facility with a valid CDFW wildlife rehabilitation permit on Catalina.

    d. Permittee may chemically euthanize Island foxes that are incurable or unduly suffering. Chemical euthanasia of Island foxes shall only be performed by or under the supervision of a licensed veterinarian.

4. Covered Reptiles and Amphibians.

    a. Permittee shall retain one or more Designated Reptile and Amphibian Biologist(s) whose qualifications shall be approved by CDFW and shall

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

include expertise in Covered Reptile and Amphibian species biology; safe capture, handling, and release or relocation; marking and collecting tissue samples from Covered Reptile and Amphibian species, and safe release and relocation of Covered Reptile and Amphibian Species.

b. The Project activities described in pages 41 through 42 of the Workplan (Herpetofauna Surveys) shall only be conducted by the Designated Reptile and Amphibian Biologist(s).

c. Capture methods shall avoid disturbing native reptile and amphibian eggs and egg masses. Amplexing or mating pairs of native amphibians and reptiles shall not be captured, handled, or disturbed.

d. Pitfall traps are authorized as needed for amphibians and reptiles. Pitfall traps shall be placed as far as possible from ant nests. If an ant nest develops within 10 feet of an existing pitfall trap, the pitfall trap shall be moved, removed from the field, or closed. Pitfall traps shall be checked no less than once daily during sampling periods. Pitfall traps shall be shaded during sampling periods and covered to prevent animal entry during non-sampling periods. Traps shall consist of non-galvanized metal or plastic containers the size of a #10 coffee can or larger. Six to eight holes, approximately 0.25 inch in diameter, shall be drilled in the sides of the traps 1 to 1.5 inches above the bottom to allow water drainage. Non-cellulose sponges (at least 1x2x2 inches) shall be placed in the bottom of the traps and kept moist at all times to avoid amphibian desiccation. Measures shall be taken to mitigate the incidental catch and potential harm to small mammals, such as an escape mechanism. When the trap array is pulled, the soil shall be replaced in the pit trap holes.

e. Amphibians shall be handled with wet hands that are free of lotions, creams, sunscreen, oils, ointment, insect repellent or any other material that may harm them. Permittee shall process individuals expediently. Individuals shall be released immediately if they exhibit signs of excessive physiological stress or if handling time exceeds one hour.

f. All amphibians and reptiles shall be released at the point of capture, unless that location puts them in imminent danger, in which case they shall be placed in a nearby refugium sufficient to protect them.

g. Any habitat element (e.g., rocks, boulders, and logs) moved to survey for reptiles or amphibians shall be carefully placed back where they were found to avoid negative impacts on habitat conditions.

h. All capture and handling methods utilized shall follow standard practices and ensure no undue disturbance of the authorized Reptile and Amphibian Covered Species and other wildlife species.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

i. Permittee may mark reptiles and amphibians for mark-recapture studies using standard non-invasive methods. Permittee may mark skin of reptiles using non-toxic ink, paint, correction fluid, or black dye. Paint should not be used to mark moist, permeable skin of amphibians. Permittee may apply non-toxic fluorescent powders to ventral and lateral parts of adult and adult sized amphibians. Marks should not burden the animal or make it vulnerable to predation.

j. If a die-off or a sick or infected individual is observed at a site, Permittee shall submit a Mortality Report to the Wildlife Health Lab via the webform at *https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Laboratories/Wildlife-Health/Monitoring/Mortality-Report* and forward the confirmation email you receive with the report details to CDFW Contact as soon as possible, but no more than 48 hours after the discovery.

5. Covered Small Mammals.

a. Permittee shall retain one or more Designated Small Mammal Biologist(s) with expertise in the areas of Covered Small Mammal species biology, including safe capture and handling using baited box or cage (e.g., Sherman, Tomahawk) traps, pitfall traps, cover boards, and hand capture; expertise in tagging with metal ear tags, PIT tags, and temporary external color marks; and experience measuring, weighing, and taking samples (fur, whisker, feces, and non-invasive swabs) from Covered Small Mammal Species.

b. The Project activities described in pages 38 through 41 of the Workplan (Shrew Surveys and Small Mammal Surveys) shall only be conducted by or under the supervision of the Designated Small Mammal Biologist(s).

c. Permittee shall employ all reasonable measures to avoid injury to or mortality of individuals (e.g., using traps of sufficient size and adjusting trap doors to create a gap to accommodate tails of mouse species).

d. All small mammals shall be released at the point of capture, unless that location puts them in imminent danger, in which case they shall be placed in a nearby refugium sufficient to protect them.

e. If pitfall traps are used for shrews or other small mammals, they shall be checked at least once during the night (every two hours is recommended), and a food supply shall be provided to avoid mortality by starvation (e.g., worms, cat food). Pitfall traps shall be placed as far as possible from ant nests. If an ant nest develops within 10 feet of an existing pitfall trap, the pitfall trap shall be moved, removed from the field, or closed. Pitfall traps shall be covered to prevent animal entry during non-sampling periods. Reasonable measures shall be taken to mitigate

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

the incidental catch and potential harm to small mammals. When the trap array is pulled, the soil shall be replaced in the pit trap holes. Excessive (i.e., within 80% of take authorization limit) incidental mortalities of any mammal species from pitfall traps shall be reported to CDFW Contact.

6. Covered Invertebrates.

    a. Permittee shall retain one or more Designated Invertebrate Biologist(s) with expertise in the areas of Covered Invertebrate species biology, including species identification, safe capture and handling using nets, night lights, and spotlights, and taking samples and measurements.

    b. The Project activities described in pages 33 through 34 of the Workplan (Island-Wide Lepidoptera Surveys) shall only be conducted by or under the supervision of the Designated Invertebrate Biologist(s).

7. Mule Deer.

    a. Permittee shall retain one or more Designated Mule Deer Biologist(s) who shall have the qualifications described in the Workplan on pages 30-33.

    b. The Project activities described in pages 23 through 32 of the Workplan (Invasive Mule Deer) shall only be conducted by or under the supervision of the Designated Mule Deer Biologist(s).

    c. Permittee shall ensure that all Covered Activities that include the use of any firearm[9], air rifle, dart gun, or any other device that shoots a bullet, dart, or any other projectile through the air (Shooting Device) follows the safety protocols described in the Workplan on pages 30-33.

    d. Permittee shall follow the American Veterinary Medical Association's Guidelines for Euthanasia of Animals (American Veterinary Medical Association, 2020) when conducting any mule deer removal activities to ensure that mule deer are treated humanely. Chemical euthanasia of mule deer shall only be performed by or under the supervision of a licensed veterinarian

    e. Permittee shall coordinate with the City of Avalon prior to conducting any mule deer removal or management activities in Avalon.[10] Permittee shall

[9] As used here, firearm includes but is not limited to any device that meets the definition of firearm in Penal Code section 16520, subdivision (a): "a device, designed to be used as a weapon, from which is expelled through a barrel, a projectile by the force of an explosion or other form of combustion."

[10] Although Permittee's application generally requested authorization for the use of drop nets and net guns to capture mule deer on Catalina, Permittee later confirmed it is not seeking authorization for these activities in Avalon. Accordingly, this RMP does not authorize the use of drop nets or net guns to capture mule deer in Avalon.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

not use any Shooting Device in Avalon unless Permittee has obtained any applicable and legally required permit from the City of Avalon for the use of a Shooting Device in Avalon and provided a copy of such permit to CDFW at least thirty days before using a Shooting Device in Avalon. If Permittee obtains such permit from the City of Avalon for the use of a Shooting Device in Avalon, Permittee shall comply with all restrictions on the use of a Shooting Device in Avalon that are included in such permit from the City of Avalon.[11]

f. This RMP does not authorize, require, or restrict recreational hunting for mule deer on Catalina or Permittee's enrollment in or utilization of CDFW's Private Lands Management Program.

8. Covered Plants.

a. Permittee shall retain one or more Designated Plant Biologist(s) with expertise in the areas of Covered Plant species biology, including species identification, seed and vegetative collection, air layering, micropropagation, growing using hydroponics and aeroponics, seed storage, and outplanting.

b. The Project activities described in pages 15 through 18 of the Workplan (Rare Plant Propagation Recovery and Monitoring) shall only be conducted by or under the supervision of the Designated Plant Biologist(s).

9. Movement of Covered Species Out of Harm's Way. This RMP authorizes a Designated Biologist for particular Covered Species or Covered Species Groups to capture, temporarily possess, and relocate those Covered Species to reduce harm or mortality in connection with otherwise lawful Project activities. When moving Covered Species out of harm's way, Permittee shall relocate the individuals of the Covered Species to a safe location as near as reasonably practicable to the location at which they are originally found or to a location specified in the Workplan.

---

[11] CDFW is aware of both City of Avalon Code sections 4-5.101 (Permit Required to Fire Weapons) and 6-1.128 (Animal Care and Conduct Toward Animals). The Project as authorized by CDFW in this RMP, including this RMP's restriction on Permittee's use of any Shooting Device in Avalon, should not result in any violations of City of Avalon Code section 4-5.101.

To the extent that City of Avalon Code section 6-1.128 purports to prohibit Permittee from undertaking certain components of the Project as authorized by CDFW in this RMP, CDFW's authorization of the Project in this RMP controls over any conflicting City of Avalon Code section 6-1.128 prohibitions. (Cal. Const., art. IV, § 20; Cal. Const., art. XI, § 7; Fish & G. Code, §§ 711.7, 1002, 1672, 1802, 2000; *Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. County of* Monterey (2023) 15 Cal.5th 135; *People v. Mueller* (1970) 8 Cal.App.3d 949; *In re Makings* (1927) 200 Cal. 474*; Matter of Application of Cencinino* (1916) 31 Cal.App. 238.)

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

10. Notify CDFW of Covered Species Relocation. Permittee shall notify the CDFW Contact at least five business days prior to initiation of Covered Activities.

11. Mortality or Injury of Covered Species. If any dead or injured individuals of the Covered Species—except for mule deer—are found, whether during relocation/movement out of harm's way, permanent translocation activities, or otherwise, Permittee shall immediately call or email the CDFW Contact.

12. Listed Plant Species Disposal. Permittee shall ensure that all seed or plant material that remains following completion of the Project will be returned to the site where they were collected or shall be deposited at a CDFW approved facility that has agreed to accept the seed or plant material for long-term storage.

IV. Conditions of Approval for Project Monitoring and Reporting

1. Monitoring. Permittee shall conduct Project monitoring as proposed by Permittee in the Workplan.

2. Reporting.

    a. Annual Report. By mail or email, Permittee shall provide the CDFW Contact a written annual report each year by January 15. The report shall include, at minimum:

    b. Relocation. The report shall include a description of both the location where any Covered Species were removed and the location of the release site, including, at minimum: photographs; the date and time of the relocation effort; a description of the equipment and methods used to collect, hold, and transport Covered Species; the number of individuals of the Covered Species relocated; the number of Covered Species injured or killed; a brief narrative of the circumstances surrounding listed Covered Species injuries or mortalities; Adaptive Management Strategies; any need for coordination with CDFW, GPS locations of any source plants for seed and vegetative material collection; and a description of any problems which arose during the relocation activities and a statement as to whether or not the activities had any unforeseen effects.

    c. Monitoring. The report shall summarize the monitoring activities that were conducted during the prior year as required by section IV(1) of this RMP, including the number of all Covered Species captured; the life stage of the Covered Species captured or tagged; biological data collected from Covered Species, any population level data relevant to Covered Activities, any species-specific updates the number and species of Covered Species injured or killed; a brief narrative of the circumstances surrounding Covered Species injuries or mortalities; and a description of any problems which arose during monitoring activities and a statement as to whether or not the activities had any unforeseen effects.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

d. Take Table. Completed take tables from this RMP with the addition of added columns to include actual take and actual mortality. The form of the take table is included as Exhibit 3, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

e. Field Survey Forms. California Native Species Field Survey forms for listed or rare species, including all information specified in CDFW's *Instructions for Submitting Data to the CNDDB*, available online: https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB/Submitting-Data

3. Five Year Review Report. Permittee shall submit a five year review report to the CDFW Contact by January 15, 2031, and January 15, 2036, including a compilation of data from vegetation surveys, wildlife monitoring, and site assessments.

Contacts

Permittee:

Lauren Dennhardt
Senior Director of Conservation
320 Golden Shore, Suite #220
Long Beach, CA 90802
(310) 510-2595
ldennhardt@catalinaconservancy.org

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW Contact):

Christian Romberger
3030 Old Ranch Pkwy, Suite 400
Seal Beach, CA 90740
(562) 292-6365
christian.romberger@wildlife.ca.gov
R5RMP@wildlife.ca.gov

V. Effective Date and Termination

The effective date of this RMP shall be the date of execution, and unless extended, amended, or revoked, this RMP will terminate 10 years from the effective date (Termination Date).

VI. Extension

If Permittee is unable to complete the Covered Activities by the Termination Date, Permittee may request in writing that CDFW extend the term of this RMP without otherwise changing the terms and conditions of this RMP, which request CDFW may grant in its reasonable discretion. A written request to extend the term of this RMP must be

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

received by CDFW at least sixty days prior to the then-current termination date of the RMP. If CDFW grants the request, CDFW will reissue this RMP with a new Termination Date and without changing any other terms and conditions of this RMP.

VII. Amendment

Other than an extension of the Termination Date pursuant to Section VI (Extension) of this RMP, this RMP may only be amended in the following ways:

1. Amendment by Mutual Agreement. This RMP may be amended by mutual agreement of CDFW and Permittee. To initiate an amendment to this RMP, either Permittee shall submit a written amendment request to CDFW or CDFW shall submit a written amendment request to Permittee. An RMP amendment shall become effective when a written amendment is signed by CDFW. Amendments to this RMP by mutual agreement may include the transfer of this RMP to a new permittee.

2. Unilateral Amendment or Termination by CDFW.

   CDFW may amend or terminate this RMP without the concurrence of Permittee: (a) as required by law; (b) if CDFW determines that continued implementation of the Project as authorized by this RMP would jeopardize the continued existence of any Covered Species or other endangered, threatened, candidate, fully protected, or rare species; or (c) if there are substantial changes in the Project or biological conditions that may cause new or different impacts to native fish, wildlife, plants, or their habitat or may cause the Project to no longer meet the definition of a qualifying restoration project as set forth in Fish and Game Code section 1671, subdivision (d)(1).

VIII. Suspension and Revocation

CDFW may issue a written decision to suspend or revoke this RMP if Permittee fails to complete the Project as described in the Project Description, fails to comply with any term or condition of this RMP, or fails to commence Project activities within two years from the effective date.

IX. Compliance with Other Laws

This RMP sets forth CDFW's requirements for Permittee to complete the Project pursuant to the Restoration Management Permit Act. (Fish & G. Code, § 1670 et seq.) This RMP does not necessarily create an entitlement to proceed with the Project. Except for the statement in footnote 11 of this RMP that CDFW's authorization of the Project in this RMP controls over any conflicting City of Avalon Code section 6-1.128 prohibitions, Permittee is responsible for complying with all other applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

X. CEQA Compliance

CDFW has determined that the Project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.56.

XI. Findings Pursuant to the Restoration Management Permit Act:

These findings are intended to document CDFW's compliance with the Restoration Management Permit Act. (Fish & G. Code, § 1670 et seq.)

CDFW finds based on substantial evidence in the RMP Application, Workplan, HRMP, Scientific Assessment, and CDFW's administrative record of proceedings for this RMP that issuance of this RMP complies with and is consistent with the Restoration Management Permit Act. CDFW further specifically finds as follows:

(1) The Project meets the definition of a qualifying restoration project as set forth in Fish and Game Code section 1671, subdivision (d)(1):

a. Pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 1671, subdivisions (b) and (c), the Project is a management or propagation project that includes activities that will: benefit, aid the conservation of, and assist in the recovery of a native fish, wildlife, or plant species, such as restoration of native fish, wildlife, plants, or their habitat and propagation; or help sustain or increase native fish, wildlife, or plant populations for scientific, conservation, management, or educational purposes;

b. Pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 1671, subdivision (d)(1), the Project has the primary purpose of restoring native fish, wildlife, plants, or their habitat;

c. Pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 1671, subdivision (d)(1), the Project will result in a substantial net benefit to any one or more of the following: native fish; native wildlife; native plants; or the habitat of native fish, native wildlife, or native plants.

d. Pursuant to Fish and Game section 1671, subdivision (e), CDFW reasonably expects that substantial net benefit will be a substantial, cumulative benefit to native fish, wildlife, plants, or their habitat, or any combination thereof, above baseline conditions. In making this determination, CDFW considered the duration of the qualifying restoration project; all impacts on native fish, wildlife, plants, or their habitat, or any combination thereof, from the qualifying restoration project; and any other information in the administrative record of proceedings for CDFW's issuance of this RMP. Further, the substantial net benefit will assist either directly or indirectly in the recovery of native fish, wildlife, plants, or their habitat, or a combination thereof.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

e. Pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 1671, subdivision (d)(2), other benefits that result from the Project, such as flood risk reduction, recreation, or groundwater recharge, will be secondary or incidental benefits.

(2) Pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 1675, subdivision (b), this RMP requires appropriate species protection, management, monitoring, and reporting measures.

(3) Pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 1677, this RMP does not authorize any activities associated with the design, construction, operation, mitigation, or maintenance of isolated Delta conveyance facilities.

(4) The Project will not jeopardize the continued existence of any Covered Species or other endangered, threatened, candidate, fully protected, or rare species, including consideration of the species' capability to survive and reproduce and any adverse impacts of the Project on those abilities in light of known population trends, known threats to the species, and reasonably foreseeable impacts on the species from other related projects and activities. Further, this finding is based, in part, on CDFW's express authority to amend or terminate this RMP without the concurrence of Permittee to avoid jeopardy or as required by law.

ISSUED BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

DocuSigned by:
_____
D6B58CFE247241F5...

Date: 1/30/2026

Erinn Wilson-Olgin, Regional Manager
South Coast Region
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Exhibits:

1. Map Depicting Project Area
2. Island Restoration Scientific Assessment
3. Restoration Management Permit application
4. Catalina Island Restoration Project 10-Year Workplan (2026-2035)
5. Habitat Restoration and Monitoring Plan: Landscape-Scale Adaptive Weed Management and Habitat Restoration Plan to Conserve the Biodiversity of Catalina Island
6. Map Depicting 10-acre acre of Active Restoration
7. Map Depicting 105-acre area of Active Restoration
8. Map Depicting 100-acre area of Active Restoration
9. Covered Species Take Reporting Table Template

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

References

1. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service federal Endangered Species Act section 10(a)(1)(A) recovery permit for Catalina Island fox (*Urocyon littoralis catalinae*), issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on February 24, 2023 (Permit Number ES090990)

2. American Veterinary Medical Association's Guidelines for Euthanasia of Animals, American Veterinary Medical Association, 2020

3. California Wildlife Damage Management Environmental Assessment, United States Department of Agriculture, 2023

4. WS Firearms Safety Manual, United States Department of Agriculture, 2018

5. Wild Pig Depredation Permit Guidance, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2021

6. BirdNET. https://birdnet.cornell.edu/, BirdNET, 2025

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B


Exhibit 1 – Map Depicting Project Area



Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit 2 – Island Restoration Scientific Assessment

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Island Restoration Scientific Assessment

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

CATALINA ISLAND CONSERVANCY™

Prepared by
Dr. Lauren Dennhardt Senior Director of Conservation
Daniel Wehner Ecological Restoration Project Manager
Aaron Kreisberg Plant Conservation Manager
Kevin Alison Native Plant Manager
Rachel Boyce Restoration Ecologist
John Knapp Senior Conservation Scientist
Sasha Gannon Ecological Restoration Project Manager

2025

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table of Contents

1. Abstract 5
2. Catalina Island Restoration Project Overview 5
1.1 Restoration Project Benefits 7
1.1.1 Climate Resilience 7
1.1.2 Biodiversity 8
1.1.3 Sensitive Species Recovery 8
1.1.4 Public Benefit 9
1.2 Catalina Island Habitat Restoration and Monitoring Plan 10
1.3 Public Outreach Concerning the Restoration Project and Invasive Mule Deer Removal 11
2. History of Introduced Ungulates on Catalina Island 13
2.1 Removed and Managed Ungulates (hooved animals) 13
2.2 Invasive Mule Deer Management 13
2.2.1 Introduction & Early Translocation Attempt 13
2.2.2 Hunting & Private Lands Management Program 14
2.2.3 Caged Outplantings & Exclosure Fencing 18
3. Necessity of Eradicating Invasive Mule Deer from Catalina Island 23
3.1 Evidence of Ecological Damage from Invasive Mule Deer 23
3.1.1 Harm to Native Plant & Animal Populations 23
3.1.2 Increased Wildfire Risk 30
3.2 Inability of Alternative Methodologies at Managing Invasive Mule Deer 32
3.2.1 Translocation 32
3.2.2 Recreational Hunting 33
3.2.3 Fencing 34
3.2.4 Fertility Control 37
3.3 Proposal to Remove Invasive Mule Deer using Ground-based Specialists 37
3.3.1 Benefits and Examples of Proposed Invasive Mule Deer Removal 37
3.3.2 Public Safety of Deer Removal Proposal 42
3.3.3 Humaneness of Invasive Mule Deer Removal Proposal 42
3.3.4. Safety and Ubiquitousness of Night Shooting 43
3.3.5. Use of Detection Dogs on Catalina Island and Other Islands 46
3.3.6. Credentials of White Buffalo Inc. 48
References 51

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit A: Hunting Tag and Harvest Data, 1982-2024 61
Exhibit B: Table of Rare Plant Taxa on Catalina Island..... 63
Exhibit C: Timeline of Introductions and Eradications on the Channel Islands 68
Exhibit D: Letters of Support..... 70

1. American Association of Wildlife Veterinarians
2. American Bird Conservancy
3. California Botanic Garden
4. California Invasive Plant Council
5. Center for Biological Diversity
6. California Institute of Environmental Studies
7. California Native Plant Society
8. Endangered Habitats League
9. Friends of the LA River
10. Gabrielino Tongva
11. Global Conservation Consortium – Oak
12. Grupo de Ecologia y Conservacion de Islas
13. Hills For Everyone
14. Keri Dearborn
15. Irvine Ranch Conservancy
16. Island Conservation
17. Dr. William Hayes, Professor of Biology, Loma Linda University
18. United States Department of Interior – National Park Service
19. Santa Barabara Botanic Garden
20. Robyn Shea, Lead Research Specialist, Santa Rosa Island Research Station
21. Roger Young, Catalina Island Resident
22. The Nature Conservancy
23. Dr. Dirk H Van Vuren, Professor of Wildlife Biology, UC Davis
24. T. Winston Vickers, DVM, MPVM, Associate Research Veterinarian – UC Davis Wildlife
25. Dr. Travis Longcore, Adjunct Professor, UCLA
26. Dr. Lisa Stratton, Director of Ecosystem Management, UC Santa Barbara
27. United States Department of Interior – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
28. Wildlands Conservation Science
29. Dr. Katherine Pease

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

30. Conservation Corps of Long Beach
31. Huttopia
32. LA Conservation Corps (The Corps)
33. Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust
34. Outward Bound Adventures
35. Laura Ahkiam, Parent, LBUSD
36. Terry Grill, Former Chair Board of Directors Catalina Island Conservancy
37. Anthony F. Michaels, Catalina Island Conservancy Board
38. San Gabriel Mountains Regional Conservancy
39. Chair of the Benefactors & Chair of the Board of Directors, Catalina Island Conservancy
40. Catalina Island Company
41. Southern California Edison
42. Dr. Geraldine Knatz, Professor of the Practice of Policy and Engineering, USC
43. Patricia McCormick, Catalina Island Resident
44. National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA)
45. Coastal Corridor Alliance
46. Victoria Dean, Catalina Island Conservancy Board
47. Josh Lowenthal, Assemblymember, 69th District
48. Steven L. Monfort, DVM, PhD, Executive Director, UC Natural Reserve System
49. Adam B. Schiff, Member of Congress
50. The South Los Angeles Transit Empowerment Zone (SLATE-Z)
51. Ventura Land Trust
52. Orange County Coastkeeper
53. Jessica Rodriguez, Catalina Island Business Owner, Newport Landing Sportfishing & Whale Watching
54. Maureen H. Ramer, Vice-Chair Catalina Island Conservancy Board of Directors
55. Blanny Avalon Hagenah, Part-Time Catalina Island Resident
56. Catalina Adventure Tours
57. Ken Owen, Executive Director, Channel Island Restoration

Exhibit E: White Buffalo Inc. Portfolio 165

Exhibit F. Curriculum Vitae of Authors 190

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

1. Abstract

This Island Restoration Scientific Assessment was developed by the Conservancy's experts in restoration ecology, southern California conservation, wildlife management, and island ecosystems. The Scientific Assessment reflects the best available science in island restoration and wildlife management, drawing on decades of research and practice from specialists across the globe. This scientific rigor is further reinforced by the letters of support from respected scientific professionals and conservation organizations included in this document.

The Scientific Assessment outlines the ecological benefits of comprehensive restoration on Catalina Island, drawing clear connections to results from comparable restoration efforts worldwide as well as experimental and long-term studies conducted on Catalina itself.

The Assessment demonstrates that removing invasive mule deer with trained specialists is a critical step for successful island-wide restoration on Catalina Island. The Conservancy's proposed deer removal fully aligns with established best practices for island restoration, both globally and within California, ensuring that the Restoration Project will be humane, safe, and effective, and will meaningfully advance the long-term recovery and resilience of Catalina's unique ecosystem.

2. Catalina Island Restoration Project Overview

The Catalina Island Restoration Project (Project) aims to restore ecological integrity on Santa Catalina Island, 88% (42,135 acres) of which is owned and managed by the Catalina Island Conservancy (Conservancy) in Los Angeles County, California. The Catalina Island Conservancy is a 501(c)(3) non-profit with a mission to be an exemplary steward of Island resources through a balance of conservation, education, and recreation. The Conservancy runs multiple conservation programs such as invasive plant control, rare plant monitoring and propagation, fox monitoring, and shrew monitoring.

The Project focuses on mitigating ecological threats posed by invasive plant species, human-caused fire ignition, nonnative mule deer, and a changing climate, which have collectively led to biodiversity loss, erosion, decreased water capture, and reduced habitat quality. The Conservancy plans to begin the Project in 2026 and is committed to continuing it through 2035.

The first 10 years of the Project aim to refine broad invasive plant treatments followed by seeding native plant species within an enclosed 10-acre site. That site will then be expanded to 105 acres before moving forward on a second major restoration location.

Critically, to reduce negative impacts caused by the high dispersal rate of invasive species, active restoration will be paired with extensive biosecurity measures, such as invasive plant treatments and fox mortality tracking and a vaccination program for the Catalina Island fox. The Project is built on a foundation of adaptive management with two scales of monitoring: 1) Island-wide and 2) active restoration. Finally, invasive mule deer will be lethally removed from the landscape to allow for Island-wide natural restoration in which the landscape begins to

heal itself, and active habitat restoration work by conservationists. Together all aspects of the Project will ensure a safer and more biodiverse Catalina Island – ultimately removing cages from rare plants and fencing from the landscape.

As climate change intensifies, Catalina is at risk of losing more habitat, state and federally listed plant species, and rare and endemic species (species found nowhere else on Earth) through more frequent fires and the depletion of the soil seed bank (the reserve of seeds stored in the soil). The lack of native woody vegetation and the spread of invasive annual grasslands has increased soil erosion, reduced water capture into the landscape, and degraded the quality of wildlife habitat. Much of what was once island chaparral and coastal sage scrub is transitioning into invasive annual grasslands, which increase the risk of more frequent and faster-moving fires. The growing likelihood of wildfire ignition across Catalina's landscape puts the entire island, including the City of Avalon (Avalon) at risk.

These challenges have likewise caused diminished climate resilience, a loss in native plant and wildlife biodiversity, the extirpation of native species on Catalina, and the extinction of others like the endemic Trask's monkeyflower (*Diplacus traskiae*) and other species also native to the mainland such as Pacific dogwood (*Cornus nutallii*), and *Lycium hassei*.

The challenges on Catalina are exacerbated by the invasive mule deer population. Mule deer were introduced to the Island in the late 1920s and early 1930s from ten individuals in total but quickly grew to a herd of over 2,000. Their continued presence and browsing behavior harm native plant populations (especially endemic species) and wildlife habitats, increase the transition of habitat types from native chapparal to invasive annual grasses, and degrade the ecosystems functions that all Island residents rely on for water capture and recreational value. The nonnative mule deer are suppressing the natural restoration of the ecosystem that would otherwise be expected to occur following the prior removal of feral sheep, cattle, feral goats, turkeys, and feral pigs from Catalina and are also preventing active restoration efforts on Catalina at the island-wide scale. The ecological challenges facing Catalina cannot be solved in a long-term, sustainable way as long as nonnative mule deer continue to prevent the recovery and restoration of the Island's natural habitat.

For decades, the Catalina Island Conservancy and its supporters have worked to reduce environmental impacts from feral animals that have degraded and overwhelmed the Island's ecosystems. As part of these efforts, the Conservancy spent 42 years attempting to manage the deer population through recreational hunting under the Private Lands Management Program. Even with the longest hunting season in California and years of prioritizing the removal of does before bucks, this hunting program made little progress in reducing the deer herd. The Conservancy's long-term experience, and decades of hunting data, show invasive mule deer on Catalina Island cannot be effectively managed through recreational hunting.

The damage caused by deer and other introduced ungulates on Catalina is too severe to fix through deer removal alone. The Project addresses these issues by removing the nonnative mule deer, enacting landscape-scale habitat restoration to reverse vegetation type conversion, and continuing long-term monitoring of plant and wildlife populations. Ultimately though, successful implementation of the Project, and its myriad benefits, depends on completely removing mule deer from the Island.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

1.1 Restoration Project Benefits

The restoration of Catalina is critical for the future of the Island's ecology, especially considering the effects of climate change and increasingly uncertain weather patterns. For the ecosystem to be as resilient as possible, it is important to ensure that all of Catalina's native biodiversity is represented on the genetic, species, and landscape scale (Oliver, et al., 2015). Without restoration, Catalina is at risk of having its natural systems altered or degraded. These systems, including water capture, soil retention, and fire resilience, are vital not only for Catalina's native plants and wildlife, but also for the people who live on and visit the Island (Carpenter, Bennet, & Peterson, 2006).

1.1.1 Climate Resilience

The Project supports Catalina's long-term climate resilience through several strategies. By supporting revegetation across Catalina through deer removal, invasive plant reduction, extensive reseeding, replenishing the native seed bank, and targeted plantings, the Project will bolster carbon sequestration. Restoring perennial plants will increase the level of carbon dioxide absorbed by vegetation and stored in the soil, helping to reduce atmospheric carbon levels to mitigate climate change.

The Project will also help improve soil stability and water capture on Catalina. Increased vegetation cover across the Island, particularly perennial plants which have more extensive root systems than invasive annual grasses, will help prevent soil erosion, landslides, and other forms of land degradation, ensuring the land's long-term health and productivity. By increasing soil stability and vegetation cover, the Project will also improve Catalina's ability to capture fog and rain and retain water. Without this stability, much of that water runs off the landscape, contributing to erosion, or evaporates before plants can use it. This improved water capture will support the health of plant and animal species on the Island and increase the ecosystem's resilience in the face of potential droughts and rising temperatures due to climate change (Woolsey, Hanna, McEachern, Anderson, & Hartman, 2018) (Rastogi & et al., 2016).

The Project's climate resilience benefits also include the protection of vital mesic habitats on Catalina. Mesic habitats are characterized by a balanced moisture supply throughout the growing season compared to other areas that may receive moisture for only a short period of time. These habitats are critical for numerous wildlife species native to the Southern California region as they provide more moderate, dependable conditions for plants and animals. These habitats are found within Catalina's canyons and drainages which offer protection from solar radiation and collect moisture, creating conditions that support species such as the endemic Santa Catalina lancetooth snail (*Haplotrema catalinense*), Santa Catalina shrew (*Sorex ornatus willetti*), and Santa Catalina Island fox (*Urocyon littoralis catalinae*). With changing climate conditions leading to potential range contractions for many species, the protection and preservation of these mesic habitats will provide essential refugia (safe habitat areas full of biodiversity) for organisms, ensuring their continued survival. These mesic communities not only provide a vital resource to local island species, but they provide the needed resources for migratory birds along the Pacific Flyway (Morgan, Maxwell, Tsao, Wildinson, & Etnoyer, 2005).

Lastly, the Project will address the existing invasive annual grasslands that have replaced native plant communities on Catalina. These are areas where a suite of invasive grasses have outcompeted native species, leading to higher ignitability and reduced biodiversity. As

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

conditions on Catalina become hotter and drier and as annual grasses have replaced evergreen native perennials, it is crucial to improve the resilience of these landscapes to wildfires and restore native perennials. Restoring these areas with native vegetation will create a more fire-resilient and less ignitable landscape, which will help reduce the risk of large, fast-moving wildfires. This restoration will occur through natural recovery, where perennial plants emerge from the soil seed bank, and through active restoration by seeding and planting a diversity of evergreen shrubs to replace the near year-round flashy fuels created by invasive grasses.

1.1.2 Biodiversity

The Project offers significant long-term net benefits to biodiversity on Catalina and the endemic species shared between Catalina and other Channel Islands. An initial focus of the Project is the mitigation of the negative impact caused by the nonnative deer population on the Island. By removing this pressure, the Project will allow vegetation to recover, especially the rare and endemic plant species that are now scarce on Catalina because deer prefer to eat them.

The Project's biodiversity enhancement strategy also includes addressing invasive plant species. These invasive species outcompete native plants for resources, which can lead to a reduction in biodiversity in the immediate invaded area and loss of habitat diversity across the Island. Through focused efforts to control and reduce the proliferation of invasive species, followed by seeding and planting with native species, the Project will help restore more biodiverse plant communities.

These actions not only enhance and preserve the unique flora found only on Catalina but also contribute to more biodiverse wildlife populations. The Project will achieve this by creating and expanding diverse plant communities that that provide refuge, forage, and breeding habitat for wildlife. By creating a more diverse and robust network of habitats, the Project will support a wider range of species, thereby promoting overall biodiversity on the Island.

For example, the Catalina Hutton’s vireo (*Vireo huttoni unitti*) depends on the island scrub oak (*Quercus pacifica*) for habitat. The scrub oak’s propagules (acorns) do not survive to maturity in large part due to browsing from deer. With browsing pressure removed, we expect that more scrub oaks will reach maturity, creating more habitat for the Catalina Hutton’s vireo. In fact, improvements in wildlife biodiversity, in particular invertebrates and birds, have also been noted on other islands following the removal of nonnative ungulates.

1.1.3 Sensitive Species Recovery

The Project will provide substantial long-term net benefits to the recovery of sensitive species on Catalina. The Project is expected to expand breeding, foraging, and refuge habitat for wildlife species such as the federally and state threatened Santa Catalina Island fox *(Urocyon littoralis catalinae*), Catalina Hutton's vireo (*Vireo huttoni unitti*), Island loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus anthonyi*), two-striped gartersnake (*Thamnophis hammondii*), Catalina California quail (*Callipepla californica catalinensis*), and Santa Catalina shrew (*Sorex ornatus willetti*). Each of these species are designated as a Species of Greatest Conservation Need per the 2015 and 2025 California Department of Fish and Wildlife State Wildlife Action Plan. In particular, the Catalina Hutton’s vireo is expected to benefit due to its use of

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

oak woodland habitat, which has been degraded by a diminished seed bank and continued presence of introduced deer, which leads to a lack of new oaks sprouting on the landscape. Without action the oaks will not be replaced on Catalina.

The Project will aid in the recovery of sensitive plant species, including island mountain lilac (*Ceanothus arboreus*), the Federally and State endangered Santa Catalina Island mountain-mahogany (*Cercocarpus traskiae*) with only six known wild species left, the Federally threatened island rush-rose (*Crocanthemum greenei*), Catalina grass *(Poa thomasii*), southern island mallow (*Lavatera assurgentiflora* ssp*. glabra*), Catalina ironwood *(Lyonothamnus floribundus* ssp*. floribundus*), Santa Catalina Island bush-mallow (*Malacothamnus fasciculatus* var*. catalinensis*), the federally and state endangered Lyon's pygmydaisy (*Pentacheta lyonii*), the federally endangered Santa Cruz Island rockcress (*Sibara filifolia*), and Catalina nightshade (*Solanum wallacei*), many of which are recognized by the California Native Plant Society with Rare Plant Ratings, and are identified as Species of Greatest Conservation Need. Catalina's endemic plant species, including those shared with other Channel Islands, are expected to recover the most once deer are removed. These endemic plant species, having evolved without large herbivores, have lost their physical and chemical defenses to herbivore eating habits.

1.1.4 Public Benefit

The Project will result in many incidental public benefits to Catalina and Avalon, including increased recreational opportunities, more secure freshwater resources, and increased safety from wildfires through the improvement of ecosystem services on the Island. The enhancement and expansion of native habitats will promote safe recreation on the Island such as hiking, biking, and plant and wildlife viewing. Additionally, the removal of fences and cages, currently necessary to protect sensitive species from browsing by nonnative mule deer, will increase the visual and aesthetic appeal of the Island. With no recreational hunting occurring on the landscape, visitors will no longer face safety incidents that are reported occasionally during the hunting season, creating a safer experience for everyone.

The Project will help secure freshwater resources for Catalina's population, which depends on a system of wells and reservoirs in watersheds across the Island for freshwater. This system relies significantly on rainfall to recharge groundwater in these watersheds. Over the last 20 years, as prolonged drought has become more common, the draw on freshwater resources has outpaced the amount of precipitation the Island receives. The Project will help to reduce the amount of rainfall lost to runoff in these watersheds by restoring native vegetation and by capturing moisture from fog. The Project will help replace invasive annual grasses with native woody vegetation which is structurally well-suited to capture water droplets on leaves and branches. This captured water then permeates into the soil and groundwater supply, reducing the amount of moisture lost to evaporation.

The Project will also help mitigate the risk of wildfire to Avalon and other inhabited areas of the Island. Invasive annual grasses are a significant contributor to wildfire risk because they are highly ignitable, allow fire to spread rapidly, and quickly regrow after fire. Some firefighters compare the spread of wildfire in grasslands to gasoline that has been ignited since it spreads quickly over large areas. These factors promote a higher frequency of fire, a pattern that would not be healthy for the Island ecosystem or the inhabitants of Avalon. These invasive grasses create a negative feedback loop. Once grasslands are established, more fire occurs, and more chaparral converts into grasslands. The Project will help to reduce the presence of these flammable invasive annual grasses across the Island and restore these

areas with native chaparral, which naturally burns much less frequently and is less ignitable than invasive grasslands This is because chaparral plants are mostly evergreen shrubs that retain more moisture throughout the year, are less likely to ignite in the first place, and burn slower if they do ignite. Fire Safe Councils in towns like Santa Barbara and San Diego promote oaks, shrubs, and sages because they have a higher moisture content and are less likely to ignite and spread fires (CNPS, bewaterwise.com, Centers, Payne, & Diego, 2025).

1.2 Catalina Island Habitat Restoration and Monitoring Plan

As part of the broader Island Restoration Project, the Conservancy is implementing an integrated island-wide strategy to restore ecological function, reduce wildfire risk and rebuild resilient native habitats. A foundational component of the Island Restoration Project is the development of a science-based planning and monitoring framework that identifies where active restoration is needed and what conditions are required for successful recovery. The Conservancy contracted with Land IQ to develop a landscape-scale *Catalina Island Habitat Restoration and Monitoring Plan.* The Habitat Restoration and Monitoring Plan identifies suitable habitat restoration targets for degraded island vegetation communities, provides restoration principles that leverage natural ecological processes, prioritizes restoration opportunities by watershed management unit, and provides best practice for high quality, cost-effective habitat restoration and enhancement at the landscape-scale to support the long-term conservation and restoration of the Island's unique ecosystems. The Habitat Restoration and Monitoring Plan incorporates a Long-Term Monitoring Plan that will monitor changes in vegetation and island ecosystem health over time to assess progress toward restoration goals and responses to the removal of deer.

The Habitat Restoration and Monitoring Plan also makes clear that meaningful landscape-scale restoration cannot occur without addressing the ecological stressors that have shaped the island for decades, most notably the chronic browsing pressure from introduced deer. The deer's continued presence fundamentally limits the Conservancy's ability to implement the restoration strategies identified by the Habitat Restoration and Monitoring Plan and to achieve the broader Island Restoration Project objectives

Removing deer from Catalina is a critical component of achieving the Project's goals, as their continued presence and browsing habits inhibit the restoration of native vegetation and habitat. However, the Conservancy anticipates that many sites will not recover passively because the seed bank has been depleted, the site has been invaded by invasive annual grasses, and/or the site has lost significant topsoil. Many of these degraded sites are at the top of watersheds and impact everything downstream. These top-of-watershed sites are high priority restoration areas. Restoration efforts without fencing have been unsuccessful due to deer browsing. Thus, prior to removal of the deer, the Conservancy and its partners will erect a 10 acres exclosure to exclude deer and begin testing active restoration methods from herbicide applications, native seed mixes, container plantings, and recovery monitoring methods.

Together the Habitat Restoration and Monitoring Plan and Long-Term Monitoring Plan provide the scientific strategies for restoration actions while deer removal creates the ecological conditions necessary for those actions to succeed, aligning all components of the Island Restoration Project toward long-term recovery of Catalina's native ecosystems.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

1.3 Public Outreach Concerning the Restoration Project and Invasive Mule Deer Removal

Public outreach about the prior version of the Restoration Project started in 2022 and 2023 through early conversations with stakeholders about the proposal to remove the nonnative mule deer and its importance to the overall Project. The Conservancy spoke to more than 70 community leaders on the Island, including longtime residents, business owners, frequent hunters, and members of the local humane society, to receive their feedback and input on the deer removal proposal.

On May 27, 2023, the Conservancy hosted some Gabrieleno-Tongva representatives on the Island to discuss the problems the invasive mule deer cause as well as the formation of an ongoing Indigenous community collaborative initiative among the Conservancy and tribal representatives to ensure continued dialogue. The Conservancy also provided the details of the initial deer removal plan to the tribes and solicited feedback at an additional meeting on October 23, 2023. The Conservancy hosted the tribes again in 2024 and signed a Memorandum of Understanding in September of 2025 with representatives of the Gabrielino Tongva Tribe, Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California, San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians Gabrieleño/Tongva and Gabrielino-Shoshone Nation of Southern California.

The Conservancy hosted two advisory committee meetings on June 16 and July 28, 2023 to discuss island restoration and deer removal. Invitees included representatives from the Catalina Island Tourism Authority, the Catalina Island Company, the Wrigley Institute of Environmental Studies, Southern California Edison, as well as the local Avalon veterinarian, City of Avalon representatives, local hunters, and hunting guides. The first advisory committee meeting focused on describing the problem that nonnative mule deer pose to the Island and included a site visit to the Catalina Island Restoration Area. This area was fenced shortly after the 2007 Island Fire to prevent deer access and has shown what's possible through natural recovery without deer impacts. The second meeting involved a discussion of the potential solutions to this challenge, in which the Conservancy received suggestions and thoughts on the Proposal.

In early October 2023, the Conservancy published a website providing information and resources concerning the proposed deer removal and set up an email address to receive comments from the public. On October 17, 2023, the Conservancy presented details about the Catalina Island Restoration Project, including the proposed deer removal, to the Avalon City Council during the City Council's regularly scheduled public meeting. Conservancy staff listened to public comments about the proposal before the Conservancy's presentation.

To further engage with the public, the Conservancy began offering free tours of the fenced Catalina Island Restoration Area. These tours provided more information on the damage deer cause to the Island ecosystem and were publicized as an opportunity to directly ask Conservancy staff questions concerning the Project and deer removal. The first tour was offered on October 25, 2023 for the local Rotary Club. Additional tours were offered starting in November 2023 through February 2024, on about five days per month, with both morning and afternoon times available, as well as both weekdays and weekends. These tours were advertised in The Islander local newspaper, and as flyers posted on community bulletin boards, locally targeted advertisements on both Facebook and Instagram, and at the City Council Meeting on October 17, 2023. A total of 30 individuals joined the tours.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

On January 31, 2024, the Conservancy held a Community Forum at the Avalon Theatre on the proposed deer removal. The event was hosted by an independent moderator and included several experts from outside the Conservancy including The Nature Conservancy, UC Davis, and the National Park Service who have worked on invasive animal eradications on islands as panelists. The event was made as inclusive as possible through in-person and online viewing options and a live Spanish translation online. Questions from the public were received during the registration process as well as through handwritten cards at the event. Multiple questions were answered during the event, with many more gathered and posted with answers on the Conservancy's website.

The Conservancy also hosted many "Community Conversations" on March 1, March 18, April 8, July 7, and September 11 2024. They continued in 2025 on October 14, November 12 and December 9. These events provided conversational public engagement opportunities, to allow the public to ask additional questions, and discuss the Project and Proposal directly with Conservancy leadership.

Additionally, the Conservancy has been interviewed by a variety of media outlets to answer questions on the Catalina Island Restoration Project. Conservancy staff has been interviewed by The New York Times, Los Angeles Times, LAist, ABC7, The Catalina Islander, KTLA, GearJunkie, Fox News online, OpenSpaces, local radio station KISL, CBS National News, the London Times, among others.

The Conservancy hosted a Last Friday Lecture Series titled Preserving the Catalina Island Fox with Katie Elder on July 26, 2024. In 2025, the Catalina Island Conservancy put on two events: Catalina Speaker Series: Spotlight on Protecting and Restoring Catalina's Amazing Oak Ecosystem on April 25, 2025 and A Community Conversation About Wildfire Prevention and Collaboration on February 28, 2025.

The Conservancy was asked to present in front of the LA County Fish and Wildlife Commission in May 2024, October 2024, and November 2025.

In 2025, following extensive public outreach, the Conservancy listened to stakeholders' strongest concerns and interests and made several key changes to the Project:

1) **Aerial shooting**-The Conservancy removed aerial shooting from the project and elected to only utilize ground based shooting by specialists as the primary removal method.

2) **Carcas Utilization**- A subset of deer carcasses will be gathered and donated to support the Condor Recovery Program.

In light of these changes, the Conservancy formally withdrew its permit application for the initial version of the Island Restoration Project in August 2025. The Conservancy subsequently submitted a new application to CDFW in September 2025 for a redesigned Island Restoration Project that prioritizes holistic restoration strategies and modifies the proposed deer removal as described above, in response to public input.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

The Conservancy has made all of its permit application materials publicly available on its website since October 2025, and has continued to actively engage with local Catalina residents, the City of Avalon, and other stakeholders regarding the proposed Restoration Project since that time.

2. History of Introduced Ungulates on Catalina Island

2.1 Removed and Managed Ungulates (hooved animals)

Large ungulate herbivore introductions on Catalina Island began as early as 1827. These introductions include goats (*Capra hircus*) in 1827, cattle (*Bos taurus*) and sheep (*Ovis aries*) in 1863, pigs (*Sus scrofa*) in the 1920s, bison (*Bison bison*) in 1924, mule deer in 1928 (Landis, 2000) and black buck antelope (*Antilope cervicapra*) in 1968. The historical presence of these large herbivores has significantly altered the vegetation communities on Catalina (Landis, 2000; Laughrin, Carroll, Bromfield, & Carroll, 1994; Knapp, 2009; Minnich, 1982; Knapp, 2005; Manuwal & Sweitzer, 2007). Subsequently, nearly all introduced herbivores have been removed, including sheep in the 1920s, cattle in 1954, pigs ~2004, goats ~2005, and blackbuck antelope ~2008. Although the Conservancy knew of the damage deer caused to the landscape, it decided to focus on removing the feral ungulates, pigs and goats first. The introduced bison population is managed by the Conservancy through an immunocontraception program. Catalina's bison herd was once as large as 527 individuals, but there are currently less than 80 individuals. The bison herd no longer is reproductively active.

2.2 Invasive Mule Deer Management

2.2.1 Introduction & Early Translocation Attempt

Newspaper archives indicate two mule deer were initially introduced to Catalina in 1928 and eight more in 1930 under a permit issued by the State Division of Fish and Game (Bruce, 1948; Day, 1948). Because the deer had no natural predators on the Island, the population boomed to 2,500 in less than a decade. The challenges deer posed to the Island were documented as early as 1947, when it was recorded that, "*Free from predation by coyotes, lions, and other hereditary enemies, excepting occasional forays by bald eagles seeking helpless fawns, the deer herd grew by leaps and bounds. When drought, such as exists this summer, parches the highlands, the deer move right into the irrigated areas*," (Long Beach Press-Telegram, 1947). The Catalina population of deer were surveyed as part of a statewide surveying effort conducted from 1948 to 1950, which determined that there were 2,000 deer on Catalina in 1949 (Longhurst, Leopold, & Dasmann, 1952).

Reports from Avalon of deer stripping away plants, climbing staircases, and even eating poison oak prompted the Catalina Island Company to ask the Fish and Game Commission for a solution (Long Beach Independent, 1948). It was proposed to round up the entire deer population and ship them off Island (Portland Press Herald, 1948). The Catalina Island Company decided the best option would be to shoot the deer, but the Fish and Game Commission was concerned about the public perception (Cedar Rapids Gazette, 1948). It was eventually decided to ship the deer off the Island, but this ultimately failed. The necessary traps were cost prohibitive and though the intention was to

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

remove all the deer from the Island, only 150 were trapped. Of the 150 deer that were trapped, only 110 survived the capture and transportation to the mainland (Long Beach Press-Telegram, 1948).

2.2.2 Hunting & Private Lands Management Program

Because of the unwillingness for a complete cull and the inability to ship the deer off the Island, a hunting season was started in 1949 (Long Beach Press-Telegram, 1949). The hunting season in 1949 was set between November 1 and January 31 (La Verne Leader, 1949). A total of 477 deer were taken, although the Fish and Game Commission was hoping for 1,250 (Palm Springs Desert Sun, 1950).

When cattle ranching moved off the Island in the 1950s, more vegetation was available for the deer to consume, though the ecosystem damage they cause was not recognized at the time. As the State began to better recognize the importance of deer population control, Catalina Island was credited as the first location in the state to encourage antlerless hunts and request a higher ratio (60:40) of does to bucks taken (Oakland Tribune, 1964; Longhurst, Leopold, & Dasmann, 1952; Associated Press, 2014).

Deer hunting has occurred on Catalina nearly every year since 1949, yet deer overpopulation has persisted. Issues of inconvenient and expensive transportation to the Island and unclaimed tags have been a longstanding problem. For many hunters, the need to obtain a deer tag made them prefer to hunt pigs and goats instead. Hunters also reported that deer population numbers were high, but that Catalina's deer were small (Culpepper, 1968).

In 1998, the Conservancy entered a Private Lands Management (PLM) agreement with the California Department of Fish and Game hoping to increase hunting to reduce the deer population. Before this, the deer hunting program was managed by the state of California and hunters were required to visit the Long Beach Department of Fish and Game office to receive tags specifically for Catalina Island. Despite this change, however, the number of deer taken remained very low under the new PLM program. Between 1998-2001 the Conservancy worked with an outfitter to help guide hunts in the interior of the Island, but that effort did not harvest enough deer to reduce deer populations. Between 2003-2008, another outfitter, Wildlife West Inc. (Wildlife West), helped increase the take on Catalina. Wildlife West was then contracted again from 2011 to 2024. As seen in Exhibit A, near the end of this document, the total harvest numbers have markedly increased under the PLM, with over 200 deer being taken in all but two years since 2003, compared to the years prior which failed to ever exceed 150. Reliable population estimates were not started on a regular basis until the 2010s which can be found in Table 1.

Year	Pop Estimate	Total Deer Harvested	Percent tag success	Hunt Mortality (% of Population)
2010	NA	180	66%	NA

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2011	NA	282	79%	NA
2012	2619	310	80%	11.84%
2013	2541	309	77%	12.16%
2014	1227	225	66%	18.34%
2015	1474	217	68%	14.72%
2016	2372	244	71%	10.29%
2017	NA	207	65%	NA
2018	2061	223	66%	10.82%
2019	1341	181	57%	13.50%
2020	NA	221	65%	NA
2021	1771	245	64%	13.80%
2022	NA	207	47%	NA
2023	NA	320	64%	NA
2024	1800	379	50.30%	21%
2025	2040			

Table 1. Deer Population Estimate with harvest numbers

In 2007-2008, the Conservancy requested an additional 200 tags, 700 tags total, increased the number of hunting guides, subsidized the costs of the tags and the costs of the hunts, and provided vehicles and staff to support the PLM program. Additionally, the Conservancy conducted public outreach to increase awareness of the deer hunting opportunity on the Island. Yet, even with this immense investment to make hunting as cheap, accessible, and popular as possible, the number of deer taken remained low in comparison to the overall population with 402 deer taken in 2007 and 254 taken in 2008 (Exhibit A).

Throughout the history of the PLM program, and particularly since the Island Fire in 2007, the Conservancy has worked to make the hunting program more accessible to the public. The Conservancy petitioned the Fish and Game Commission to expand the hunting program which resulted in Catalina hosting the longest hunting season in the state (July-December). To increase the number of local hunters, the Conservancy paid to train Conservancy staff as hunter safety educators and provided free hunter safety training to residents of the Island. To make hunting more affordable, the first hunting tag for residents of the Island were given out for free despite the costs for the tag to the Conservancy. In 2025, up to two hunting tags were made free for local residents.

In addition to tag fees, however, there have been other financial costs to deer hunting that cannot be overcome. For example, liability insurance can cost a hunter $50. This insurance is required because of the inherent risks involved in hunting and to the Conservancy as a small non-profit. Another cost is the price of travel and lodging on the Island. These aspects make further increasing subsidies for the PLM program financially unsustainable for the Conservancy. For example, in 2024, the Conservancy invested over $470,703 to increase hunting

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

in the interior and made hunting free to locals. The Conservancy partnered with Rivers of Recovery and provided vehicles and lodging to allow veterans to hunt through this partnership. The Conservancy also continued to work with Wildlife West, partnered with Wounded Warriors, and allowed non-locals to hunt using e-bikes or shuttles to access the wildlands of the Island. This effort yielded only 379 deer harvested out of the 754 tags claimed. With increased recreational hunters on the landscape however, eight safety incidents were reported that included hunters entering residential homes without prior warning, shots near Conservancy fox vaccination teams (twice), and hunters shooting in the town of Avalon which is off limits. To manage this expanded hunter effort, Conservancy resources were also shifted away from Conservation initiatives such as invasive plant removal and volunteer events. The hunt ultimately ended with a net loss of $256,108 to the Conservancy and the following year the deer population increased from 1,800 individuals to 2,040 in the interior of the Island (Table 1). In Avalon, the population increased from 55 in 2024 to 149 in 2025.

This outcome can be explained by compensatory mortality. This ecological concept means that animals taken by hunting are often the same individuals that would have died soon anyway because of limited food, drought, disease, or competition. In these cases, hunting doesn't increase the total number of deaths — it simply replaces deaths that would have occurred naturally, so the overall population size changes very little (McCullough, 1979). Research on hoofed mammals (ungulates) shows that when a population is temporarily reduced, the remaining animals often have higher survival rates. This effect is especially strong in places without predators. As a result, the population compensates for the losses and can rebound quickly (Festa-Bianchet, Gaillard, and Côté 2003). This means that even large or subsidized hunting programs may only produce short-term declines before the population grows back. Catalina has seen this pattern, which aligns with broader ungulate research (Bender, G.A., Spencer, McAllister, & Murphie, 2004).

Between 2012 and 2024, the population of deer has ranged in size from a high of 2,619 in 2012 to a low of 1,227 deer in 2015, with a mean of 2,153 deer, despite an average take of about 350 deer every year over that same period. Both the deer population and number of juveniles detected had a positive relationship with the rainfall amount during the prior year. This data suggests that the mule deer population size is controlled more by forage production than the level of deer harvest during a hunting season (Stapp, Hamblen, Duncan, & King, 2022)

Catalina has an average annual precipitation of 14 inches (Yoho, Boyle, & McIntire, 1999); however, there is a wide variable in total precipitation in any given year (Table 2). During the last decade, annual precipitation has fluctuated from as little as 4.20" to 20.92". This corresponds with fluctuations of abundant years of forage with a positive reproductive response from deer to subsequent years of very little vegetation growth during drought years, which reduces the deer population through starvation. For example, the successive drought years 2014/2015 and 2015/2016, followed by an above average rain year (2016/2017) of 15.78", followed then by one of the driest years on record (4.2") in 2017/2018, led to high numbers of emaciated deer observed throughout the Island and in the town of Avalon where many deer searched for forage in resident's landscaping. Six of the last ten years have been below average rainfall years, and with the increased seesaw effect of precipitation driven by a changing climate.

Table 2. Precipitation by season

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Precipitation Season	Precipitation as Rain in Inches	Deer population the following year (year)
2015-2016	8.13	NA
2016-2017	15.78	2061 (2018)
2017-2018	4.20	1341 (2019)
2018-2019	17.31	NA (2020)
2019-2020	12.31	1771 (2021)
2020-2021	4.35	NA (2022)
2021-2022	7.55	NA (2023)
2022-2023	18.87	1800 (2024)
2023-2024	20.92	2040 (2025)

Deer not only contend with years of very low forage, they also live with an over-abundance of cactus. It is reasonable to suspect that cactus is unnaturally abundant due to its natural physical defenses to herbivore eating habits and the last two centuries of over-browsing by introduced ungulates (Salladay & Ramirez, Herbivore Preference of Island Chaparral Shrubs Compared to Mainland Relatives, 2018; Bowen & Vuren, 1997). Cactus without any control filled the gap left by the removal of endemic plants once abundantly diverse across the landscape. Deer suffer from the injurious spines of the cactus as seen in the images taken by hunters dressing their deer in the field (Fig. 1).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 1- Cactus spine injuries on mule deer revealed after successful dispatch. Photos taken by hunters dressing their harvest on December 5th (left and center) and December 26th (right), 2021.

2.2.3 Caged Outplantings & Exclosure Fencing

The Conservancy's efforts to conduct any restoration vegetation outplantings to improve habitat and save rare species from extirpation or extinction without fencing or cages have all failed. Without an effective control of the deer population across the Island, the Conservancy has utilized a two-fold strategy for conservation and restoration of native plant communities and wildlife habitat. First, in high-visibility areas where vegetation type conversion has occurred and where road access is possible, restoration plantings of select species have been undertaken, using t-posts and wire mesh to build cages to protect individual plants. This is a capital- and labor-intensive strategy, with very limited utility as the cages cannot be removed without exposing the plants to intense browse from the deer as seen in Figure 2 and Figure 3.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 22: Catalina cherry (*Prunus ilicifolia* ssp. *lyonii*), a Channel Islands endemic, in cages at Haypress Restoration Area. Note the basal sprout on the cherry within the intact cage (left) compared to the browse damage and lack of basal sprouts on the cherry in the cage that has been compromised (right). Cages cannot be removed from plants even into maturity without jeopardizing their long-term health as many species depend on resprouts to replace old growth. Photos taken 1/19/2023.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 3: Island mountain lilac (*Ceanothus arboreus*) outplantings in Bulrush Canyon. In the foreground, a compromised cage has allowed the plant inside to decimated by mule deer browse and left with very little vegetation. Note the now bare center stem that extends the height of the photo. Compare this plant with those in the background which show far more vegetation, yet they are still unable to grow beyond the cages due to mule deer browse. Photo taken 11/17/2022.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Second, the Conservancy also relies on a network of 39 deer exclosures, ranging in size from 0.02 hectares to 45.44 hectares, to protect habitats from deer browse. In total, 89.94 hectares are protected by fencing, representing 0.4% of the Island's total land area. Following a fire in 2000, the Conservancy invested heavily in deer exclosure fences to protect remaining native plant communities and wildlife habitat (Aguilera, 2000). The largest investment occurred in 2007-2008 following the 2007 Island Fire which burned 10% of the Island, after which the Conservancy erected eight miles of 8-foot deer fence (Rhein, 2008). Of 2,516.34 hectares burned since 1999, 29.71 hectares have been fenced – just 1.18% of the fire-impacted land area. Protecting even this small proportion of post-fire regenerating habitat comes at a considerable expense, and maintenance poses a significant challenge. The overall cost of simply installing the fenced areas has easily exceeded $3,000,000, with a single fenced exclosure costing $1,000,000 in 1999.

The Catalina Island Restoration Area, one of the fenced exclosures erected after the 2007 Island Fire, is a 7.99-hectare area above White's Landing to protect many rare, listed, and endemic plant species that emerged naturally from the soil seed bank after the Island Fire. The fenced area originally protected 44.2-hectares, but was reduced to a more maintainable size due to the difficult terrain. Today, the area protects healthy habitats that are not present outside of the exclosure due to deer browsing. An important function of this fenced area is not just conservation of the native plants it protects but also demonstrating the biodiversity and richness that could occur across the Island without the detrimental impact of deer. Inside this fenced area are populations of at least five Catalina endemic plants, such as the Santa Catalina Island manzanita (*Arctostaphylos catalinae*), Trask's yerba santa (*Eriodictyon traskiae* ssp*. traskiae*), Catalina ironwood *(Lyonothamnus floribundus* ssp*. floribundus*), Santa Catalina Island bush-mallow (*Malacothamnus fasciculatus* var*. catalinensis*), and Santa Catalina Island bedstraw (*Galium catalinense*), as well as all three of the California lilac (*Ceanothus* spp.) taxa in high abundance. One federally threatened plant, island rush-rose (*Crocanthemum greenei*) continues to emerge since 2007. Within the Catalina Island Restoration Area, rare plants are more common, providing necessary habitat to wildlife and pollinators on the Island as seen in Figure 4. It is common to see the endemic Santa Catalina Island fox*,* Catalina Hutton's vireo, and Catalina California quail within the restoration area.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 4: Catalina Island Restoration Area, fence line marked in red, within the footprint of the 2007 Island Fire. The left side of the photo shows the inside of the fenced area while the right side shows the outside of the fence. Note the stark difference in the endemic island bigpod ceanothus (*Ceanothus megacarpus var. insularis*), which is in full bloom with white flowers, inside the area compared to outside. Island bigpod ceanothus struggles to successfully grow outside of protected areas due to deer browsing pressure. Photo taken 2/29/24.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3. Necessity of Eradicating Invasive Mule Deer from Catalina Island

3.1 Evidence of Ecological Damage from Invasive Mule Deer

3.1.1 Harm to Native Plant & Animal Populations

Islands like Catalina are at-risk biodiversity hotspots. Islands support approximately 20% of Earth's biodiversity and 50% of threatened species on just 6.7% of the globe's land surface area (Fernandez-Palacios, et al., 2021). The arrival of introduced species to islands is a major threat to this biodiversity with invasive species a primary driver of recent extinctions (Bellard, Cassey, & Blackburn, 2016). In fact, 61% of global extinctions since the 1500s have taken place on islands. Eradicating invasive vertebrates is an essential island restoration tool to address this issue (Spatz, et al., 2022) Impacts from overabundance and introductions of deer and other animals on biodiversity have been well established in scientific literature (Côté, 2004; Anderson, 2003; Anthony, 2019; Bowen & Vuren, 1997; Coblentz, 1990; Diamond, 1989). On Catalina, introduced mammals have substantially impacted the landscape – at least 48 native plant species have been eliminated by feral animals (Thorne, 1967). On the Channel Islands overall, feral ungulates have taken a considerable toll on the native vegetation, reducing standing biomass and accelerating erosion. This creates a feedback loop where the loss of plant cover exacerbates soil loss and impairs water retention, making the landscape even less hospitable to plants and more vulnerable to impacts from introduced animals (Minnich, 1982; Vitousek, 1988).

The ecological damage that the nonnative mule deer cause to native plant populations on Catalina has been thoroughly documented (Manuwal & Sweitzer, 2007; Jacobsen, Pratt, Alleman, & Davis, 2018; Salladay & Ramirez, Reduced Defenses and Increased Herbivore Preference of Island Chaparral Shrubs Compared to Mainland Relatives, 2018; Stapp, Hamblen, Duncan, & King, 2022; Knapp, 2010; Dvorak & Catalano, 2016; Knapp, 2005; Ramirez, Pratt, Jacobsen, & Davis, 2012). The removal of livestock and other feral animals from Catalina in the past has helped to put the Island on a trajectory of recovery (Knapp, 2014) and the Conservancy has documented natural revegetation of the Island from prior ungulate removals. But the species that are able to regrow on Catalina are deer-resistant species that are commonly found across southern California, not the Catalina and Channel Islands endemic species that are necessary for the full biodiversity of Catalina to be represented. Native plants on Catalina have fewer chemical and physical defenses to deer than closely related mainland species and are therefore more susceptible to deer browse (Orians & Ward, 2010). This is because island varieties of plants have evolved without the presence of herbivores such as deer and therefore without the need to deter herbivores. In a forage palatability trial comparing plants from 10 matched taxonomic groups comprising samples from the mainland and Catalina, deer decisively favored browsing on the Island plants (Salladay & Ramirez, Reduced Defenses and Increased Herbivore Preference of Island Chaparral Shrubs Compared to Mainland Relatives, 2018).

The damage from deer is particularly harmful to vegetation communities post-fire when native seedlings begin to germinate to revegetate the landscape and reestablish the native habitat. An example of this can be seen in Figure 5 (Knapp, 2005). A study on Catalina of post-fire

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

regeneration for three woody resprouting plants (*Heteromeles arbutifolia, Rhus integrifolia,* and *Rhamnus pirifolia*) found that exposure to nonnative mule deer resulted in an eight-fold increase in plant mortality. In plots protected by fencing only 11% of resprouts died, but in deer-exposed plots the die-off rose sharply to 88%. Deer browse also resulted in a greater than 93% reduction in canopy coverage among dominant shrub species, allowing for invasion by exotic species and vegetation type conversion (Ramirez, Pratt, Jacobsen, & Davis, 2012). Avalon Canyon, an area burned during the 2007 Island Fire, clearly displays how deer browse can alter landscapes post-fire. Areas outside of fenced exclosures in the burned area are currently dominated by flax-leaved broom (*Genista linifolia*), a highly invasive Mediterranean plant that deer do not consume. In contrast, areas protected from deer browse after the fire supported native plants four times the size of those outside the fenced exclosures (Jacobsen, Pratt, Alleman, & Davis, 2018). Over time, this disparity has translated into major population differences as seen in Figure 6. In fenced areas within Avalon Canyon, native plants (*Ceanothus arboreus* and *C. megacarpus*) are dominant instead of the invasive flax-leaved broom seen outside of areas exposed to deer. Throughout much of the Island, areas not protected from deer are dominated by invasive annual grasses which promote faster moving and more frequent fires.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 5: A Goat Harbor exclosure, fence line marked in red, built in the early 2000s after a fire in 1999. Chaparral communities are adapted to persist after wildfires by resprouting new growth and germinating fire-stimulated seeds. However, the presence of mule deer post-fire can be disastrous. This photo shows the devastating effects that non-native mule deer browse has on post-fire chaparral regeneration. Inside the exclosure shows successful post-fire regeneration, with resprouting and new seedling recruitment resulting in green growth. In comparison, the outside of the exclosure shows the beginning stages of vegetation type conversion to non-native annual grassland due to mule deer browse on resprouts and new recruits. If native plant species cannot resprout or recruit new seedlings after a fire, the vegetation community will shift to invasive species, and entire rare and endemic plant populations can be eliminated from the area. Goats and pigs were removed from the landscape at this time. Photo taken in 2005.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 6: The Farnsworth exclosure, fence line marked in red, within the footprint of the 2007 Island Fire. The left side of each photo shows the outside of the fenced exclosure while the right side shows the inside of the exclosure. Note the stark difference in island mountain lilac (*Ceanothus arboreus*), a California Islands endemic, presence inside the exclosure compared to outside. Island mountain lilac struggles to grow outside of the exclosure due to browsing pressure, especially evident in the bottom right photo where it is in full bloom with lilac flowers. Photos taken 5/24/2013 (left), 2012 (top right), and 2/28/2024 (bottom right).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Deer also directly threaten endemic and rare plant species on Catalina. The flora of Catalina contains 69 species or subspecies included in the California Native Plant Society's California Rare Plant Ranking system, listed in Exhibit B. These species include nine Catalina endemic plants and 37 Channel Islands endemic plants (including the Catalina endemics). Four species (*Cercocarpus traskiae*, *Pentachaeta lyonii*, *Sibara filifolia,* and *Crocanthemum greenei*) are federally listed endangered or threatened species. Two of these species (*Cercocarpus traskiae* and *Pentachaeta lyonii)* are listed as endangered by the state of California.

The island rush-rose (*Crocanthemum greenei*) is a federally threatened species found only on the Channel Islands. Following the 2007 Island Fire, growth and reproductive success of the island rush-rose was measured across Catalina, within and outside protective exclosures. Populations exposed to deer browse outside of exclosures showed markedly lower reproductive success, with 58% of those populations failing to produce any seeds. However, populations protected by fenced exclosures contained plants of significantly larger size, and 100% of plants in protected areas successfully fruited, regenerating the soil seed bank (Dvorak & Catalano, 2016).

Several other sensitive plant species on Catalina are at risk because of the deer. The endemic Catalina Island mountain-mahogany (*Cercocarpus traskiae*) is a state and federally endangered species and is nearly extinct in the wild with only six known individuals remaining. Goats, pigs, and deer have all contributed to its decline, rendering it one of the rarest woody plants in North America. A single fence that the Conservancy installed in 1999 prevents deer from eliminating the last individuals of Catalina Island mountain-mahogany in the wild. Additionally, the vast majority of the federally endangered Santa Cruz Island rockcress (*Sibara filifolia*) individuals on Catalina are found within this protected area, with the Santa Barbara Botanic Garden suggesting the plant was previously more widely distributed on Catalina but had the best chance of persisting where it was protected from deer (Schneider & Mason, 2023). The southern island mallow (*Lavatera assurgentiflora* ssp. *glabra*) occurs on just two rocky islets off the northeast coast of Catalina, which deer cannot access. The total population of southern island mallow is estimated to be fewer than 200 plants.

Restoration of these Channel Islands endemic has so far proved impossible beyond fenced restoration areas; future success is dependent upon effective deer removal. Additionally, the Island scrub oak (*Quercus pacifica*) is thought to have covered a third of Catalina as recently as the 1940s. In the intervening decades this oak habitat has declined by 31%. This dieback is driven by several factors, but ongoing acorn predation and browse on new growth by deer, as seen in Figure 7, is likely among the more significant impacts (Manuwal & Sweitzer, 2007).

The impacts of invasive deer on federally listed species on Catalina Island extend far beyond Catalina's borders. These same threatened and endangered species occur on other Channel Islands and mainland preserves managed by the U.S. Navy, Channel Islands National Park, The Nature Conservancy, and the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area. These agencies are actively working to recover many of the same species that persist on Catalina; however, full recovery and delisting across their range cannot occur while the threat of deer over-browsing on Catalina remains unresolved. Many of these already rare species have experienced significant genetic bottlenecks due to historic over-browsing by introduced herbivores elsewhere in the Channel Islands. As a result, each island now carries a unique and irreplaceable portion of the species' remaining genetic diversity. Catalina's populations represent a critical piece of that diversity. Protecting

and restoring them is therefore not only essential for the Island itself—it is foundational to the conservation, recovery, and long-term resilience of these species across their entire range.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 713: An island scrub oak (*Quercus pacifica*) with basal resprouts. These resprouts have been browsed down to the ground by mule deer, inhibiting the replacement of older branches and reducing the likelihood of the oak surviving. Photo taken 5/19/2003.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

For these reasons, the continued presence of deer on Catalina represents a significant threat to the Island's and the region's remaining diversity of native plants, and the animals who rely on these plant species for habitat and forage. On other islands around the world, the cascading effects of deer include negatively impacting bird species abundance on the Gulf and San Juan Islands (Martin, Arcese, & Scheerder, 2011) and lowering species density and abundance of insects on Haida Gwaii (Allombert, Stockton, & Martin, 2005). Catalina is home to over 45 species of endemic invertebrates and three endemic bird species that are likely impacted similarly. In fact, management recommendations for two of Catalinas endemic birds, the Catalina California quail (*Callipepla californica catalinensis*) and the Catalina Hutton's vireo (*Vireo huttoni unitti*), recognize the deer as an ongoing threat to these species due to the habitat destruction deer cause. The deer destroy areas to nest and available food. Because of this destruction, the authors suggest removing the deer from the Island to aid the recovery of these species (Shuford & Gardali, 2008).

3.1.2 Increased Wildfire Risk

Fire is a natural phenomenon in most Mediterranean-like ecosystems, including Catalina's. Catalina Island has fire-dependent shrubs and fire-following annuals, which indicates that fire has been a predictable presence on the Island historically. Following a fire, the natural return interval of chapparal ecosystems in California has been estimated to be between 40 to 100 years or longer (Keely, Zedler, Zammit, & Stohlgren, 1989; Minnich, 1995; Missoula Fire Sciences Laboratory, 2018; Syphard A. B., 2019). On the Channel Islands, natural fire intervals may be even longer due to the inability of fires to spread from the mainland and the lower rate of lightning ignitions in coastal regions (Carroll, Laughrin, & Bromfield, 1993; Keeley, 2006).

Within the normal parameters of an ecosystem's fire regime, fire can be a regenerative force by which fire-following plants sprout and dead woody vegetation is recycled back into the environment. However, outside of these parameters, and depending on the biotic environment where the burn occurs, it can be a significant threat to biodiversity. In fact, many chapparal shrub species are eliminated in the area when fires return more than once within a decade and even fire adapted annual plants are quickly outcompeted by invasive annual grasses after frequent fire (Keeley, 2000).

Deer on Catalina are contributing to the vegetation type conversion of native shrublands and chapparal into invasive annual grasslands. A study on Catalina found that deer browse significantly decreased regrowth of dominant native shrub species and resulted in a >93% reduction in total shrub cover in areas unprotected from deer browse after fire, allowing for the conversion of native shrubland into invasive annual grasslands (Ramirez, Pratt, Jacobsen, & Davis, 2012). The impact of deer on suppressing shrub communities was documented on Santa Rosa Island to the north of Catalina as well, where areas that become naturally inaccessible to deer passively shifted back from the surrounding invasive annual grassland to native sage scrub (Cloud & Taylor, 2002).

This conversion of chapparal and shrub habitats on Catalina into invasive annual grasslands significantly increases the risk of more frequent and faster moving fires on the Island. These

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

invasive annual grasses are well known for increasing the rate of ignition and spread of fires, initiating a feedback loop in which they create conditions that support even more frequent fires (Fig. 8) because invasive annual grasses are better able to survive and recolonize after fires compared to native plant species (D'Antonio & Vitousek, 1992; Mack & D'Antonio, 1998; Keeley, 2000; Brooks, et al., 2004; Park & Jenerette, 2019). Invasive annual grasses have resulted in significant increases in fire occurrence and frequency in ecoregions across the country and California in particular, including sagebrush systems where fire is otherwise naturally infrequent, by creating abundant, quick drying, and easily ignitable fuels (Fusco, Finn, Balch, Nagy, & Bradley, 2019). With the loss of chaparral due to deer browse and the resulting transformation of sagebrush habitat into invasive annual grasslands, Catalina is likely to experience more frequent fires than if it had its intact native plant communities.




Figure 814: The cycle of increased fire frequency on the island due to the presence of deer. When mule deer eat native chapparal on the Island, invasive grasses take over.

Removing the deer from the landscape will restore native chapparal habitats which will reduce fire frequency on the landscape. A study on coastal sage scrub communities conducted in Southern California suggests that reestablishing native shrubland can lengthen fire return intervals due to shrub communities having discontinuous canopies and retaining higher moisture content longer into the growing season than grasslands (Cione, Padgett, & Allen, 2002). This contrast in moisture retention is also found in the fuel size classifications used by firefighters and prescribed fire practitioners to describe downed dead material. Finer fuels like grasses are called one-hour fuels because they rapidly lose moisture in dry conditions and allow fires to spread quickly, whereas the branches of shrubs are considered 10-hour and 100-hour fuels since they take longer to dry out (Cowan, Adlam, & Berger, 2023). The regeneration of native chaparral and shrublands after the removal of deer will reduce the amount of easily

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

ignitable, flashy fuels present across Catalina by replacing areas of continuous invasive grass with plants that retain more moisture and are harder to ignite.

Reducing Catalina's grasslands will have incidental public benefits as well. Decreasing the abundance of invasive annual grasses is key to reducing catastrophic fire risk to Catalina and the town of Avalon. Research has shown that when fires occur, significant property loss is more likely to occur when the surrounding fuel type is invasive annual grasses as opposed to shrubs (Syphard, Keeley, Massada, Brennan, & Radeloff, 2012). Most recent fires on the Island have had human causes such as escaped campfires, risky use of power tools, plane crashes, downed power lines, vehicle fires, and equipment, suggesting that the risk of fire will always be present. While fire is a natural part of the Catalina ecosystem, evidence shows that native woodlands, chaparral, and shrublands are less likely to ignite, burn slower, and have a longer interval of return (40-100 years) than the invasive annual grasslands (3-5 years) that the deer facilitate. Thus allowing deer to remain on the Island will increase the risk of wildfire both endangering the wildlands and the community of Avalon.

The role that introduced ungulates have in increasing wildfire risk is evident in the case of the 2023 Hawaii wildfires. Experts note that invasive ungulates, specifically goats, suppressed native plant communities on Maui and facilitated the spread of invasive grasses. It has been indicated that restoration and fire risk reduction cannot be achieved on Maui without the removal of feral goats (Rubinoff & Gon III, 2023). Catalina faces a similar challenge with the deer population.

3.2 Inability of Alternative Methodologies at Managing Invasive Mule Deer

The Conservancy has attempted or investigated several alternatives to address the harm deer cause to the Island, including translocation, hunting, fencing, and fertility control. Removal through aerial hunting is the most efficient, effective, and humane option, but a contingent of the public sees views this method as "unfair" or "unsportsman-like." Thus, the Conservancy has agreed to only use helicopters in a supporting role with no shooting from an aerial platform. All deer will be removed using rifles discharged from the ground by specialists. Other proposed methodologies have proven to either not permanently remove the negative impact of the deer, not be feasible due to the existing population size and Catalina's terrain, and/or not be humane for the animals.

3.2.1 Translocation

Translocating deer to the mainland has been attempted on Catalina, and other islands as well, but is not feasible given the current population size, estimated in 2025 to be about 2,040 deer in the interior and 149 in Avalon. The Island's rugged terrain is too steep and isolated in many locations to safely deploy crew members to attach sedated animals to helicopters to even attempt translocation. Additionally, capture and translocation are not optimal for the animal's welfare. In 1948, there was an attempt to capture all the deer on the Island and transfer to the mainland. The deer population was estimated at about 2,000 at the time, but only 150 were caught and just 110 survived the relocation (Long Beach Press-Telegram, 1948). The loss of life

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

may be attributed to the fact that capture methods in general have an equal or worse welfare rating prior to death than shooting, and the welfare impact is made even worse by transportation (Sharp & Saunders, 2011). This is because chemical immobilization, capture, and translocation can induce capture myopathy, a non-infectious disease characterized by muscle damage from extreme exertion, struggle, or stress in deer (Beringer, Hansen, Wilding, Fischer, & Sheriff, 1996). Additionally, translocated deer are unaware of their new surroundings, including the locations of resources and the presence of predators and high volumes of traffic – two factors that deer on Catalina are completely naïve to (Pennsylvania Game Commission). For example, only 15% of translocated deer from Angel Island in the San Francisco Bay Area survived after the first year of transportation to the mainland, with malnutrition, vehicle accidents, and predators being contributing factors to their low survival rate (O'Bryan & McCullough, 1985). Researchers have observed that, "The principal reason for translocating deer from metropolitan preserves to rural locations is to reduce local abundance without killing deer. The reality of this choice is that translocation may result in the deaths of more than 50% of these deer during the first-year post-release." (Jones & Witham, 1990). Experts have further expanded on this, stating that "The 'rescue,' rehabilitation and release of wild animals are highly risky activities from disease and other perspectives. There is little evidence to justify this activity either from an ethical or an ecological perspective. It is assumed that the release site is already at capacity for deer, and transporting relocated deer to these sites upsets the natural balance already in place by increasing competition for food resources by the new deer. Many released animals will die, and wild populations will not benefit from this practice, but are more likely to suffer problems such as disturbance, territorial aggression, genetic pollution, and introductions of disease (Kock, Woodford, & Rossiter, 2010).

3.2.2 Recreational Hunting

Recreational hunting has been shown to be ineffective at controlling the deer population on the Island and elsewhere (Giles & Findlay, 2010; Simard, Dussault, Huot, & Côté, 2013; Perez-Gonzalez, 2024). One study found that even when 93% of harvest objectives were met, deer density, vegetation abundance, and vegetation growth did not vary significantly between control experimental sites (Simard, Dussault, Huot, & Côté, 2013).

Because of Catalina's rugged terrain recreational hunters have never been and are unlikely ever to be able to take a high proportion of Catalina's deer population. Additionally, deer have learned to avoid hunters throughout the hunting season by going to Avalon, making many deer inaccessible to hunting. Ultimately, recreational hunting is not a long-term solution to reducing the threat deer pose to Catalina's ecosystems. It has not succeeded in adequately controlling the deer population (Stapp, Hamblen, Duncan, & King, 2022), and a further expansion in recreational hunting would not eliminate the negative impacts of the deer, likely due to compensatory mortality.

Compensatory mortality in deer populations, particularly in the mule deer, is a complex biologic al process influenced by various ecological factors. This process shows that when the population drops, the remaining deer survive at higher rates, offsetting the losses. The remaining deer benefit from increased food resources, leading to a higher

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

reproductive rate (Bartmann, White, & Carpenter, 1992).

Maintaining or expanding the current PLM hunting program is less humane than fully removing the nonnative mule deer from Catalina. Hunting data shows that from 1982-2025 a total of 6,739 deer have been killed which far exceeds the number of deer that would need to be removed for this project. And this number does not account for the many deer that starve during drought years or have been killed by vehicle strikes. Annual hunts that continue indefinitely into the future will only further grow the number of deer killed on Catalina. As noted by the British Columbia SPCA regarding the humaneness of recreational hunting compared to eradication, indefinite management "would mean more deer suffering and being killed every year and would still not achieve the goal of long-term sustained ecological recovery" (BC SPCA, 2023).

3.2.3 Fencing

The Conservancy has relied on exclosure fencing and wire cages to protect sensitive plant species and plantings on the landscape for decades. While these efforts have helped protect limited areas of native habitat and minimal numbers of individual plants, it is not enough to contribute to meaningful restoration on the Island overall. In total, after a significant investment, <0.5% of the Island has been fenced. As seen in Figure 9, these isolated, contained plants and sites lack the connectivity that is necessary for the restoration to improve ecological processes across Catalina (McRae, Hall, Beier, & Theobald, 2012). For example, recruitment of new plants is not improved by caged plants because new seedlings are not protected from browsing by deer and are rapidly consumed outside of the cages as seen in Figure 10. Fencing and cages are not a long-term solution that supports the ecological conditions necessary for natural restoration to occur on Catalina and interconnectedness of island habitats.

These limitations demonstrate that fencing vegetation is not a viable long-term strategy for restoring ecological processes or reconnecting Catalina's habitats. Extending this concept to deer management highlights even greater challenges. Catalina's 48,000 acres of steep, rugged terrain make it impossible to construct and maintain a barrier that could reliably contain deer. Any sufficiently large fence would be highly vulnerable to storm damage, rockfalls, fallen trees, or general wear, allowing deer to breach the barrier and reinvade areas that had already been restored.

Beyond these practical limits, fencing deer into a smaller area would create serious animal-welfare concerns. Confinement would reduce access to food and water, heighten competition, and could result in starvation or poor body condition. Concentrating deer in restricted habitat is not humane, and for these reasons, fencing, whether used to protect plants or to contain deer, fails to provide a sustainable, effective path toward long-term ecological recovery on Catalina.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 9: Caged plantings of the endemic Catalina Island ironwood (*Lyonothamnus floribundus* ssp. *floribundus*) at the Laura Stein Volunteer Camp. Note the lack of growth beyond the edge of the cage due to significant browsing from mule deer as well as the gaps between plantings. The plantings are unable to grow to their full potential and outcompete the surrounding non-native vegetation. Photo taken 10/10/2023.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 10: To the left, a blooming Channel Island tree poppy (*Dendromecon harfordii*), endemic to the Channel Islands, flourishes inside the protection of an exclosure. In contrast, the right side of the photo shows a Channel Island tree poppy struggles to establish outside the exclosure due to heavy browsing pressure from mule deer. Photo taken 6/24/2010.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.2.4 Fertility Control

Fertility control of the deer population through surgical sterilization or immunocontraception has not been attempted on Catalina as it was for the bison herd because it is not a feasible option to control the much larger deer population. Although bison and deer are both introduced animals on Catalina, their degree of invasiveness and ecological impact is very different due to their distinct behavior and functional traits (Lundgren, et al., 2024). Deer are primarily browsers of shrubs, while bison are grazers of grasses. These factors influence how these two different nonnative animal species can be managed. Both surgical sterilization and immunocontraception would require the immobilization and capture of at least every female deer on the Island, which has been shown to be unachievable (Long Beach Press-Telegram, 1948), to cause capture myopathy (Pennsylvania Game Commission), and to be insufficient at reducing deer populations without the help of periodic culling by researchers at Colorado State and the National Park Service (Raiho, Hooten, Bates, & Hobbs, 2015; Boulanger & Curtis, 2016). Additionally, studies show that it can take 10 years to see significant deer population decreases even with contraceptive rates over 50%, which would be impossible to attain and maintain on the difficult terrain of Catalina. Additionally, canyons and other remote areas that are too dangerous for crews to access would become refugia (safe pockets where deer could gather and avoid treatment) making it impossible to administer as many contraceptives as needed. (Seagle & Close, 1996). A contraceptive program was successful for the Island's bison because they are herd animals and can be located and treated reliably. Deer, however, are solitary and disperse across difficult terrain, making it impossible to track, capture, and administer contraceptives to the number of animals required, or ensure each receives the correct dose.

3.3 Proposal to Remove Invasive Mule Deer using Ground-based Specialists

3.3.1 Benefits and Examples of Proposed Invasive Mule Deer Removal

The proposed removal of invasive mule deer from Catalina through professional shooters is consistent with successful removal efforts on other islands around the world. The removal of invasive mammals has been shown to greatly benefit biodiversity conservation on island ecosystems. Research examining 1,550 eradication attempts across 998 islands worldwide found that 88% have been successful. Of those efforts, 300 took place on inhabited islands, where the success rate remained high at 82% (Spatz, et al., 2022).

A review of this data has found that 596 populations of 236 native island species benefited from invasive eradications on 181 islands worldwide, and four threatened species had their International Union for the Conservation of Nature Red List extinction-risk categories reduced as a direct result of invasive mammal eradication (Jones, et al., 2016).

3.3.1.1 Channel Islands

In addition to the introduction of invasive ungulates such as goats, pigs, and deer to Catalina, invasive mammals have also been introduced to the other Channel Islands. Across the Channel Islands archipelago, removal of introduced mammals has been a long-standing objective of

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

federal, state, and non-governmental organizations. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife's (CDFW) 2015 State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP) Appendix H and CDFW's 2025 SWAP Apendix G revision covering Offshore Islands establish an objective to "remove or reduced introduced mainland vertebrates and/or feral livestock that impact native species, specifically endemic species, and ecosystem function" (California Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2015; California Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2025).

Santa Rosa Island (Santa Rosa), within Channel Islands National Park, once had an invasive population of deer like Catalina. The Santa Rosa mule deer population was introduced from the Kaibab National Forest in Arizona (Gustkey, 1986). Santa Rosa also had invasive populations of Roosevelt elk (*Cervus canadensis roosevelti*) and, in the first half of the 19th century, fallow deer (*Dama dama*). Like Catalina, these animals were introduced to Santa Rosa for recreational hunting (French, 2012). In addition to deer and elk, Santa Rosa had introduced populations of pigs, sheep, goats, and cattle. Following the removal of pigs in the early 1990s, the removal of cattle in 1998, and the removal of sheep and goats, deer and elk were removed in 2012. These removals have allowed passive recovery of native flora on Santa Rosa as well as the opportunity for active restoration (McEachern, Atwater, Collins, Faulkner, & Richards, 2016).

After all invasive ungulates were removed from Santa Rosa, 36 endemic and/or rare taxa increased in area and 38 endemic and/or rare taxa increased in abundance with corresponding substantial biodiversity gains (Thomson, et al., 2022). Prior to these removal efforts on Santa Rosa, opponents claimed that there was no evidence showing that deer were inhibiting recovery of native plants (Matthews, 2009). The decade since removal of the deer and elk from Santa Rosa has clearly demonstrated the ecosystem recovery that follows the eradication of introduced herbivores (McEachern, Atwater, Collins, Faulkner, & Richards, 2016).

On San Clemente Island (San Clemente) cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, and deer were introduced in the late 1800s to mid-1900s, with goats removed in 1991 and pigs and deer in the 1990s (Keegan, Coblentz, & Winchell, 1994). The removal of these introduced species from San Clemente made possible the recovery of endemic island flora and fauna, with five species including the San Clemente Island lotus (*Acmispon dendroides* var. *traskiae*), San Clemente Island paintbrush (*Castilleja grisea*), San Clemente Island bush-mallow (*Malacothamnus clementinus*), San Clemente Island larkspur (*Delphinium variegatum* ssp. *kinkiense*), and the San Clemente Bell's sparrow (*Artemisiopiza belli clementeae*) declared fully recovered in 2023 and no longer in need of Endangered Species Act protection (U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2023). Like the biodiversity recovery seen on Santa Rosa after the removal of introduced ungulates, the recovery of plant and wildlife species on San Clemente provides an example of the benefits Catalina's ecosystem will experience following the removal of mule deer.

Cattle, sheep, and pigs were similarly introduced to Santa Cruz Island (Santa Cruz). Cattle and sheep were removed following the cessation of ranching operations in the 1980s and 1990s, while pigs were removed in 2007. After all of the invasive introduced mammals were removed from Santa Cruz, the endemic and endangered Santa Cruz Island fox (*Urocyon littoralis santacruzae*) experienced the fastest recovery and delisting of any mammal in the history of the

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Endangered Species Act (The Nature Conservancy, 2018). In addition, two formerly threatened and endangered endemic plants, Santa Cruz Island Dudleya (*Dudleya nesiotica*) and island bedstraw (*Galium buxifolium*) have also been delisted due to the removal of introduced hooved animals (National Park Service, 2023). After the removal of invasive ungulates from Santa Cruz, natural recovery of the Island's ecosystem has included a 23% increase in woody overstory and a transition from invasive annual grasslands and bare ground to woody plants (McEachern, Atwater, Collins, Faulkner, & Richards, 2016).

As seen in Exhibit C, invasive mammal eradications on the other Channel Islands have spanned a range of species and scales. The remaining Channel Islands of San Miguel Island, San Nicolas Island, Anacapa Island, and Santa Barbara Island all experienced introduction of invasive mammals, the majority of which have been successfully removed: San Miguel Island had sheep and donkeys (*Equus africanus asinus*) removed in the 1960s and 1970s respectively; San Nicolas Island had sheep and cats (*Felis catus*) removed in the 1940s and 2000s respectively; Anacapa Island had sheep, cats, rabbits (*Lepus europaeus*), and black rats introduced, with the larger mammals removed in the late 1960s and rats removed in the 2000s; and Santa Barbara Island had sheep and rabbits introduced in the early 1900s with sheep removed in 1926 and rabbits removed in the early 1980s.

Beyond rats remaining on San Miguel, San Clemente, and Catalina islands and cats and house mice (*Mus musculus*) remaining on the latter two, Catalina's deer and bison are the only remaining introduced mammals on the Channel Islands (McEachern, Atwater, Collins, Faulkner, & Richards, 2016).

Island rush-rose (*Crocanthemum greene*i), a federally threatened species, is found on Catalina, Santa Cruz, and Santa Rosa islands, and has met recovery criteria on the latter two islands following the removal of invasive mammals. The delisting process for Island rush-rose on Catalina is impeded by the continued threat posed by invasive mule deer (Ken Niessen, personal communication). Other species that are still recovering throughout their range will remain on the Endangered Species List if the threats of deer are still present on Catalina. These include: Catalina Island mountain mahogany (*Cercocarpus traskiae)*, Lyon's pygmydaisy (*Pentachaeta lyonii*), and Santa Cruz Island rockcress (*Sibara filifolia*).

3.3.1.2 Hawaiian Islands

Like Catalina and the other Channel Islands, introduced axis deer (*Axis axis*) on the Hawaiian Islands have proven to be problematic because these island ecosystems evolved without ungulate herbivores. In addition to harmful impacts they cause to native species and ecosystems (Hess S. , 2008), Axis deer have numerous public safety impacts, such as vehicle collisions, disease spread, and unregulated hunting, and economic impacts like crop loss, grazing competition, damage to golf courses, and damage to cultural and archeological sites (Anderson, 2003). Axis deer are present on the islands of Maui, Molokai, and Lanai, with the Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources attempting to manage populations through recreational hunting, however this has proven to be ineffective at controlling the populations (Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, 2024). On Maui, axis deer numbers

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

increased from just eight to 7,000 within 30 years (Hess, Muise, & Schipper, 2015). In 2011, there were 12,000 axis deer with 10,000 removed, bringing the population to 2,000, but the numbers increased to 11,000 two years later and increased to 70,000 by 2021 (Hawaii Division of Forestry and Wildlife, 2022) underscoring the need for consistent pressure applied to the population until complete removal is achieved. (Bonenza, 2023).

3.3.1.3 Canada

In North America, islands in British Columbia, Canada have been impacted by introduced deer. Introduced fallow deer and native black-tailed deer are present on Sidney Island within the Gulf Islands National Park Reserve in British Columbia, Canada. Black-tailed deer are also present on other islands in the Salish Sea although some islands do not have deer present; the extirpation of predators has resulted in estimates of a tenfold increase in deer populations due to decreased predation pressure (Payton, 2023). On six islands within Gwaii Haanas National Park Reserve, National Marine Conservation Area Reserve, and Haida Heritage Site, Parks Canada has also initiated an effort to remove Sitka black-tailed deer (Thomson, et al., 2022).

3.3.1.4 Mexico

Removals of introduced mammals have also taken place across the Baja California Islands, with Grupo de Ecología y Conservación de Islas (GECI) a central driver of these efforts in collaboration with the Mexican government. They have completed the removal of 60 invasive mammals starting with goats from Guadalupe Island (Guadelupe) in 2007, which aided significant vegetative recovery (Garcillan, Ezcurra, & Vega, 2008). There are extensive similarities between Guadeloupe and Catalina's cultural and natural histories. Both islands host perennial residents, with a small military garrison, a community of fishermen, and a biological field station located on Guadalupe. Guadalupe is floristically very similar to the Channel Islands, as "24 of its 160 vascular plants are restricted to Guadalupe Island and to one or more islands of the southern [Channel Islands]" (Raven, 1967).

Guadalupe had multiple invasive mammal introductions including cows, feral dogs (*Canis familiaris*), house mice, and feral cats. Feral goats, introduced in the 19th century by whalers, disproportionately impacted the island's flora and fauna through overgrazing, soil erosion and compaction, and over-browsing. All the original plant communities on the island, besides one present on islets off the coast, were highly disturbed by the introduction of goats and "either disappeared, became restricted to a very patchy distribution, or were represented only by isolated individual plants," resulting in the extirpation or extinction of at least 26 plant taxa. A temporary fencing project of critical species allowed for multiple taxa undescribed or unseen in centuries to sprout in the exclosure alongside other underrepresented species. The Guadalupe Island Pine (*Pinus radiata* var*. binata*) flourished. Cupped leaf ceanothus (*Ceanothus perplexans*) was discovered for the first time since the late 1800s (Keitt, Junak, Luna-Mendoza, & Aguirre, 2005). The ecosystem of Guadalupe proved its resilience through passive restoration after goats were removed by 2007. Formerly extinct and eliminated species were rediscovered. New plant records were established, including an undescribed species. The endemic pine seedlings increased to several thousand individuals after only 220 adult pines were recorded on

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

the island in 2001. Heavily impacted maritime desert scrub recovered from almost 0% native vegetation coverage to 52% (Luna-Mendoza, et al., 2019).

Eradication efforts were also conducted on Socorro Island from 2009 to 2012 to remove 1,762 feral sheep (Ortiz-Alcaraz, Aguirre-Munoz, Mendez-Sanchez, & Ortega-Rubio, 2016). A third of the Island's habitat was destroyed by feral sheep putting many endemic species at risk. Within one year of the eradication, 11% of the disturbed area showed measurable recovery with the forest habitat having the greatest recovery followed by mixed scrub and then eroded surface (Ortiz-Alcaraz, et al., 2019).

3.3.1.5 Australia and New Zealand

Ungulate control efforts in Australia and New Zealand also parallel the difficulties on Catalina, as both these countries' ecosystems evolved without these animals. Australia is dealing with the environmental challenge posed by feral deer, whose invasion across the continent threatens natural ecosystems. Without effective management and intervention, these invasive species are projected to invade most of Australia (Hampton & Davis, 2020). In response, the Government of South Australia, in collaboration with the National Feral Deer Working Group, has developed the National Feral Deer Action Plan. This comprehensive strategy aims to mitigate the adverse effects of feral deer on agriculture, communities, and the environment through targeted culling by highly skilled shooters. Despite being classified as game animals in some Australian jurisdictions, conventional recreational hunting has proven insufficient in curbing the deer population's growth (Government of South Australia, 2023; Shaw & Willacy, 2021).

Between 1861 and 1919, New Zealand witnessed the introduction of over 250 red deer (*Cervus elaphus*) for sport hunting, along with various other deer species such as wapiti, fallow deer, Sitka black-tailed deer, sambar deer, rusa deer, and whitetail deer (New Zealand Department of Conservation, 2024). Released into environments devoid of natural predators and abundant in resources, these deer species experienced rapid population growth, in part due to initial legal protections against hunting. This led to significant ecological impacts, as deer began over-browsing native undergrowth and young trees in forests. The deer removed the native plants that played a crucial role in reducing rainfall runoff, which consequently increased erosion, and hindered the forests' natural regeneration capabilities (Mark & Baylis, 1982; Monks, Lee, Burrows, McNutt, & Edge, 2005).

3.3.1.6 Galápagos Islands

Project Isabela on the Galápagos Islands in Ecuador was an ambitious effort to eradicate several invasive ungulates from the islands, which was initiated due to the environmental damage caused by feral goats on the ecosystem of Isabela Island. The presence of goats led to extensive ecological damage, particularly affecting the Galápagos giant tortoises (*Chelonoidis niger*), by destroying the forested areas that provided essential shade and water sources during the dry season (Galápagos Conservancy). The goats not only decimated the habitat of the tortoises but also adversely impacted other native and endemic species across the island.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

In response, the Charles Darwin Foundation and the Galapagos National Park Directorate convened an international workshop in 1997 to explore the feasibility of eradicating the invasive goat population. This led to the launch of Project Isabela, the most extensive ecosystem restoration initiative in a protected area globally, aimed at eradicating all large, introduced mammals from key islands to restore natural ecological balance. Utilizing advanced techniques, the effort achieved remarkable success. By 2006, the goat populations on Pinta, Santiago, and northern Isabela were eradicated, leading to a significant recovery of the native vegetation and resurgence of endemic species, including the Galápagos rail (*Laterallus spilonota*) which increased in abundance after the removal of goats (Galápagos Conservancy, 2025).

3.3.2 Public Safety of Deer Removal Proposal

There is minimal public safety risk of using shooting to complete removal efforts on an inhabited island. This has been proven by several successful removal efforts that used this method without incident. Professional shooting was used successfully and safely on several inhabited islands, including but not limited to: Goat and pig removals on Catalina Island, Lord Howe Island (Parkes, Macdonald, & Leaman, 2002), Dirk Hartog Island (Heriot, Asher, Williams, & Moro, 2019), and Kangaroo Island (Cox, et al., 2023) in Australia; Sydney Island and Haida Gwaii in Canada; Guadalupe Island (Luna-Mendoza, et al., 2019) in Mexico; the Galápagos Islands of Floreana and Isabela (Ruiz-Ballesteros & del Campo Tejedor, 2022) in Ecuador; Trinidade Island (da Silva & Alves, 2011) in Brazil; Maui (Bonenza, 2023) in the Hawaiian Islands. Even in areas of the mainland United States, professional shooting has been proven to be a safe and effective tool, such as at Point Reyes National Seashore, where the National Park Service used this methodology to manage populations of introduced fallow deer and axis deer (National Park Service, 2024).

There are no published cases in the global island eradication literature where a member of the public was injured by eradication operations. The primary documented risks to people in these operations are risks to operators that are present from remote-field activities generally, like boat and helicopter transport, rough terrain, and weather, and do not result from shooting or removing non-native species.

Recreational hunting, however, does pose a safety risk. Estimates from hunting-safety organizations suggest that several hundred to around 1,000 hunting-related injuries occur each year in the United States, with a smaller number of fatal accidents (USA, 2025). Because of differences in reporting and definitions, the exact annual count is uncertain. On Catalina last year, there were no hunting injuries but eight reported incidents involving recreational hunters being unsafe. If the Conservancy proceeds with the removal of mule deer by specialists, the public would be far safer than under a continued recreational hunting season.

3.3.3 Humaneness of Invasive Mule Deer Removal Proposal

The Proposal to remove nonnative mule deer through professional shooters was made following the international consensus principles for ethical wildlife control laid out by experts from the British Columbia SPCA, Centre for Compassionate Conservation, Animal Welfare

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Science and Bioethics Centre, Detroit Zoological Society, Canadian Federation of Humane Societies, Wildlife Protection Department of the Humane Society of the United States, RSPCA UK Wildlife Department, and RSPCA Australia (Dubois, et al., 2017; Cox, et al., 2023).The humaneness of shooting over methods that require capture is reiterated in the report "A model for assessing the relative humaneness of pest animal control methods." This report found shooting to have an equal or better welfare rating prior to death than trapping methods and notes that "the humaneness of trapping is highly dependent on how the subsequent stages (i.e. holding in the yards, drafting, shooting or transport) are conducted (Cox, et al., 2023). The cumulative effects of these stages will compound welfare impact," (Sharp & Saunders, 2011). Based on these findings, alternatives such as translocation and sterilization that require prolonged or repeated trapping would earn an overall welfare rating that is worse than shooting. Additionally, the American Veterinary Medical Association lists gunshot as "acceptable with conditions for euthanasia of free-ranging, captured, or confined wildlife" in their guidelines for the euthanasia of animals (American Veterinary Medical Association, 2020).

The British Columbia SPCA has stated regarding the Sydney Island Ecological Restoration Project, which is utilizing aerial shooting to remove deer, that:

> The BC SPCA is not opposed to the eradication program given it is scientifically sound, supports reconciliation, will be conducted humanely and ethically, and will result in less animal suffering in the long term. The continuous cycle of recreational hunting and culls of fallow deer on Sidney Island over the past 40 years has not restored the island's biodiversity to benefit other species or ecosystem recovery. The current proposal intends to end this ineffective killing cycle. (BC SPCA, 2023)

3.3.4. Safety and Ubiquitousness of Night Shooting

The Conservancy's proposed removal of invasive deer will include night ground-based shooting conducted by trained professionals in the interior of Catalina Island. This method is widely used across the United States for deer depopulation and has an extensive record of safe and effective implementation in both rural and densely populated environments (DeNicola & Williams, Managing White-tailed Deer: Setting the Record Straight, 2010; DeNicola & DeNicola, Ovariectomy As a Management Technique for Suburban Deer Populations, 2021; Maryland Department of Natural Resources, 2020; Maryland–National Capital Park and Planning Commission (Montgomery Parks), 2024). Night shooting is a standard component of professional deer reduction programs as it aligns with natural behavior of deer, which are most active during crepuscular and nocturnal periods (Beier & McCullough, 1990). Conducting operations at night allows for high detection rates, precise targeting, and minimal disruption to residents and visitors, and is widely recognized in wildlife management literature as an effective tool for achieving population reduction targets where recreational hunting is insufficient (DeNicola A. J., 2010; Kilpatrick, 1999).

Throughout the country night shooting is routinely authorized and implemented by state and federal wildlife agencies, including the Maryland Department of Natural Resources and the Pennsylvania Game Commission, under permits that allow qualified professionals to conduct

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

removal operations in sensitive areas (Maryland Department of Natural Resources, 2020; Pennsylvania Game Commission, 2015). Many municipalities conduct annual or recurring night shooting operations to control overabundant deer populations. Examples include Fairfax County, Virginia, which carries out annual wildlife-department–led sharpshooting operations in closed parks during evening and nighttime hours (Fairfax County ,Virginia, 2025); the Vassar College Preserve in Poughkeepsie, New York, where deer culls are conducted exclusively at night when the preserve is closed to the public (Vassar College Preserve, 2025); and the City of Wildwood, Missouri, which authorizes professional contractors to remove deer using suppressed firearms and night-vision equipment as part of its suburban deer management program (City of Wildwood, 2025). These programs consistently report high efficiency and no public safety incidents when operations are conducted by qualified personnel.

The safety of night shooting is supported by decades of documented practice. Professionals use restricted access zones, designated firing lanes, controlled engagement distances, and ammunition selected to prevent overpenetration. Thermal and infrared imagery are also used to positively identify targets and observe the surrounding terrain. These tools increase accuracy and reduce the likelihood of wounding. Evaluations of ground-based ungulate control methods have found that professional night shooting achieves rapid incapacitation, precise shot placement, and minimal risk to the public when proper protocols are followed (Williams, 2013; Sharp & Saunders, 2011).

Night shooting has been used safely in communities with population densities far higher than Catalina Island, including residential neighborhoods and institutional campuses where professional sharpshooting programs have operated for decades without public safety incidents (Kilpatrick, 1999). In comparison, the Conservancy's operations will occur in remote interior zones during nighttime periods where public presence is extremely limited. The combination of experienced sharpshooters, controlled access areas, and advanced thermal detection technologies enables a high level of operational control and safety, consistent with established best practices for ground-based ungulate removal (Sharp & Saunders, 2011).

Furthermore, island eradications require methods that ensure complete detection and removal of remaining animals and night shooting is specifically suited to these conditions. Research on Catalina has shown that the rugged terrain, dense vegetation, and limited road access allow ungulates to evade daytime detection making nocturnal operations essential for locating all individuals (Krajick, 2005). Studies of island based ungulate control programs, including work on feral pigs, show that night shooting paired with thermal imaging provides a critical advantage in identifying animals that would otherwise remain hidden in complex island landscapes (McCann, 2004). Additional island case studies, including the removal of feral pigs on Quail Island in New Zealand, demonstrate that targeted nocturnal operations were critical to achieving full eradication in complex terrain (Bolden & Johnston, 2020). As successful island eradications depend on removing every animal to prevent rapid population recovery (Morrison et al., 2007), the elevated detection rates and low disturbance nature of night operations make them an established best practice for island ecosystems while also supporting a high degree of

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

operational safety (Sharp T. , 2013). Night shooting in association with trapping was conducted on Catalina for feral pig removal without incident (Peter Schuyler personal communication).

The importance of night operations for locating remnant individuals in island settings is further illustrated by the following expert statement from Gregg Howald, an island restoration practitioner with more than nineteen years of experience and more than forty island eradication projects across North and South America:

"remnant deer that will not have been removed using earlier/daytime techniques, can become adept at avoiding certain techniques, become more active under darkness (night) to avoid visual detection, and will move toward more dense or rugged island terrain where they will be less likely detected visually. It is these individuals that are of the greatest concern from an operational planning perspective - the ability to detect and remove these individuals will be imperative to the ultimate success of the eradication. Night hunting, utilizing tools such as spotlighting and/or advanced thermal and night vision technologies, allows professional marksmen to more likely detect and safely discharge a firearm to remove deer. This specialized phase is crucial as even a handful of remaining animals can rapidly re-establish the invasive population, negating years of costly effort"

This point is further reiterated by Chad Hanson, Island Conservation's Deputy Vice President, who is an island restoration practitioner with over 20 years of experience including a predominant role in the world's largest goat removal on Santiago Island, Galápagos:

" Utilizing a night hunting approach capitalizes on natural deer behavior as deer tend to feed more actively at night and spend more time in open areas where they can be more readily detected. Thermal imaging produces an immediate indication where temperature fluctuations exist and traditional efforts with spotlights as well as infrared illuminators coupled with night vision are capable of exposing the reflective tapetum lucidum layer in a deer's eyes thus enhancing the opportunity to detect an animal which are generally cryptic during daylight hours due to their behavior and pelage color. Systematic sweeps with these technologies can reveal body heat or eye shine across large tracks of habitat and at considerable distances. This action helps field practitioners rapidly locate animals at a landscape scale and prepare for their removal in an undisturbed fashion which supports controlled and precise shot placement increasing the humanness of the removal action – an effort that also reduces disturbance to the public and allows carcasses to be removed discreetly, minimizing conflict and impacts to those not familiar with wildlife management efforts.

Furthermore, deer are generally less wary at night and less likely to anticipate human activity. As a result, nighttime operations aid shooters in carefully planning removal efforts to avoid educating individuals who become costly to remove at the end of a project. This aligns with a core principle of eradication where removal techniques selected should be sequenced strategically to maximize efficiency and not jeopardize efficacy of current and subsequent methods. Hunting at night with specialized tools adheres to this as the risk of an animal escaping and becoming wary of removal techniques is minimized. This should be a key concern if removal tools are limited as a common risk to eradication success is running out of tools or

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

techniques that effectively detect and remove animals more quickly than they can repopulate. As a result, night operations, conducted by disciplined practitioners, limit animals' ability to adapt behaviorally and deliver more efficient and cost-effective projects."

In California, night shooting has been allowed for take of pigs (Management, 2025; CDFW, 2025). White Buffalo has utilized night shooting in the Point Reyes Fallow and Axis deer eradication project, the techniques used were very similar to the Conservancy's proposed plan. A truck was set up with the shooting rack and used a driver, spotter, and shooter.

The peer-reviewed literature and decades of global eradication practice demonstrate that night shooting is a standard, widely used, and often essential method in ungulate eradications on islands, including deer. Night operations are incorporated specifically because they maximize target detectability, reduce disturbance, improve humane outcomes, and decrease safety risks to personnel and the public by limiting activity to controlled-access nighttime conditions. Professionally led night shooting operations maintain among the lowest accident rates of any remote-field wildlife management activity.

3.3.5. Use of Detection Dogs on Catalina Island and Other Islands

The next stage of deer removal will utilize trained detection dogs to assist in locating remaining deer that retreat into dense vegetation and rugged interior terrain as numbers decline and visual detection becomes less successful. This approach is consistent with established practice on other Channel Islands, where detection dogs have been used to effectively locate invasive mammals that could not be found through thermal imaging, night shooting, or ground-based surveys once populations reached very low densities.

During the feral pig removal on Catalina Island, dog teams were deployed to locate pigs that had avoided earlier removal efforts and moved into cover where they could not be detected through aerial or ground-based searches. Their use allows field crews to find individuals that would have otherwise remained undetected (Garcelon, 2005). On Santa Cruz Island, detection dogs also played an important role in locating pigs that had retreated into remote drainages and dense vegetation once the broader population had been reduced (Ramsey, Parkes, & Morrison, 2009; Parkes, et al., 2010). Detection dogs were considered essential as they tracked the last remnant feral pigs hiding in sea caves that were considered to be inaccessible to pigs (Ramsey, Parkes, & Morrison, 2009).

Detection dogs were similarly employed on Santa Rosa Island for feral pig removal, locating remaining animals to reach full eradication (Lombardo & Faulkner, 2000). Detection dog use has also been documented in ungulate management on Santa Cruz Island where live capture and removal of feral sheep also required locating animals in difficult terrain and reduced densities (Faulkner, 2011). In addition to these ungulate removal projects, trained dogs were used in the removal of feral cats on San Nicolas Island, enabling crews to detect remaining cats (Hanson, Will, Bonham, & Keitt, 2009), further demonstrating the role of trained dogs in complex island environments.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

These Channel Islands case studies align with broader invasive species eradication practice. International experience has shown that finding the last remaining individuals of an invasive mammal population is often the most challenging element of an eradication and that detection dogs reduce likelihood of undetected survivors that would allow a population to reestablish (Howald, et al., 2007). Detection dogs have been so effective in finding "a needle in a haystack", that they have also been employed to detect any Argentine ants and the remains of island spotted skunk scat on Santa Cruz Island (Christina Boser and Lara Brenner, personal communication respectively).

The operational role of detection dogs in the final stages of eradication is further described by Gregg Howald:

"The subsequent or concurrent use of detection dogs is necessary to locate any ultra-wary, low-density survivors and confirm eradication success. Dogs, with their unparalleled sense of smell, are the most reliable tool for overcoming the inherent challenges of low-density detection, such as finding a single animal in a vast, complex landscape otherwise inaccessible to people. By running detection dogs under the control of trained marksmen, in a systematic manner, we can detect and encourage deer to move out of high cover into more open areas to be safely and humanely dispatched by trained marksmen. The use of detection dogs that 'sweep' blocks of the island are essential to confirming eradication success."

The role and importance of detection dogs is further reiterated by Chad Hanson:

"Specially trained detection/hunting dogs also serve an essential complementary role in these projects. Their sensitive olfactory capabilities allow them to detect residual scent traces long after their target was present at the site. Skilled dogs can discriminate between individual scent signatures, follow faint trails, and signal to handlers whether deer remain in an area supporting near real-time planning and decision making. In an eradication context, this function is invaluable because it provides a detection mechanism independent of visual or technological tools and importantly, one that deer cannot avoid through altered behavior. As a result, dogs serve in a unique role by supporting removal efforts as well as building confidence towards eradication confirmation, ensuring that no animals persist undetected.

The combined use of thermal imaging, night vision, spotlights, and trained dogs to support systematic, intensive, and disciplined hunting efforts ensures that removal rates stay ahead of recruitment. Strategically sequencing and leveraging every effective method not only improves efficiency but offers confidence that eradication is feasible."

The use of detection dogs in this project follows the established and successful model previously employed on Catalina, Santa Cruz, Santa Rosa, and San Nicolas islands and reflects best practices for completing invasive mammal eradications in large topographically complex island environments.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.3.6. Credentials of White Buffalo Inc.

The Conservancy plans to work with White Buffalo Inc. (White Buffalo) to complete the proposed removal of the deer population from Catalina. White Buffalo is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization that was founded in 1996 by Dr. Anthony DeNicola and is dedicated to the conservation of native species and ecosystems. Since its inception, White Buffalo has conducted 15 different capture efforts for big game animals, including deer, wild pigs, and elk, totaling over 4,000 individual animals. They have a full complement of capture equipment and have used various capture methods. White Buffalo specializes in the use of remote immobilization equipment and have trained many professionals in this discipline including the Humane Society of the United States, professionals at Pneudart, Inc., and a NYPD special operations unit, along with graduate students from University of Georgia, University of Connecticut, Yale University, and Rutgers University. Dr. DeNicola has also provided training for the Wildlife Society summer field technique training group. White Buffalo has darted well over 5,000 free-ranging deer, making it the most experienced organization in the country at this method of capture. White Buffalo also works with local veterinarians, has veterinarians on staff, and/or uses veterinary partners if animals need to be anesthetized.

White Buffalo has also conducted over 100 deer population reduction efforts across the United States. White Buffalo's methods are humane and address concerns for animal welfare by following the American Veterinary Medical Association's stringent guidelines for humane depopulation of animals (American Veterinary Medical Association, 2020). White Buffalo has also spent over 20 years committed to improving both technology and techniques to increase safety, humaneness, and efficiency for the management of white-tailed deer. As a result of their extensive testing, they have found that during hunting no bullet fragments with significant size or inertia exit the target animal, therefore ensuring public safety. They have extensive experience in both removing and capturing deer in a variety of human-occupied environments without incident to the public. White Buffalo has experience selecting safe shooting sites that satisfy the requirements of regulatory officials and property owners.

White Buffalo is also committed to sharing their research findings and expertise with students, colleagues, and the public. White Buffalo's founder, Dr. DeNicola has extensively published (DeNicola & DeNicola, 2021; DeNicola, Kesler, & Swihart, 1997; Anthony, 2019; Gagnier, Laurion, & DeNicola, 2020; O'Donnell & DeNicola, 2006; Stafford, DeNicola, & Magnarelli, 1996), and has presented at a variety of conferences, seminars, and training programs. White Buffalo's work on wildlife capture and euthanasia along with fertility control and hunt management programs has led to over 70 peer reviewed publications. DeNicola has trained biologists in capture and humane euthanasia techniques and shared his field knowledge broadly with students. In addition, he has consulted with numerous communities and landowners, helping them understand how to best address the problems of overabundant deer. His research has contributed to management of Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD) (Gagnier, Laurion, & DeNicola, 2020), Lyme disease transmission (Stafford, DeNicola, & Magnarelli, 1996), dosing of birth control in white-tailed deer (DeNicola, Kesler, & Swihart, 1997), and the humanness of gunshot targeting (Anthony, 2019). White Buffalo has extensive experience

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

working in a populated areas including single-family residential communities in Ann Arbor, Michigan, the Clifton neighborhood of Cincinnati, Ohio, the suburbs of Fairfax City, Virginia, the National Institute of Health office complex in Bethesda, Maryland, the Village of Cayuga Heights, New York, and the Villages Gold and Country Club in San Jose, California (DeNicola & DeNicola, 2021).

In addition to reviewing White Buffalo's extensive experience, provided in Exhibit E, the Conservancy has consulted with several partners and individuals to determine whether White Buffalo would be the correct organization to remove deer on Catalina. White Buffalo has worked on several major successful invasive animal removal programs in California, including on other Channel Islands. These efforts include the removal of deer and elk from Santa Rosa Island, removal of fallow and axis deer from Point Reyes National Seashore, and removal of turkeys and pigs from Santa Cruz Island. Each of these successful efforts used similar methodologies to what is proposed on Catalina, including ground shooting and aerial support techniques. The Conservancy has received testimonials, which are included in Exhibit F, from other organizations that led these invasive animal removal efforts, which commended White Buffalo's work and methods and recommended contracting with White Buffalo for the Catalina Island Restoration Project.

Robyn Shea, the Lead Research Station Specialist at the Santa Rosa Island Research Station, stated:

> The use of wildlife biologists as professional shooters has been proven around the globe to be the most humane and most effective way to remove invasive ungulates from landscapes. The company being hired for the removal on Catalina, is the same company that did the removal of deer and elk on Santa Rosa Island. I had the privilege of working alongside them, and no one can do it better. They are trained wildlife biologists; they are not mercenaries as many are depicting them to be. Utilizing helicopters as a support tool is the surest way to remove the animals in the most efficient and most humane way possible, which will ultimately cause the least disturbance for residents and visitors. (Shea, 2023)

Morgan Ball, the Executive Director of Wildlands Conservation Science (WCS), and Katrina Olthof, the Conservation Program Manager of WCS, also worked with White Buffalo on Santa Rosa Island, describing how they:

> … teamed with White Buffalo, Inc. to remove all introduced Kaibab mule deer and Roosevelt elk from Santa Rosa Island in 2011. WCS has experienced first-hand the solemn professionalism and level-headedness that these professional shooters bring to their work. (Ball & Olthof, 2023)

Dr. DeNicola and his team at White Buffalo have a well-established track record of success as well as an outstanding reputation within the field of conservation. The Conservancy is confident that the methodology proposed in its permit application and implemented by White Buffalo will be as efficient, humane, and safe as it has been proven to be in projects that White Buffalo has previously completed. It is the professional opinion of the Conservancy's Conservation

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

department that White Buffalo is the most qualified operator to carry out the Conservancy's proposed deer removal.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

References

Aguilera. (2000, April 28). Helping out -- naturally. *Santa Ana Orange County Register*.

Allombert, S., Stockton, S., & Martin, J.-L. (2005). A Natural Experiment on the Impact of Overabundant Deer on Forest Invertebrates. *Conservation Biology, 19*(6), 1917-1929.

American Veterinary Medical Association. (2020). *Guidelines.* Schaumburg, IL: American Veterinary Medical Association.

Anderson, S. B. (2003). Introduced axis deer (Axis axis) on Maui, Hawaii: History, current status, home range, grouping patterns, and a species account. 24.

Anthony, L. (2019, January 22). Deer Wars: The Forest Awakens. *Hakai Magazine*.

Arcese, P., Skaien, C., Puri, P., Diao, K., & Bai, Y. (2018). *The Degradation and Restoration of Maritime Meadow, Savanna and Forest Habitats of the Coastal Douglas-fie Ecosystem.* Vancouver: Forest and Conservation Sciences, University of British Columbia.

Associated Press. (2014, June 7). Hunters Will Thin Catalina Mule Deer Herd. *Victorville Daily Press*.

Ball, M., & Olthof, K. (2023, December 22). Santa Catalina Island Restoration Project.

Bartmann, R. M., White, G. C., & Carpenter, L. H. (1992). Compensatory Mortality in a Colorado Mule Deer Population. *Wildlife Monographs, No. 121*, 3-37.

BC SPCA. (2023, November 23). *BC SPCA Stance on the Sidney Island Ecological Restoration Project*. Retrieved from BC SPCA: https://spca.bc.ca/news/bc-spca-stance-on-the-sidney-island-ecological-restoration-project/

Beier, P. a. (1990). Factors Influencing White-tailed Deer Activity Patterns and Habitat Use. *Wildlife Monographs*.

Beier, P., & McCullough, D. (1990). Factors Influencing White-tailed Deer Activity Patterns and Habitat Use. *Wildlife Monographs*.

Bellard, C., Cassey, P., & Blackburn, T. M. (2016). Alien Species as a Driver of Recent Extinctions. *Biology Letters*.

Beltran, R. S., Kreidler, N., Van Vuren, D. H., Morrison, S. A., Zavaleta, E. S., Newton, K., . . . Croll, D. A. (2014). Passive Recovery of Vegetation after Herbivore Eradication on Santa Cruz Island, California. *Restoration Ecology, 22*(6), 790-797.

Bender, L., G.A., S., Spencer, R., McAllister, K., & Murphie, B. (2004). Survival, cause-specific mortality, and harvesting of male black-tailed deer in Washington. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 68(4), 870-878.

Beringer, J., Hansen, L. P., Wilding, W., Fischer, J., & Sheriff, S. L. (1996). Factors Affecting Capture Myopathy in White-Tailed Deer. *The Journal of Wildlife Management, 60*(2), 373-380.

Big Island Invasive Species Committee. (2024, January 10). *Axis Deer*. Retrieved from Big Island Invasive Species Committee: https://www.biisc.org/pest/axis-deer/

Bolden, A. &. (2020). Eradication of feral pigs on quail island to protect and restore ecological values. *The Victorian Naturalist 137(6)*, 219-227.

Bolden, A., & Johnston, M. (2020). Eradication of feral pigs on quail island to protect and restore ecological values. *Victorian Naturalist*, 137(6); 219-227.

Bonenza, J. (2023). *Concerns over bounty being offered to control Maui's deer population.* Khon2.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Boulanger, J. R., & Curtis, P. D. (2016). Efficacy of surgical sterilization for managing overabundant suburban white-tailed deer. *Wildlife Society Bulletin, 40*(40), 727-735.

Bowen, & Vuren, V. (1997). Insular endemic plants lack defenses against herbivores. *Conservation Biology*, 11:1249-1254.

Brooks, M. L., D'Antonio, C. M., Richardson, D. M., Grace, J. B., Keeley, J. E., DiTomaso, J. M., . . . Pyke, D. (2004). Effects of invasive alien plants on fire regimes. *BioScience, 54*(7), 677-688.

Bruce. (1948, May 20). 16,000,000 Deer in state held possible by 1968. *Placerville Mountain Democrat*, 25.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. (2015). *California State Wildlife Action Plan.* Retrieved from https://wildlife.ca.gov/SWAP/Final

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. (2025). *California State Wildlife Action Plan, 2025: A Conservation Legacy for Californians.*

Carpenter, S. R., Bennet, E. M., & Peterson, G. D. (2006). Scenarios for Ecosystem Services: An Overview. *Ecology and Society, 11*(1).

Carroll, M. C., Laughrin, L. L., & Bromfield, A. C. (1993). Fire on the California islands: Does it play a role in chaparral and closed cone pine forest habitats? In F. G. Hochberg (Ed.), *The third California Islands symposium: Recent advances in research on the California Islands* (pp. 73-88). Santa Barbara, CA: Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History.

CDFW. (2025). *Guidelines for Wild Pig Depredation*. Retrieved from https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Mammals/Wild-Pig/Depredation

Cedar Rapids Gazette. (1948, November 11). Catalina Isle Deer Proving Big Headache. *Cedar Rapids Gazette*.

Cione, N. K., Padgett, P. E., & Allen, E. B. (2002). Restoration of a native shrubland impacted by exotic grasses, frequent fire, and nitrogen deposition in southern California. *Restoration Ecology, 10*(2), 376-384.

City of Wildwood. (2025, 11 21). *Sharpshooting for Managing a Suburban White-Tailed Deer Population*. Retrieved from City of Wildwood: https://www.cityofwildwood.com/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Item/44835?fileID=52699

Cloud, J., & Taylor, R. S. (2002). The curious case of the Santa Rosa Island pedestals. *Proceedings of the Fifth California Islands Symposium*, (pp. 161-166).

CNPS, bewaterwise.com, Centers, A. G., Payne, T., & Diego, C. o. (2025, 12 1). *California Native Plant List*. Retrieved from Fire Resistant Plants: chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://firesafesdcounty.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Comprehensive-Fire-Resistant-Plant-List.pdf

Coblentz. (1990). Exotic organisms: a dilema for conservation biology. *Conservation Biology*, 4:261-265.

Côté, S. D.-P. (2004). Ecological Impacts of Deer Overabundance. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 113-147.

Cowan, A., Adlam, C., & Berger, C. (2023). *Prescribed fire basics: Fuels.* Oregon State University, Forestry & Natural Resources Extension Fire Program. doi:extension.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/documents/12581/osu-rx-modules-fuels-em9386.pdf

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Cox, T. E., Paine, D., O'Dwyer-Hall, E., Matthews, R., Blumson, T., Florance, B., . . . Page, B. (2023). Thermal aerial culling for the control of vertebrate pest poopulations. *Scientific Reports, 13*(1).

Culpepper. (1968, January 28). Catalina Abounds in Wild Game. *Independent Press Telegram*, 33.

da Silva, N. G., & Alves, R. J. (2011). The eradication of feral goats and its impact on plant biodiversity - a milestone in the history of Trindade Island, Brazi. *Rodriguésia, 62*(3), 717-719.

D'Antonio, C. M., & Vitousek, P. M. (1992). Biological invasions by exotic grasses, the grass/fire cycle, and global change. *Annual review of ecology and systematics, 23*(1), 63-87.

Day. (1948, May 4). Pipefuls by Jim Day. *The Bakersfiled Californian*, 9.

DeNicola, A. J. (2008). Sharpshooting suburban white-tailed deer reduces deer–vehicle collisions. *Human–Wildlife Conflicts 2*, 28–33.

DeNicola, A. J. (2010). Managing White-tailed Deer: Setting the Record Straight. *The Wildlife Professional* , 52–57.

DeNicola, A. J., & DeNicola, V. L. (2021). Ovariectomy as a Management Technique for Suburban Deer Populations. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*.

DeNicola, A. J., Kesler, D. J., & Swihart, R. K. (1997). Dose determination and efficacy of remotely delivered norgestomet implants on contraception of white-tailed deer. *Zoo Biology*, 16(1).

DeNicola, A., & DeNicola, V. (2021). Ovariectomy As a Management Technique for Suburban Deer Populations. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 45(3): 445-455.

DeNicola, A., & Williams, S. (2010). Managing White-tailed Deer: Setting the Record Straight. *The Wildlife Professional*, 4(1): 52-57.

Diamond. (1989). Overview of recent extinctions. In Western, & Pearl, *Conservation for the twenty-first centery* (p. 392). New York: Oxford University Press.

Drew, K. (2008, November 24). *Deer: The New Zealand Story*. Retrieved from Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand: https://teara.govt.nz/en/deer-and-deer-farming

Dubois, S., Fenwick, N., Ryan, E. A., Baker, L., Baker, S. E., Beausoleil, N. J., . . . Fraser, D. (2017). International consensus principles for ethical wildlife control. *Conservation Biology, 31*(4), 753-760.

Dvorak, T. M., & Catalano, A. E. (2016). Exclusion of introduced deer increases size and seed production success in an island-endemic plant species. *Ecology and Evolution, 6*(2), 544-551.

Fairfax County ,Virginia. (2025, November 21). *Sharpshooting | Wildlife | Fairfax County Government*. Retrieved from fairfaxcounty.gov: https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/wildlife/sharpshooting

Faulkner, K. R. (2011). Live capture and removal of feral sheep from eastern Santa Cruz Island, California. In Island Invasives: Eradication and Management. *International Union for the Conservation of Nature*, (pp. 295–299.). Gland, Switzerland.

Fernandez-Palacios, J. M., Kreft, H., Irl, S. D., Norder, S., Ah-Peng, C., Borges, P. A., . . . Drake, D. R. (2021). Scientists Warning - The Outstanding Biodiversity of Islands is in Peril. *Global Ecology and Conservation*.

French, C. (2012, Janaury 17). Era Ends, New One Begins at Santa Rosa Island. *The Log*.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Fusco, E. J., Finn, J. T., Balch, J. K., Nagy, R. C., & Bradley, B. A. (2019). Invasive grasses increase fire occurrence and frequency across US ecoregions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 116*(47), 23594-23599.

Gagnier, M., Laurion, I., & DeNicola, A. J. (2020). Control and surveillance operations to prevent chronic wasting disease establishment in free-ranging white-tailed deer in Quebec, Canada. *Animals*, 10, 283.

Galápagos Conservancy. (2025). *Project Isabela*. Retrieved from Galápagos Conservancy: https://www.galapagos.org/conservation/project-isabela/

Garcelon, D. K. (2005). Application of techniques for feral pig eradication on Santa Catalina Island, California. *California Islands Symposium* (pp. 331-340). Arcata, California: National Park Service Technical Publication CHIS-05-01, Institute for Wildlife Studies.

Garcillan, P. P., Ezcurra, E., & Vega, E. (2008). Guadalupe Island: Lost paradise recovered? Overgrazing impact on extinction in a remote oceanic island as estimated through accumulation functions. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 1613-1625.

Giles, B. G., & Findlay, C. S. (2010). Effectiveness of a selective harvet system in regulating deer populations in Ontario. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 266-277.

Government of South Australia. (2023). *National Feral Deer Action Plan.* Creative Commons.

Gustkey, E. (1986, November 24). On the Elk Hunt: Santa Rosa Island Takes the Prize as Far as Records Go. *Los Angeles Times*.

Hampton, J., & Davis, N. (2020). Impacts of Introduced Deer in Victoria. *The Victorian Naturalist*, 276-281.

Hanson, C. C., Will, D. J., Bonham, J. E., & Keitt, B. S. (2009). The Removal of Feral Cats fron San Nicolas Island, California to Protect Native and Endemic Species. Santa Cruz, California: Island Conservation.

Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources. (2024, January 10). *Game Mammal Hunting*. Retrieved from Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resource: https://dlnr.hawaii.gov/recreation/hunting/mammal/

Hawaii Division of Forestry and Wildlife. (2022). *Axis Deer on Maui.* https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/73b80a5776a0468596ce1d123e430582.

Heriot, S., Asher, J., Williams, M. R., & Moro, D. (2019). The eradication of ungulates (sheep and goats) from Dirk Hartog Island, Shark Bay World Heritage Area, Australia. *Biological Invasions, 21*(5), 1789-1805.

Hess, S. (2008). *Wild Sheep and Deer in Hawai'i-A Threat to Fragile Ecosystems.* Hawaii National Park: USGS.

Hess, S. C., Muise, J., & Schipper, J. (2015). Anatomy of an Eradication Effort Removing Hawaii's Illegally Introduced Axis Deer. *The Wildlife Professional*, 40-43.

Howald, G., Donlan, C., Galvan, J., Russell, J., Parkes, J., Samaniego, A., . . . Tershy, B. (2007). Invasive rodent eradication on islands. *Conservation Biology*, 21(5): 1258-1268.

Human Wildlife Conflicts Working Group. (2018). *Methods for Managing Deer in Populated Areas.* The Assocation of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.

Jacobsen, A. L., Pratt, R. B., Alleman, D., & Davis, S. D. (2018). Post-fire ecophysiology of endemic chaparral shrub seedlings from Santa Catalina Island, Southern California. *Madrono*, 106-116.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Jones, H. P., Holmes, N. D., Butchart, S. H., Tershy, B. R., Kappes, P. J., Corkey, I., . . . Croll, D. A. (2016). Invasive mammal eradication on islands results in substantial conservation gains. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113*(15), 4033-4038.

Jones, J. M., & Witham, J. H. (1990). Survival of Black-Tailed Deer Following Relocation in California. *Wildlife Society Bulletin, 18*(4), 434-441.

Keegan, D. R., Coblentz, B. E., & Winchell, C. S. (1994). Feral Goat Eradication on San Clemente Island, California. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 56-61.

Keeley, J. E. (2000). Fire and invasive species in Mediterranean-climate ecosystems of California. *Proceedings of the invasive species workshop: the role of fire in the control and spread of invasive species.*, *11*, pp. 81-94.

Keeley, J. E. (2006). South coast bioregion. In J. W. van Wagtendonk, N. G. Sugihara, S. L. Stephens, A. E. Thode, K. E. Shaffer, & J. Fites-Kaufman (Eds.), *Fire in California's ecosystems* (pp. 350-390). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Keely, J. E., Zedler, P. H., Zammit, C. A., & Stohlgren, T. J. (1989). Fire and demography. In S. C. Keeley (Ed.), *The California chaparral: paradigms reexamined* (Vol. No. 34, pp. 151-153). Los Angeles, CA: Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Science Series.

Keitt, B., Junak, S., Luna-Mendoza, L., & Aguirre, A. (2005). The Restoration of Guadalupe Island. *Fremontia*, 20-25.

Kilpatrick, H. J. (1999). A controlled archery deer hunt in a residential community: cost, effectiveness, and deer recovery rates. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 115-123.

Knapp, D. A. (2005). Rare Plants in the Goat Harbor Burn Area. *Proceedings of the Sixth California Islands Symposium* (pp. 205-211). Ventura: Institute for Wildlife Studies and National Park Service.

Knapp, D. A. (2009). Oak Ecosystem Restoration on Santa Catalina Island, California: Resources, Threats, and Management Recommendations. Avalon: Catalina Island Conservancy.

Knapp, D. A. (2010). Changes in oak distribution and density by decade on Santa Catalina Island, 1943.

Knapp, D. A. (2014). Ecosystem Restoration on Santa Catalina Island: A Review of Potential Approaches and the Promise of Bottom-Up Invader Management. *Monographs of the Western North American Naturalist, 7*(1), 421-434.

Knowlton, J. L., Donlan, C. J., Roemer, G. W., A., S.-H., Keitt, B. S., Wood, B., . . . Tershy, B. R. (2007). Eradication of Non-Native Mammals and the Status of Insular Mammals on the California Channel Islands, USA, and Pacific Baja California Pennisula Islands, Mexico. *The Southwestern Naturalist*, 528-540.

Kock, R. A., Woodford, M. H., & Rossiter, P. B. (2010). Disease risks associated with translocation. *Revue scientifique et technique, 29*(2), 329.

Krajick, K. (2005). Winning the war against island invaders. *Science, 310(5753)*, 1410-1413.

La Verne Leader. (1949, September 2). Catalina Deer Hunt. *La Verne Leader*.

Landis, F. (2000). Unburned and grazed chaparral: a case study. *Interface between Ecology and Land Development in California*, 00-62.

Laughrin, L., Carroll, M., Bromfield, A., & Carroll, J. (1994). Trends in Vegetation Changes with Rellloval of Feral Animal. *The Fourth California Islallds Syl/lposiul/l: Update Oil tile Status ofResources*, 523-530.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Lombardo, C., & Faulkner, K. (2000). Eradication of feral pigs (Sus scrofa) from Santa Rosa Island, Channel Islands National Park, California. *Proceedings of the Fifth California Islands Symposium*, 300-306.

Long Beach Independent. (1948, February 29). Deer Strip Catalina Bare. *Long Beach Independent*.

Long Beach Press-Telegram. (1947, August 27). Limited Deer Hunting Advised for Catalina. *Long Beach Press-Telegram*.

Long Beach Press-Telegram. (1948, September 16). Island Deer Transplanted to Mainland. *Long Beach Press-Telegram*.

Long Beach Press-Telegram. (1948). Island Deer Transplanted to Mainland. *Long Beach Press-Telegram*.

Long Beach Press-Telegram. (1949, November 6). Odds and Ends From the Tackle Box. *Long Beach Press-Telegram*.

Longhurst, W., Leopold, A. S., & Dasmann, R. F. (1952). *A Survey of California Deer Herds: Their Ranges and Managment Problems.* Berkeley: State of California, Department of Fish and Game, Bureau of Game Conservation.

Luna-Mendoza, L., Aguirre-Munoz, A., Hernandez-Montoya, J. C., Torres-Aguilar, M., Garcia-Carreon, J. S., Puebla-Hernandez, O., . . . Mendez-Sanchez, F. (2019). Ten years after feral goat eradication: the active restoration on Guadalupe Island, Mexico. *Island invasives: scaling up to meet the challenge* (pp. 571-575). Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

Lundgren, E. J., Bergman, J., Trepel, J., le Roux, E., Monsarrat, S., Kristensen, J. A., . . . Svenning, J.-C. (2024). Functional traits—not nativeness—shape the effects of large mammalian herbivores on plant communities. *Science, 383*(6682), 531-537.

Mack, M. C., & D'Antonio, C. M. (1998). Impacts of biological invasions on disturbance regimes. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 13*(5), 195-198.

Management, C. G. (2025). *California Hog Hunting Regulations: Know Before You Go*. Retrieved from https://huntcgm.com/california-hog-hunting-regulations-know-before-you-go/

Manuwal, T., & Sweitzer, R. (2007). *Browse Impacts of Introduced Mule Deer to Island Scrub Oak Habitats on Santa Catalina Island, California.* Avalon: Catalina Island Conservancy.

Mark, A., & Baylis, G. (1982). Further studies on the impact of deer on Secretary Island, Fiordland, New Zealand. *NZ Journal of Ecology, 5*, 67-75.

Martin, T. G., Arcese, P., & Scheerder, N. (2011). Browsing down our natural heritage: Deer impacts on vegetation structure and songbird populations across an island archipelago. *Biological Conservation, 144*(1), 459-469.

Maryland Department of Natural Resources. (2020). *Maryland White-Tailed Deer Management Plan 2020–2034.* Annapolis, Maryland: Maryland Department of Natural Resources.

Maryland Department of Natural Resources. (2021). *Maryland Deer Management Annual Report.* Maryland Department of Natural Resources.

Maryland–National Capital Park and Planning Commission (Montgomery Parks). (2024). *Montgomery Parks announces 2024–2025 annual deer population management operations and seasonal park closures.* Montgomery, Maryland: Maryland–National Capital Park and Planning .

Maryland–National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Department of Parks and Recreation, Prince George's County. (2025, 11 21). Retrieved from Maryland–National

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Capital Park and Planning Commission, Department of Parks and Recreation, Prince George's County. n.d.: https://www.pgparks.com/

Matthews. (2009, November 22). Volunteers needed for pair of desert wildlife water project. *Barstow Press Dispatch*, 29.

McCann, B. E. (2004). Techniques and approaches for the removal of feral pigs from island and mainland ecosystems. *Proceedings of the Vertebrate Pest Conference, 21.* 2004.

McCullough, D. (1979). The George Reserve Deer Her: Population Ecology of a K-Selected Species. *University of Michigan Press*.

McEachern, K., Atwater, T., Collins, P. W., Faulkner, K., & Richards, D. V. (2016). Managed Island Ecosystems. In H. Mooney, & E. Zavaleta, *Ecosystems of California* (pp. 755-778). Oakland: University of California Press.

McRae, B. H., Hall, S. A., Beier, P., & Theobald, D. M. (2012). Where to Restore Ecological Connectivity? Detecting Barriers and Quantifying Restoration Benefits. *PLoS One, 7*(12).

Minnich, R. A. (1982). Grazing, fire, and management of vegetation on Santa Catalina Island, California. In Conrad, & Oechel (Ed.), *Proceedings of the symposium on the dynamics and management of Mediterranean-type ecosystems*, (pp. 444-449).

Minnich, R. A. (1995). Fuel-driven fire regimes of the California chaparral. In J. E. Keeley, & T. Scott (Eds.), *Brushfires in California wildlands: ecology and resource* (pp. 21-27). Fairfield, WA: International Association of Wildland Fire.

Missoula Fire Sciences Laboratory. (2018). *Fire regimes of California chaparral communities: Information from the Pacific Southwest Research Station and LANDFIRE*. (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Missoula Fire Sciences Laboratory) Retrieved January 8, 2024, from Fire Effects Information System: https://www.fs.usda.gov/database/feis/fire_regimes/CA_chaparral/all.html

Monks, A., Lee, W., Burrows, L., McNutt, K., & Edge, K.-A. (2005). *Assessment of forest changes on Secretary island, Fiordland National Park, from 1975 to 2003, based on long-term plot measurements, in relation to the presence of deer.* Landcare Research Contract Report: LC0506/007.

Mooney, H., & Zavaleta, E. (2016). *Ecosystems of California.* University of California Press.

Morgan, L., Maxwell, S., Tsao, F., Wildinson, T. A., & Etnoyer, P. (2005). *Marine Priority Conservation Areas: Baja California to the Bering Sea.* Montreal: Commission for the Environment Cooperation of North America and the Marine Conservation Biology Institute.

Morrison, S. (2023, October 17). Letter of Support for the Catalina Island Conservancy's Catalina Island Restoration Project.

National Park Service. (2023, November 6). *News Release*. Retrieved from On the 50th anniversary of hte Endangered Species Act, Channel Islands plant species declared fully recovered: https://www.nps.gov/chis/learn/news/pr110623.htm

National Park Service. (2024, January 9). *Non-native Deer Managment Plan*. Retrieved from National Park Service Point Reyes National Seashore: https://www.nps.gov/pore/learn/management/planning_nonnativedeermanagementplan.htm

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

New Zealand Department of Conservation. (2024, January 10). *Animal Pests: Deer*. Retrieved from Department of Conservation: https://www.doc.govt.nz/nature/pests-and-threats/animal-pests/deer/

Oakland Tribune. (1964, August 20). Anterless hunts becoming more popular. *Oakland Tribune*.

O'Bryan, M. K., & McCullough, D. R. (1985). Survival of Black-Tailed Deer Following Relocation in California. *The Journal of Wildlife Management, 49*(1), 115-119.

O'Donnell, M. A., & DeNicola, A. J. (2006). Den site selection of lactating female raccoons following removal and exclusion from suburban residences. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 34(2).

Oliver, T. H., Heard, M. S., Isaac, N. J., Roy, D. B., Procter, D., Eigenbrod, F., . . . Bullock, J. M. (2015). Biodiversity and resilience of ecosystem functions. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 30*(11), 673-684.

Orians, C., & Ward, D. (2010). Evolution of plant defenses in nonindigenous environments. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 55:439-459.

Ortiz-Alcaraz, A., Aguirre-Munoz, A., Mendez-Sanchez, F., & Ortega-Rubio, A. (2016). Feral Sheep Eradication at Socorro Island, Mexico: A Mandatory Step to Ensure Ecological Restoration. *Interciencia*, 184-189.

Ortiz-Alcaraz, A., Aguirre-Munoz, A., Mendez-Sanchez, F., Rojas-Mayoral, E., Solis-Carlos, F., Rojas-Mayoral, B., . . . Ortega-Rubios, A. (2019). Ecologcal restoration of Socorro Island, Revillagigedo Archipelago, Mexico: the eradication of feral sheep and cats. *Island invasives: scaling up to meet the challenge* (pp. 267-273). Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

Palm Springs Desert Sun. (1950, February 24). Plenty of Deer on Catalina. *Palm Springs Desert Sun*.

Park, I. W., & Jenerette, G. D. (2019). Causes and feedbacks to widespread grass invasion into chaparral shrub dominated landscapes. *Landscape Ecology, 34*, 459-471.

Parkes, J. P., Macdonald, N., & Leaman, G. (2002). An attempt to eradicate feral goats from Lord Howe Island. *Turning the tide: the eradication of invasive species* (pp. 233-239). Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK: IUCN SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group.

Parkes, J., Ramsey, D., Macdonald, N., Walker, K., McKnight, S., Cohen, B., & Morrison, S. (2010). Rapid eradication of feral pigs (Sus scrofa) from Santa Cruz Island, California. *Biological Conservation*, 143: 634-641.

Payton, B. (2023, February 7). Giving Bambi the Boot. *Hakai Magazone*.

Pennsylvania Game Commission. (2015). *White-Tailed Deer Damage Management Project Environmental Assessment.* U.S. Department of Agriculture & Pennsylvania Game Commission.

Pennsylvania Game Commission. (n.d.). *Capture Myopathy*. Retrieved from Pennsylvania Game Commission: https://www.pgc.pa.gov/Wildlife/WildlifeHealth/Pages/CaptureMyopathy.aspx

Perez-Gonzalez, J. (2024). Evolution, Ecology, and Management of Wild Boar and Deer. *Animals*, 22;14(18):2741.

Portland Press Herald. (1948, February 28). Catalina Deer Face Starvation. *Portland Press Herald*.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Raiho, A. M., Hooten, M. B., Bates, S., & Hobbs, N. T. (2015). Forecasting the Effects of Fertility Control on Overabundant Ungulates: White-Tailed Deer in the National Capital Region. *PLoS One, 10*(12).

Ramirez, A. R., Pratt, R. B., Jacobsen, A. L., & Davis, S. D. (2012). Exotic deer diminish post-fire resilience of native shrub communities on Santa Catalina Island, southern California. *Plant Ecology, 213*, 1037-1047.

Ramsey, D., Parkes, J., & Morrison, S. (2009). Quantifying eradication success: the removal of feral pigs from Santa Cruz Island, California. *Biological Invasions*, 11:123-133.

Rastogi, B., & et al. (2016). Spatial and Temporal Patterns of Cloud Cover and Fog Inundation in Coastal California: Ecological Implications. *Earth Interactions, vol. 20, no. 15*.

Raven, P. H. (1967). The Floristics of the California Islands. *Proceedings of the Symposium on the Biology of the California Islands* (pp. 57-59). Santa Barbara: Santa Barbara Botanic Garden.

Rhein. (2008). Snap-shots of fire recovery one year later. *Catalina Islander*.

Rubinoff, D., & Gon III, S. M. (2023, September 22). The role of feral goats in Maui fires. *Science, 381*(6664), p. 1294.

Ruiz-Ballesteros, E., & del Campo Tejedor, A. (2022). Eradicate to Construct Nature. Goats, Rats, and Humans in Floreana (Galapagos Islands). *Ethnos*.

Salladay, R. A., & Ramirez, A. R. (2018). Herbivore Preference of Island Chaparral Shrubs Compared to Mainland Relatives. *Western North American Naturalist, 78(4)*, 768-776.

Salladay, R. A., & Ramirez, A. R. (2018). Reduced Defenses and Increased Herbivore Preference of Island Chaparral Shrubs Compared to Mainland Relatives. *Western North American Naturalist, 78*(4), 768-776.

Schneider, H. E., & Mason, K. M. (2023). *Santa Cruz Island Rockcress (Sibara filifolia) Survey and Habitat Suitability Model 2023 Annual Report.* Santa Barbara, CA: Santa Barbara Botanic Garden.

Seagle, S. W., & Close, J. D. (1996). Modeling white-tailed deer Odocoileus virginianus population control by contraception. *Biological Conservation, 76*(1), 87-91.

Sharp, T. (2013). Ground shooting of feral deer. *pestSMART*.

Sharp, T. a. (2011). *Model for Assessing the Relative Humaneness of Pest Animal Control Methods.* NSW Department of Primary Industries.

Sharp, T., & Saunders, G. (2011). *A model for assessing the relative humaneness of pest animal control methods.* Canberra, ACT: Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry.

Shaw, J., & Willacy, R. (2021). *Informing island eradications: Lessons learned.* Brisbane, AU: The University of Queensland.

Shea, R. (2023, October 16). Letter of Support.

Shuford, W. D., & Gardali, T. (Eds.). (2008). *California Bird Species of Special Concern Book.* Western Field Ornithologists, California Department of Fish and Game.

Simard, M. A., Dussault, C., Huot, J., & Côté, S. D. (2013). Is hunting an effective tool to control overabundant deer? A test using an experimental approach. *The Journal of Wildlife Management, 77*(2), 254-269.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Spatz, D. R., Holmes, N. D., Will, D. J., Hein, S., Carter, Z. T., Fewster, R. M., . . . Russel, J. C. (2022). The global contribution of invasive vertebrate eradication as a key island restoration tool. *Scientific Reports, 12*(1).

Stafford, K. C., DeNicola, A. J., & Magnarelli, L. A. (1996). Presence of Ixodiphagus hookeri (Hymenoptera: Encyrtidae) in Two Connecticut Populations of Ixodes scapularis (Acari: Ixodidae). *Journal of Medical Entomology*, 33(1).

Stapp, P., Hamblen, E., Duncan, C. L., & King, J. L. (2022). Status of the Introduced Mule Deer Population on Catalina Island, California, Based on Annual Spotlight Counts. *Proceedings of the Vertebrate Pest Conference*, *30.*

Syphard, A. B. (2019). Extent and drivers of vegetation type conversion in Southern California chaparral. *Ecosphere: 10(7)*, e02796.

Syphard, A. D., Keeley, J. E., Massada, A. B., Brennan, T. J., & Radeloff, V. C. (2012). Housing arrangement and location determine the likelihood of housing loss due to wildfire. *PloS one, 7*(3).

The Nature Conservancy. (2018, October 10). *Stories In California*. Retrieved from Endangered Island Foxes Break Record for Fast Recovery: https://www.nature.org/en-us/about-us/where-we-work/united-states/california/stories-in-california/endangered-island-foxes-break-record-for-fast-recovery/

Thomson, D. M., McEachern, K. A., Schultz, E. L., Niessen, K., Wilken, D., Chess, . . . Tucker, A. (2022). Diverse Native Island Flora shows Rapid Initial Passive Recovery after Exotic Herbivore Removal on Santa Rosa Island, California. *Biological Invasions*, 1635-1649.

Thorne. (1967). *A flora of Santa Catalina Island, California.* Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden.

U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2023, January 24). Five Species on San Clemente Island Declared Fully Recovered. Naval Base Coronado, California.

USA, I. H. (2025, November 11). *Hunting Incident Database*. Retrieved from https://incidents.ihea-usa.org/

Vassar College Preserve. (2025). *The Preserve at Vassar*. Retrieved from Deer Management: https://www.vassar.edu/preserve/management/deer-management

Vassar College Preserve. n.d. (2025, 11 21). *“Deer Management – The Preserve at Vassar.”*. Retrieved from Vassar.edu: https://www.vassar.edu/preserve/management/deer-management

Vitousek. (1988). Diversity and Biological Invasions of Ocean Isalnds. In E. Wilson, *Biodiversity.* Washington DC: National Academies Press (US).

Williams, S. C. (2013). Deer density estimation in a suburban population using distance sampling. *Human–Wildlife Interactions 7(1)*, 89-101.

Woolsey, J., Hanna, C., McEachern, K., Anderson, S., & Hartman, B. D. (2018). Regeneration and Expansion of Quercus tomentella (Island Oak) Groves on Santa Rosa Island. *Western North American Naturalis*, 758-767.

Yoho, D., Boyle, T., & McIntire, E. (1999). The climate of the Channel Islands, California. *Proceedings of the Fith California Islans Symposium* (pp. 81-88). Santa Barbara: Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit A: Hunting Tag and Harvest Data, 1982-2024

YEAR	TAGS ISSUED	TOTAL HARVEST	PERCENT TAG SUCCESS
1982	150	74	49%
1983	150	82	55%
1984	70	45	64%
1985	300	146	49%
1986	300	119	40%
1987	251	79	31%
1988	UNKNOWN	106	UNKNOWN
1989	300	7	2%
1990	300	7	2%
1991	300	21	7%
1992	179	100	56%
1993	289	67	23%
1994	249	84	34%
1995	241	81	34%
1996	108	21	19%
1997	NA	15	NA
1998	141	79	56%
1999	239	101	42%
2000	184	100	54%
2001	0	0	NA
2002	98	77	79%
2003	271	214	79%
2004	220	165	75%
2005	240	166	69%
2006	263	235	89%
2007	547	402	73%
2008	372	254	68%
2009	286	216	76%
2010	271	180	66%
2011	358	282	79%
2012	389	310	80%
2013	400	309	77%
2014	340	225	66%
2015	321	217	68%
2016	344	244	71%
2017	320	207	65%
2018	340	223	66%

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2019	318	181	57%
2020	339	221	65%
2021	385	245	64%
2022	437	207	47%
2023	500	320	64%
2024	754	379	50%
AVERAGE	**289**	**158**	**55%**

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit B: Table of Rare Plant Taxa on Catalina Island

SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	FEDERAL STATUS	STATE STATUS	STATE RANK	GLOBAL RANK	CALIFORNIA RARE PLANT RANK	CATALINA ISLAND ENDEMIC
Abronia maritima	Red sand verbena			S3?	G4	4.2	
Aphanisma blitoides	Aphanisma			S2	G3G4	1B.2	
Arctostaphylos catalinae	Santa Catalina Island manzanita			S2?	G2?	1B.2	X
Atriplex coulteri	Coulter's saltbush			S1S2	G3	1B.2	
Atriplex pacifica	South Coast saltscale			S2	G4	1B.2	
Atriplex serenana var. *davidsonii*	Davidson's saltscale			S1	G5T1	1B.2	
Bergerocactus emoryi	Golden-spined cereus			S2	G2G3	2B.2	
Calochortus catalinae	Catalina mariposa lily			S3S4	G3G4	4.2	
Calystegia macrostegia ssp. *macrostegia*	Island morning-glory					CBR	
Ceanothus arboreus	Feltleaf ceanothus					CBR	
Ceanothus megacarpus var. *insularis*	Island ceanothus			S4	G5T4	4.3	
Centromadia parryi ssp. *australis*	Southern tarplant			S2	G3T2	1B.1	
Cercocarpus betuloides var. *blancheae*	Island mountain-mahogany			S4	G5T4	4.3	
Cercocarpus traskiae	Catalina Island mountain mahogany	FE	CE	S1	G1	1B.1	X

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Cistanthe maritima	Seaside cistanthe			S3	G3G4	4.2	
Constancea nevinii	Nevin's wooly sunflower			S3	G3	1B.3	
Convolvulus simulans	Small-flowered morning glory			S4	G4	4.2	
Crocanthemum greenei	Island rush-rose	FT		S3	G3	1B.2	
Crossosoma californicum	Catalina crossosoma			S3	G3	1B.2	
Deinandra clementina	Island tarplant			S4	G4	4.3	
Dendromecon harfordii var. *rhamnoides*	South island bush-poppy			S1	G4T1Q	3.1	
Dichondra occidentalis	Western dichondra			S3S4	G3G4	4.2	
Diplacus traskiae	Santa Catalina Island monkeyflower			SX	GX	1A	X
Dissanthelium californicum	Catalina grass			S1	G2	1B.2	
Dithyrea maritima	Beach spectaclepod		CT	S1	G1	1B.1	
Dudleya greenei	Greene's dudleya			S3	G3	4.2	
Dudleya virens ssp. *hassei*	Catalina Island dudleya			S2	G3?T2	1B.2	X
Dudleya virens ssp. *insularis*	Island green dudleya			S3	G3?T3	1B.2	
Dudleya virens ssp. *virens*	Bright green dudleya			S2	G3?T2	1B.2	
Eriodictyon traskiae ssp. *traskiae*	Trask's yerba santa					CBR	

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Eriogonum giganteum var. *giganteum*	Santa Catalina Island buckwheat			S3	G3T3	4.3	X
Eriogonum grande var. *grande*	Island buckwheat			S4	G4T4	4.2	
Eschscholzia ramosa	Island poppy			S4	G4	4.3	
Euphorbia misera	Cliff spurge			S2	G5	2B.2	
Galium catalinense ssp. *catalinense*	Santa Catalina Island bedstraw			S2	G4T2	1B.3	X
Galium nuttallii ssp. *insulare*	Nuttall's island bedstraw			S4	G5?T4	4.3	
Gambelia speciosa	Showy island snapdragon			S3	G3	1B.2	
Gilia nevinii	Nevin's gilia			S4	G4	4.3	
Harpagonella palmeri	Palmer's grapplingho ok			S3	G4	4.2	
Hordeum intercedens	Vernal barley			S3S4	G3G4	3.2	
Isocoma menziesii var. *decumbens*	Decumbent goldenbush			S2	G3G5T2T3	1B.2	
Jepsonia malvifolia	Island jepsonia			S4	G4	4.2	
Lavatera assurgentiflora ssp. *glabra*	Southern island mallow			S1	G1T1	1B.1	
Lepechinia fragrans	Fragrant pitcher sage			S3	G3	4.2	
Lepidium virginicum var. *robinsonii*	Robinson's pepper-grass			S3	G5T3	4.3	
Lonicera subspicata var. *subspicata*	Santa Barbara honeysuckle			S2?	G5T2?	1B.2	
Lotus dendroideus	Island deerweed			S3	G4T3	4.2	

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

var. *dendroideus*							
Lycium brevipes var. *hassei*	Santa Catalina Island desert-thorn			S1	G5T1Q	3.1	
Lycium californicum	California box-thorn			S4	G4	4.2	
Lyonothamnus floribundus ssp. *floribundus*	Santa Catalina Island ironwood			S2	G3T2	1B.2	X
Malacothamnus fasciculatus var. *catalinensis*	Santa Catalina Island bush-mallow			S2	G4T2Q	4.2	X
Microseris douglasii ssp. *platycarpha*	Small-flowered microseris			S4	G4T4	4.2	
Nemacaulis denudata var. *denudata*	Coast woolly-heads			S2	G3G4T2	1B.2	
Orobanche parishii ssp. *brachylobum*	Short-lobed broomrape			S3	G4?T4	4.2	
Pentachaeta lyonii	Lyon's pentachaeta	FE	CE	S1	G1	1B.1	
Piperia cooperi	Chaparral rein orchid			S3S4	G3G4	4.2	
Quercus engelmannii	Engelmann oak			S3	G3	4.2	
Quercus pacifica	Island scrub oak			S4	G4	4.2	
Quercus tomentella	Island oak			S3S4	G3G4	4.2	
Quercus x macdonaldii	Macdonald oak					CBR	
Rhamnus pirifolia	Island redberry			S4	G4	4.2	
Ribes viburnifolium	Santa Catalina Island currant			S2?	G2?	1B.2	

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scrophularia villosa	Santa Catalina figwort			S3	G3	1B.2	
Senecio aphanactis	Chaparral ragwort			S2	G3	2B.2	
Senecio lyonii	Island senecio					CBR	
Sibara filifolia	Santa Cruz Island rock cress	FE		S2	G2	1B.1	
Solanum wallacei	Wallace's nightshade			S2	G3Q	1B.1	
Suaeda taxifolia	Wooly seablite			S4	G4	4.2	
Trifolium gracilentum var. *palmeri*	Southern island clover			S4	G4	4.2	

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit C: Timeline of Introductions and Eradications on the Channel Islands

Species	San Miguel	Santa Rosa	Santa Cruz	Anacapa	Santa Barbara	San Nicolas	Santa Catalina	San Clemente
Rabbits (*Lagomorpha*)								
European rabbit					1942–1981		2000–present (pets)	
European hare				1930s–mid-1960s	1918–1930s			
Rodents (*Rodentia*)								
Western harvest mouse								1930s–present?
California vole								1930s–present?
House mouse							Early 1900s–present	Post-1943–present
Black rat	Early 1900s–present			1853?–2002			Early 1900s–present	Post-1943–present
Norway rat							1939–present?	
Carnivores (*Carnivora*)								
Dogs								
Domestic dog	1884–1940s	1888-1993	1880s–1980			1853–1857, early 1940s	Late 1800s–present (pets)	1870s–1940s
Cats								
Feral cat	1884–early 1940s	Late 1930s	Early 1920s–1939	Late 1920s–late 1940s	Pre-1863–1978	1901–2010	Pre-1932–present	1863–present
Herbivores: Odd-toed ungulates (*Perissodactyla*)								
Horse	1851–1948	1844–present	1839–2009		1915–1919	1857–1943	1863–present	1860s–1958, 1972–1977
Mule/burro/donkey	Early 1950s–1976	1880s			1915–1922	1900s–early 1940s	1886–1903?	1913–1930s

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Species	San Miguel	Santa Rosa	Santa Cruz	Anacapa	Santa Barbara	San Nicolas	Santa Catalina	San Clemente
Herbivores: Even-toed ungulates (*Artiodactyla*)								
Pigs								
Feral pig	1851–1897?	1853–1993	1852–2006				1932–2004	1951–1990
Deer								
Fallow deer			1890–1949					
Mule deer		1880–2015					1928–present	1955, 1962–1990
Elk		1879–2011						
Cattle, Sheep, Goats								
American bison							1924–present	
Domestic cattle	1851–1917?	1844–1998	1830–1999			1856–1870, late 1930s	1854–1970s	1890s–1934
Blackbuck							1972–2011	
Goat	Late 1880s–1890?	1883–early 1900s	Late 1880s, 1919–1920				Pre-1827–2005	1875–1993
European mouflon sheep	Pre-1850–early 1970s	1844–early 1960s	1853–2001	1869–1937	Pre-1863–1926, 1942–1946	1856–1949	1850s–mid-1920s	1853–1941
Barbary sheep							1973–late 1970s	

Table adapted from *Ecosystems of California* (Mooney & Zavaleta, 2016).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit D: Letters of Support

1. ***American Association of Wildlife Veterinarians***
2. ***American Bird Conservancy***
3. ***California Botanic Garden***
4. ***California Invasive Plant Council***
5. ***Center for Biological Diversity***
6. ***California Institute of Environmental Studies***
7. ***California Native Plant Society***
8. ***Endangered Habitats League***
9. ***Friends of the LA River***
10. ***Gabrielino Tongva***
11. ***Global Conservation Consortium – Oak***
12. ***Grupo de Ecologia y Conservacion de Islas***
13. ***Hills For Everyone***
14. ***Keri Dearborn***
15. ***Irvine Ranch Conservancy***
16. ***Island Conservation***
17. ***Dr. William Hayes, Professor of Biology, Loma Linda University***
18. ***United States Department of Interior – National Park Service***
19. ***Santa Barabara Botanic Garden***
20. ***Robyn Shea, Lead Research Specialist, Santa Rosa Island Research Station***
21. ***Roger Young, Catalina Island Resident***
22. ***The Nature Conservancy***
23. ***Dr. Dirk H Van Vuren, Professor of Wildlife Biology, UC Davis***
24. ***T. Winston Vickers, DVM, MPVM, Associate Research Veterinarian – UC Davis Wildlife***
25. ***Dr. Travis Longcore, Adjunct Professor, UCLA***
26. ***Dr. Lisa Stratton, Director of Ecosystem Management, UC Santa Barbara***
27. ***United States Department of Interior – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service***
28. ***Wildlands Conservation Science***
29. ***Dr. Katherine Pease***
30. ***Conservation Corps of Long Beach***
31. ***Huttopia***
32. ***LA Conservation Corps (The Corps)***
33. ***Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust***
34. ***Outward Bound Adventures***
35. ***Laura Ahkiam, Parent, LBUSD***
36. ***Terry Grill, Former Chair Board of Directors Catalina Island Conservancy***
37. ***Anthony F. Michaels, Catalina Island Conservancy Board***
38. ***San Gabriel Mountains Regional Conservancy***
39. ***Chair of the Benefactors & Chair of the Board of Directors, Catalina Island Conservancy***
40. ***Catalina Island Company***
41. ***Southern California Edison***
42. ***Dr. Geraldine Knatz, Professor of the Practice of Policy and Engineering, USC***
43. ***Patricia McCormick, Catalina Island Resident***
44. ***National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA)***
45. ***Coastal Corridor Alliance***

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

46. Victoria Dean, Catalina Island Conservancy Board
47. Josh Lowenthal, Assemblymember, 69th District
48. Steven L. Monfort, DVM, PhD, Executive Director, UC Natural Reserve System
49. Adam B. Schiff, Member of Congress
50. The South Los Angeles Transit Empowerment Zone (SLATE-Z)
51. Ventura Land Trust
52. Orange County Coastkeeper
53. Jessica Rodriguez, Catalina Island Business Owner, Newport Landing Sportfishing & Whale Watching
54. Maureen H. Ramer, Vice-Chair Catalina Island Conservancy Board of Directors
55. Blanny Avalon Hagenah, Part-Time Catalina Island Resident
56. Catalina Adventure Tours
57. Ken Owen, Executive Director, Channel Island Restoration

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

American Association of Wildlife Veterinarians

President:
John A. Bryan, II
Zachery Consulting, LLC
2595 Rogers Mill Rd
Danielsville, GA 30633-3064
president@aawv.net

President Elect:
Samantha Allen
Wyoming Game & Fish Dept
1212 S Adams St
Laramie WY 82070
presidentelect@aawv.net

Secretary:
Jennifer Bloodgood
Dauphin Island Sea Lab
101 Bienville Blvd
Dauphin Island, AL 36528
secretary@aawv.net

Treasurer:
Laurie Baeten
129 Frey Ave
Fort Collins, CO 80521
treasurer@aawv.net

Immediate Past President:
Anne Justice-Allen
Arizona Game and Fish Dept
5000 West Carefree Hwy
Phoenix, AZ 85086
pastpresident@aawv.net

www.aawv.net

To Whom It May Concern:

Please accept this note as the American Association of Wildlife Veterinarian's (AAWV) unequivocal support for the Catalina Island Conservancy's (CIC) Catalina Island Restoration Project; specifically, for the complete removal of mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) from Catalina Island, California. As an anthropogenically introduced, non-native species, mule deer populations have brought about profoundly negative impacts on the natural ecosystems of Catalina Island. Moreover, the effects associated with the presence of this non-native species have not been limited to the landscape. Since their introduction in the 1930s, mule deer populations on Catalina have exceeded the ecosystem's carrying capacity; a situation that now frequently results in starvation and associated welfare issues for these animals. Anthropogenic interventions in response to these pressures, such as supplemental feeding, have failed to curtail browsing, and have often proven only to exacerbate the situation by creating artificial densities of mule deer, thus increasing the risks of disease transmission and suffering.

In response to the destructive pressures applied to the island's habitat by non-native mule deer, the CIC has put forward a program of lethal removal of this species. Following an exhaustive investigation assessing the benefits and costs of various removal methodologies; e.g., the installation of fencing, recreational hunting, the introduction of predators, translocation, and reproductive management, the CIC's informed conclusion to employ lethal removal via aerial sharpshooting has the support of the AAWV. This method of lethal removal is time-tested in the field of wildlife management, and affords the CIC the greatest opportunity to achieve total extirpation of mule deer from Catalina; especially in the context of animal welfare, human safety, efficiency of resources, and time management. It is the express view of the AAWV that the CIC's mule deer removal plan is scientifically well-grounded, informed, safe, humane, and urgently needed.

Sincerely,

John A. Bryan, II

John A. Bryan, II, DVM, MS
President, American Association of Wildlife Veterinarians

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

AMERICAN BIRD CONSERVANCY

November 17, 2023

Letter of Support for the Catalina Island Conservancy's Catalina Island Restoration Project

To Whom It May Concern,

American Bird Conservancy (ABC) is a nonprofit organization dedicated to conserving wild birds and their habitats throughout the Americas. Over the past 50 years, North America has lost almost 3 billion birds[1], with habitat loss, including degradation caused by introduced species, being a leading cause. As bird populations continue to decline and habitats become more fragmented and degraded, it is critical that we take the opportunity where we can to restore habitats to benefit birds and people.

The negative impacts of artificially high deer populations on bird populations has been documented across North America. Using Breeding Bird Survey data for all of North America, a group of 73 widespread species including both neotropical migratory and non-migratory species showed declining numbers as deer (white-tailed deer, black-tailed deer, and moose) numbers increased. Bird species that are known to be sensitive to higher deer densities declined more strongly in states with more deer[2].

On islands off the coast of British Columbia, islands that had had introduced Sitka black-tailed deer populations for more than 50 years had bird populations only 30% to 45% as high as populations of deer-free islands. On islands with long-term deer populations the bird species with the highest dependence on understory vegetation were most affected, and their abundance was only 7% of those on deer-free islands. Deer overabundance decreased bird food resources and reduced nest site quality[3]. In the islands of Puget Sound, black-tailed deer regulated cover and structure of the understory, which, in turn affected bird populations, and deer-free islands supported the most abundant and diverse bird faunas[4].

These anecdotes are from situations where deer are native but their numbers were artificially high. Deer are not native to Catalina Island, and this it can be expected that their impact on birds and their habitat would be even more significant as those habitats' natural condition is without large herbivores.

Surprisingly, deer can even have direct impacts on birds. White-tailed deer are also known to depredate songbird nests, eating both eggs and nestlings. Deer found and depredated both ground- and above-

---

[1] Rosenberg et al. 2019. Decline of the North American avifauna. Science vol. 366, pp 120-124.
[2] Chollet, S., and J.-L. Martin. 2012. Declining woodland birds in North America: should we blame Bambi? Diversity and Distributions DOI: 10.1111/ddi.12003 http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ddi.12003/full
[3] Allombert, S., A. J. Gaston, and J.-L. Martin. 2005. A natural experiment on the impact of overabundant deer on songbird populations. Biological Conservation 126: 1-13.
[4] Martin, T. G., P. Arcese, and N. Scheerder. 2011. Browsing down our natural heritage: deer impacts on vegetation structure and songbird assemblages across an island archipelago. Biological Conservation. 144:459-469.

P.O. Box 249, The Plains, VA 20198 (regular, registered, or certified mail)
8255 E. Main Street, Suites D & E, Marshall, VA 20115 (physical address; use for deliveries)
tel: **540-253-5780** | fax: **540-253-5782** | email: **info@abcbirds.org** | website: **abcbirds.org**

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

AMERICAN BIRD CONSERVANCY

ground nests, and open bowl-type and covered-bowl nests[5,6]. Although deer are herbivores and such behavior may be uncommon, direct deer effects on birds could be significant at high deer population densities, such as those found on Catalina Island.

Accordingly, American Bird Conservancy strongly supports the Catalina Island Conservancy's Catalina Island Restoration Project. Completely and permanently removing non-native deer from the island is the only way to allow the island's habitats and the species that rely on them to recover.

Sincerely,



Brad Keitt
American Bird Conservancy
bkeitt@abcbirds.org

[5] Pietz, P. J., and D. A. Granfors. 2000. White-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) predation on grassland songbird nestlings. American Midland Naturalist 144(2):419-422. Jamestown, ND: Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center Online. http://www.npwrc.usgs.gov/resource/birds/deerpred/index.htm (Version 09MAR2001)

[6] Ellis-Felege, S. N., J. S. Burnam, W. E. Palmer, D. C. Sisson, S. D. Wellendorf, R. P. Thornton, H. L. Stribling, and J. P. Carroll. 2008. Cameras identify white-tailed deer depredating Northern Bobwhite nests. Southeastern Naturalist 7: 562-564. [See also many citations referenced in this article.]

P.O. Box 249, The Plains, VA 20198 (regular, registered, or certified mail)
8255 E. Main Street, Suites D & E, Marshall, VA 20115 (physical address; use for deliveries)
tel: 540-253-5780 | fax: 540-253-5782 | email: info@abcbirds.org | website: abcbirds.org

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

California BOTANIC GARDEN



November 28, 2023

To whom it may concern,

On behalf of the California Botanic Garden, I am writing to express our strong support for the *Catalina Island Restoration Project*. With more than 86 acres and 95,000 people served annually, California Botanic Garden (CalBG) is the largest botanic garden dedicated to California native plants. We have a mission to conserve California's plant diversity and to enhance human well-being by inspiring and educating the public and the scientific community. Beyond the garden walls, CalBG is regarded as a leading center for research and conservation. The Garden's work has a special focus on California plants including those of Catalina Island. Resident scientists have published a flora of the Island and, more recently, our researchers contributed to the understanding of the evolution of a rare grass native to the Island, *Dissanthelium californicum* (Catalina grass). Further, our living collection, seed bank, and nursery support numerous collections of rare and endemic plants from Catalina Island, providing a safeguard for the unique and irreplaceable botanical diversity.

Catalina Island is a special place for plants. The Island supports 34 plants that are endemic to the Channel Islands, eight of which are restricted to Catalina Island and live nowhere else on earth. One of these extremely rare and endemic species, *Cercocarpus traskiae* (Catalina Island mountain-mahogany) is considered one of the rarest trees in California, with only seven known individuals. *One of the major threats to this extremely rare species is habitat degradation from introduced herbivores.* This threat was recently cited as ongoing in the latest five-year review published for the species by the US Fish and Wildlife in 2021.

The Catalina Island Conservancy manages 48,000 acres on Catalina Island or 88% of the Island. As such, their stewardship is critical to the long-term conservation of the rare, threatened and endemic plants that call the Island home. The *Catalina Island Restoration Project* focuses on three key areas: 1) Habitat restoration to combat soil erosion, conserve endangered species, and reduce wildfire risk. 2) Plant restoration, fostering a seed supply of local native seeds which is essential to reintroducing native plants to the landscape. 3) Non-native species removal including the removal of mule deer and invasive plant species. Invasive species removal is a particularly key component of the restoration project because invasive species are known to have significant impact on islands ecosystems and have been found to be a leading cause of species extinctions on islands.

There is a growing body of evidence demonstrating that the removal of non-native and invasive animals contributes significantly to the restoration and recovery of island ecosystems and species. For example, four federally listed plant species endemic to San Clemente Island, San Clemente Island (SCI) bush-mallow (*Malacothamnus clementinus*), SCI paintbrush (*Castilleja grisea*), SCI lotus (*Acmispon dendroideus* var. *traskiae*), and SCI larkspur (*Delphinium variegatum* subsp. *kinkiense*), were removed from the List of Federal Endangered and Threatened Plants based on species recovery in 2023. Specifically, the US Fish and Wildlife

California Botanic Garden
1500 North College Avenue, Claremont, CA 91711
info@calbg.org | (909) 625-8767 | www.calbg.org

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

California BOTANIC GARDEN



Service review indicated that the U.S. Navy's successful removal of non-native herbivores (goats, sheep, pigs, cattle, mule deer) led to recovery of vegetation in areas of severely degraded habitat on San Clemente Island which in turn led to the recovery of these four plant species, such that they no longer require protections under the Federal Endangered Species Act.

As the primary land stewards of Catalina Island, the Catalina Island Conservancy has the important task of ensuring the longevity of imperiled plant species such as the Catalina Island mountain-mahogany. We commend the Catalina Island Conservancy for proposing a comprehensive restoration program that will support restoration and recovery of the Island's biodiversity from multiple angles, including invasive species removal. We look forward to learning of the recovery of endangered species that will result from the removal of invasive non-native herbivores, as has been demonstrated across the other Channel Islands. The plants of Catalina Island deserve this important action for their protection. As the indigenous inhabitants that give Catalina Island its unique sense of place, the native plants of Catalina are an irreplaceable treasure not only to Californians, but also to the world.

Sincerely,

Lucinda A. McDade

Lucinda A. McDade, Ph.D.
Executive Director
Judith B. Friend Director of Research

California Botanic Garden
1500 North College Avenue, Claremont, CA 91711
info@calbg.org | (909) 625-8767 | www.calbg.org

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

CAL-IPC
CALIFORNIA INVASIVE PLANT COUNCIL

1442-A Walnut St., #462
Berkeley, CA 94709
(510) 843-3902
fax: (510) 217-3500
www.cal-ipc.org

December 14, 2023

Dr. Lauren Dennhardt, Sr. Director of Conservation
Catalina Island Conservancy
P.O. Box 2739, Avalon, CA 90704

Dear Dr. Dennhardt,

I am writing on behalf of the California Invasive Plant Council. Our organization is dedicated to protecting California's environment and economy from invasive plants by supporting the community of land stewards across the state. Though we focus on invasive plants, we are well aware of the damage caused by invasive animals, from shot hole borers killing trees in southern California to South American nutria damaging vegetation in San Joaquin Valley waterways.

The rationale for removing imported mule deer from Catalina Island to protect endemic plants and wildlife has been clearly described by the Catalina Island Conservancy and is well supported by studies of the impacts of introduced grazers on islands. The conservancy has evaluated a wide range of alternatives and selected the one deemed to be the most effective and humane. We agree with the rationale for removing mule deer on the island shared by other environmental groups such as The Nature Conservancy, the Center for Biological Diversity, and the California Native Plant Society.

We also understand and empathize with the deep concern community members have about killing the mule deer, a beloved feature of their local environment. This is one of the many difficult aspects of our modern ecological reality. Having moved organisms around the globe over the last several centuries we are faced with situations where these introductions have resulted in significant ecological harm. We must either address the causes or live with the consequences. In a situation like the one on Catalina Island, we believe that the importance of protecting the survival of species that have evolved over millions of years who are faced with extinction is the greater need, difficult as it is for those of our current generations with a strong personal connection to the deer.

We acknowledge the passion and dedication of all stakeholders involved in this decision, and hope that the community will come to peace with the hard choices needed to ensure the survival of the island's unique biological diversity for future generations.

Sincerely,

Doug Johnson

Doug Johnson
Executive Director

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



CENTER for BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

working through science, law and creative media to secure a future for all species, great or small, hovering on the brink of extinction

October 19, 2023

Lauren Dennhardt, PhD
Acting Director of Conservation
Catalina Island Conservancy
Phone: 310-510-1299 x229
P.O. Box 2739, Avalon, CA 90704

Re: Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Dr. Dennhardt,

On behalf of the Center for Biological Diversity, I write to express our organization's strong support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project. Given the unique endemic species and ecosystems of Catalina Island - and the growing threats they face from climate change, drought, fire, and invasive species - the restoration project is one of the most important biodiversity protection efforts underway in California.

While climate change - and the consequent intensifying drought and more frequent and intense fires affecting the island- requires global action to address, the actual impacts of climate change on the species and ecosystems of Catalina can be significantly lessened or mitigated with on-the-ground actions that increase the resiliency of native species. In this context, addressing invasive species on the island is critically important.

Invasive species have long been recognized as one of the greatest drivers of extinction, particularly on islands. Last month, the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) released its *Assessment Report on Invasive Alien Species and their Control*, highlighting the significant role invasive species play in the extinction crisis. The report found that invasive species have been a major factor in 60% of recorded extinctions globally, specifically noting that "invasive species are most damaging on islands."[1]

The Channel Islands generally, and Catalina specifically, are home to dozens of rare and endangered species, with Catalina alone hosting 60 species that occur nowhere else on the planet. The greatest past and ongoing threats to these species have come from introduced, non-native plants and animals. But these threats can be successfully addressed: over the past several decades, islands where introduced goats, pigs, deer and other invasive species have been removed have shown remarkable recovery.

On Santa Cruz Island, for example, non-native feral pigs were completely eliminated from the island in 2006, and as a result, the native fox population rebounded, from fewer than 100 foxes in 2004 to now more than 1,200 in the wild. The pig removal also allowed the Channel Islands bedstraw and Santa Cruz Island dudleya to recover from the brink of extinction, so much so that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife

[1] https://www.ipbes.net/ias

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Service (USFWS) recently proposed them for delisting under the Endangered Species Act (ESA).[2] To protect Santa Rosa Island's endemic flora and fauna, the National Park Service in the 1990's removed all non-native herbivores, including pigs, cattle, elk, and deer. Now that removal is complete, recent surveys document nearly twice as many rare and endemic plant species in study plots as there were in the 1990s.[3] Importantly, in delisting the island fox on San Miguel, Santa Rosa and Santa Cruz islands, USFWS cited the removal on non-native ungulates as a key element in their recovery.[4] Notably, on Catalina Island, where non-native ungulates remain, USFWS determined that the fox remains threatened and still warrants the protections of the ESA.

On Catalina, the non-native deer, introduced to the island almost a century ago for the purpose of hunting, are destroying the ecosystem and pushing several endemic plants to the very edge of extinction. Many of these plants evolved without defense mechanisms to protect against deer herbivory. With no natural predators, the deer population repeatedly grows and then contracts, as animals starve or die of thirst during drought years. Consequently, the deer overgraze the island, and in the process have destroyed the natural habitats that support native wildlife and serve other crucial ecological functions, such as erosion control, groundwater recharge, and wildfire resilience. The impacts of deer on the island have been exacerbated by the severe drought of recent decades, impacts that will only grow in the face of climate change. True recovery of the species and ecosystems of Catalina is impossible so long as the deer herd remains on the island.

While all the components of the Catalina Island Restoration Project are important, the single most impactful thing that can be done to protect the unique and irreplaceable plants of Catalina Island is to remove the introduced, non-native deer from the island. We look forward to the recovery and increased resilience of the native plants, animals, and ecosystems on the island as the program is implement.

Sincerely,

Brendan Cummings, Conservation Director
Center for Biological Diversity
1212 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94612
bcummings@biologicaldiversity.org

2 50 Fed. Reg. 7322 (12/01/2022)
3 https://www.usgs.gov/news/featured-story/livestock-grime-islands-decimated-native-flora-makes-a-comeback
4 81 Fed. Reg. 53315 (8/12/2016)

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE
OF ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

P.O. Box 1185
Davis, CA 95617
(530) 400-1512

October 25, 2023

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing on behalf of the California Institute of Environmental Studies (CIES) to confirm support for the Catalina Island Conservancy's (CIC) island restoration project which includes, in part, eradicating introduced mule deer from Catalina Island. CIES is a California-based nonprofit organization with over 40-years' experience advancing conservation of coastal and marine birds and healthy island ecosystems in the Pacific region through sound science, restoration, partnerships, and community outreach. Our organization is well versed in efforts to conduct restoration work on the Channel Islands, having participated in numerous restoration and conservation projects on seven of the eight islands.

CIC's comprehensive restoration project is designed with the best science available and is in line with the best practices and approaches used across the world for island conservation. These global island conservation best practices regularly use helicopters to eliminate introduced mammals (e.g., deer, pigs, goats). Once removal of destructive mammals has occurred, restoration of the island ecosystem can be truly initiated. This includes actions such as removal of non-native vegetation that crowd out native plants, degrade wildlife habitat and alter fire cycles and soil chemistry. It also includes conducting plant restoration in conjunction with the invasive plant control work. The plant restoration work includes using techniques such as creating a seed farm so that native seeds can be produced in bulk and used for restoration efforts. It also includes out-planting native plants grown in an on-island native plant nursery that helps ensure the recovery and maintenance of a resilient ecosystem. All these actions are included as part of CIC's plan.

In conclusion, the CIC habitat restoration project is well designed, and its implementation is essential to restoring a healthy ecosystem by preventing erosion of soils, promoting native vegetation, and building resiliency to wildfires. Ultimately these actions are essential so that the unique plants and animals of Catalina Island not only persist but thrive, resulting in a functioning ecosystem. It is important to understand that the restoration of the Catalina Island ecosystem cannot occur until all the introduced mule deer are removed from the island. CIES supports the CIC habitat restoration project because it follows the best available science and methods as seen across hundreds of global island conservation efforts.

Sincerely,

Michael Parker

Michael Parker
Executive Director

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



CALIFORNIA
NATIVE PLANT SOCIETY

October 30, 2023

Re: Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing on behalf of the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) in support of current efforts to improve the conservation and management of native biodiversity on Catalina Island via the Catalina Island Restoration Project. CNPS is a non-profit environmental organization with more than 12,500 members in 36 local chapters. Our mission is to protect California's native plants and their natural habitats, today and into the future, through science, education, stewardship, gardening, and advocacy.

Catalina Island is home to more than 60 species of plants and animals that are found nowhere else on Earth. According to the CNPS Rare Plant Inventory, the Island is home to 72 rare plant taxa, eight of which are Catalina Island endemics, and five of which are listed as threatened or endangered under the California and/or Federal Endangered Species Acts[1]. Furthermore, 34 of these taxa are endemic to the Channel Islands. On the extreme side of rarity, Catalina is home to one of the world's rarest plant species, Catalina Island mountain mahogany (*Cercocarpus traskiae*), which is now known from only seven individuals in the wild. The remarkable diversity on Catalina Island, and the fact that so many of its species are so rare and of extremely limited distribution, makes their conservation vital.

Since European colonization, the flora and fauna of the Catalina Island continue to be impacted by a number of threats, including climate change, the spread of invasive species, and impacts from feral herbivores. Animals introduced to the island include pigs, goats, sheep, bison, and deer. Each of these species has caused negative impacts to the flora of the island. While feral pigs, sheep, and goats have been eliminated from the island, and bison are managed to minimize ecosystem impacts, the impacts from introduced mule deer continue to be severe and wide-ranging. Over the past decades, the Catalina Island Conservancy has implemented measures including increased hunting permits for deer to reduce population levels and fencing of rare plants to limit harm caused by herbivory. Despite these actions, the population of deer on the island has not been reduced significantly, and the impacts to sensitive resources continue to increase.

For decades, the Catalina Island Conservancy and researchers have documented impacts caused by introduced mule deer. Deer over-browsing is decreasing the density of vegetation, with significant impacts to both rare and common plant species. This is resulting in the death of individual plants, erosion, and the spread of non-native, invasive plant species. The continued presence of deer on the Island presents grave implications for a number of critically imperiled

[1] https://rareplants.cnps.org/

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

rare plant species. We are specifically concerned that populations of some rare species will be extirpated, and species could go extinct without the complete removal of deer on the island.

The management of introduced animals, as currently proposed by the Catalina Island Conservancy, is not a novel concept on island ecosystems worldwide. Scientists have documented the recovery of species and habitats that has resulted after non-native animals are removed. For example, on nearby Santa Rosa Island, the National Park Service undertook a decades-long effort to remove non-native herbivores including pig, deer, elk, and cattle[2]. Remarkably, the recovery of habitats following this action has been quite rapid with nearly all rare plant species increasing in abundance following feral herbivore removal. Most importantly, follow-up surveys have documented nearly twice as many rare and endemic species compared with surveys in the 1990s, prior to removal. On San Clemente Island, the eradication of non-native herbivores in the 1990s led to the recovery and delisting of four taxa listed under the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). Of additional significance is that these four taxa were some of the very first plants to be listed under Federal ESA. These examples from Santa Rosa and San Clemente Islands give us reason to believe that positive change will occur on Catalina Island following the removal of introduced deer.

For these reasons, CNPS supports the Catalina Island Restoration Project. The most important aspect of the plan from the perspective of habitat management and the recovery of rare and endemic plant species is the removal of introduced deer. The global biodiversity crisis and California's perilous ranking for national plant extinction[3], necessitate these actions to protect Catalina Island's rare plant species and their recovery.

Sincerely,

Nick Jensen, PhD
Conservation Program Director
California Native Plant Society
2707 K Street, Suite 1
Sacramento, CA 95816
njensen@cnps.org

[2] https://www.usgs.gov/news/featured-story/livestock-gone-islands-decimated-native-flora-makes-a-comeback

[3] https://www.natureserve.org/bif

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

ENDANGERED HABITATS LEAGUE
DEDICATED TO ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION AND SUSTAINABLE LAND USE

December 3, 2024

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Charlton Bonham, Director
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Catalina Island Restoration Project – *Support*

Dear Director Bonham:

Endangered Habitats League (EHL) *supports* ecological restoration and climate-resilient actions on Catalina Island as provided in the Cataline Island Restoration Project. For your reference, EHL is a Southern California regional conservation group dedicated to ecosystem protection and sustainable land use.

EHL is concerned that invasive species such as deer have had adverse impacts on the island for decades, and it is imperative to act now to halt and reverse the damage. Catalina Island has more than 60 endemic plant and animal species. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is critical to protect the biodiversity and integrate management for island residents and visitors.

The Channel Islands are unique ecosystems in their own right, and natural communities have evolved apart from the mainland. It is important to respect these attributes. As the only accessible island in Southern California, Catalina is an important entry point for millions of people in Southern California to connect with one of the richest island ecosystems in the world. The Channel Islands can offer a chance to see what California was like prior to European arrival.

EHL supports the Catalina Island Restoration Project because it will provide the proper basis for science, education, and nature. We thus urge the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to support the Restoration Project, *including the most humane and effective programs available to remove invasive species*. Eradicating the mule deer is a vital and foundational component of the Restoration Project, and will enable the ecosystem to recover from overgrazing and trampling. Studies have shown that aerial hunting, as proposed in the permit, is the most humane and effective method of deer removal, minimizing stress levels of deer significantly more than translocation and birth control. Despite Catalina Island having the longest recreational hunting season in the state, the mule deer population continues to grow unchecked, indicating that recreational hunting alone is not a viable method of controlling mule deer population.

Catalina Island's ecosystems as we know them are truly at risk. Without protective measures, many native and endemic species face extinction, and the Island may no longer be able to withstand climate change or support diverse ecosystems for years to come. The effects of disappearing species are already evident, as native chaparral habitats disappear and transition into invasive annual grasslands. Native plants on the Island absorb and retain water and are drought-resistant, acting as natural protection against wildfire and providing important habitat for native animal species. When these native plants are threatened by non-native wildlife and other risks, the Island is vulnerable to devastating climate threats such as wildfire and drought. A catastrophic wildfire is inevitable, such as the 2007 Island Fire. Droughts

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

are similarly unavoidable and disastrous, such as the 2011-2017 drought on the Island, which caused wildlife to die of dehydration and starvation in large numbers and residents to rely on polluting desalination plants. The Catalina Island Restoration Project will safeguard the Island from similar catastrophic impacts, lessening the damage to the Island and bolstering the Island's ability to recover.

The Catalina Island Conservancy is an exemplary steward of Island resources, successfully balancing conservation, education, and recreation. Their Catalina Island Restoration Project is a science-based, comprehensive plan to protect the Island's biodiversity, reduce erosion, prevent wildfires, and create a sustainable environment where nature and humans will thrive for years to come. The implementation of the Restoration Project is urgent due to the heightened climate threats to the plant and animal species, residents, and ecosystems of the Island. Without the Restoration Project, communities across Southern California could lose access to one of the largest and most unique outdoor classrooms, residents would be prey to climate-induced stresses, and the world could lose species found nowhere else on earth.

We thank you for your time and greatly look forward to working together to ensure that Catalina Island will be preserved for generations to come.

Yours truly,

Dan Silver
Executive Director

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

FRIENDS OF THE LA RIVER

570 W. AVE 26 #250
LOS ANGELES
CA 90065
323.223.0585
CONTACT@FOLAR.ORG

12/5/24

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham,

On behalf of Friends of the Los Angeles River, I am writing to express our organization's support for a healthy, climate resilient, and fire-resistant Catalina Island where humans and nature can thrive for years to come. Invasive species have had adverse impacts on the island for decades, and it is imperative to act now to halt and reverse the damage. Catalina Island is a special place for the many species who live on and visit the Island, with more than 60 endemic plant and animal species, 3,500 year-round residents, and a terrain that offers ample recreational opportunities for over one million annual visitors. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is critical to protect the biodiversity that will secure climate resilience for an important resource for communities across California to learn about and experience unique landscapes and species.

FoLAR supports the Catalina Island Restoration Project because Catalina Island serves as a gateway to science, education, and nature for Catalina Island residents and visitors. We urge the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to support the Restoration Project. As the only accessible island in Southern California, Catalina is an important entry point for millions of people in Southern California to connect with one of the richest island ecosystems in the world through hiking, camping, snorkeling, and much more. These visitors include thousands of youth per year who participate in overnight camps centered on outdoor science and adventures, creating a foundation for the next generation of environmental leaders and stewards. Catalina Island's unique wildlife and recreation opportunities generate millions in visitor-driven revenue, supporting the people living and working on the island, many of whom have called the Island home for generations.

Catalina Island's ecosystems as we know them are at risk. Without protective measures, many native and endemic species face extinction, and the Island may no longer be able to withstand climate change or support diverse ecosystems for years to come. The effects of disappearing species are already evident, as native chaparral habitats disappear and transition into invasive annual grasslands. Native plants on the Island absorb and retain water and are drought-resistant, acting as natural protection against wildfire and providing important habitat for native animal species. When these native plants are threatened by non-native wildlife and other risks, the Island is vulnerable to devastating climate threats such as wildfire and drought. A catastrophic wildfire is inevitable, such as the 2007 Island Fire, in which 10% of the Island burned and 700 residents and visitors were forced to evacuate. Droughts are similarly unavoidable and disastrous, such as the 2011-2017 drought on the Island, which caused wildlife to die of dehydration and starvation in large numbers and residents to rely on highly polluting desalination plants. Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project will safeguard the Island from similar catastrophic impacts, lessening the damage to the Island and bolstering the Island's ability to recover.

The Catalina Island Conservancy is an exemplary steward of Island resources, successfully balancing conservation, education, and recreation. Their Catalina Island Restoration Project is a science-based, comprehensive plan to protect the Island's biodiversity, reduce erosion, prevent wildfires, and create a sustainable environment where nature and humans will thrive for years to come. The implementation of

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

FRIENDS OF THE LA RIVER

570 W. AVE. 26 #250
LOS ANGELES
CA 90065
323.223.0585
CONTACT@FOLAR.ORG

the Restoration Project is urgent due to the heightened climate threats to the plant and animal species, residents, and ecosystems of the Island. Without the Restoration Project, communities across Southern California could lose access to one of the largest and most unique outdoor classrooms, thousands of residents could lose their homes, and the world could lose species found nowhere else on earth.

We thank you for your time and greatly look forward to working together to ensure that Catalina Island will be preserved for generations to come.

Best,

Candice Dickens-Russell
President & CEO

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Gabrieleno
San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians

December 3, 2026,

Dear Supervisor Hahn,

As a member of The San Gabriel Band of MIssion Indians, who have stewarded Tovaangar (The Los Angeles Basin and Southern California Channel Islands), including Pimu (Catalina Island) since time immemorial, I am writing to express my support for Operation Protect Catalina Island and the Catalina Island Conservancy's island restoration work.

This effort will safeguard the island's future by making Catalina more resilient to climate change and catastrophic wildfire. Invasive species have harmed Catalina for decades, and it is imperative to act now to halt and reverse the damage. Catalina is home to more than 60 plant and animal species found nowhere else on Earth. Pimu holds important cultural artifacts that we are still uncovering,such as its soapstone quarries, which also provide invaluable insight into the cultural practices of Gabrieleno-Tongva tribes. On a personal level, Catalina is also where we have continued to explore and connect with our ancestors. Preserving the Island for future generations is deeply important to me. We recently entered into an MOU with the Conservancy and hope that our relationship will continue to grow through engaging conversations, especially considering the cultural sensitivity of the island.

I support this restoration work because Catalina serves as a gateway to science, education and nature-based experiences for both residents, visitors and those of us with cultural ties to the land. Through access to a healthy Catalina and partnership with the Catalina Island Conservancy, my community and I are able to gather shells, rocks, elderberry, materials for basketry and other plants for food, medicine and cultural activities.

Without protective action, Catalina's ecosystems are at serious risk, such as our beloved White Sage and Catalina Island Fox. Many native and endemic species face extinction as invasive plants and animals spread. The loss of native chaparral gives ways to invasive annual grasses, which now dominate 35% of ecosystems on the Island. Our cultural practices and material gathering on Pimu is at risk when non-native plants and animals, like mule deer, are allowed to flourish.

Thank you for your leadership and for all you are doing to protect the people, wildlife and cultural beauty of Pimu. With your support, we can ensure a healthy, resilient Island for everyone.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Johnson

Kimberly Johnson Tribal Secretary, San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians led by the Gabrieleno Tongva Tribal Council

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Global Conservation Consortium
Oak

March 1, 2024

To whom it may concern:

On behalf of the Global Conservation Consortium for Oak (GCCO)-Oaks of the Californias' Working Group, we are writing in support of the Catalina Island Restoration Project. The Global Conservation Consortium for Oak, in partnership with Botanic Gardens Conservation International (BGCI), is a coordinated network of institutions and experts who work collaboratively to develop and implement a comprehensive conservation strategy to prevent the extinction of the world's oak species. The GCCO has over 100 members in the Western US and are working to initiate, support and collaborate on projects that mitigate threats to the priority, threatened oaks in this biodiverse region. More specifically, the GCCO follows the data and information provided in the Red List of Oaks 2020 Report (Carrero et al., 2020) and the Conservation Gap Analysis of Native US Oaks (Beckman et al., 2019) to prioritize and guide their conservation and research efforts.

These reports identified numerous priority threatened oaks native to California: *Quercus cedrosensis, Quercus dumosa, Quercus engelmannii, Quercus pacifica, Quercus parvula,* and *Quercus tomentella,* several of which are native to Catalina Island. As part of the GCCO efforts to conserve these species of concern, the GCCO Western US regional group worked together to draft a conservation action plan. They had in-depth discussions on the species threats and challenges, and then identified what we can do as a group to mitigate the most imminent threats to the species conservation status. The final action plan can be accessed on the GCCO website. One of the main threats identified for the oaks native to Catalina are the impacts from browse, affecting the oaks population and health, reducing regeneration, as well as the survival of the young oaks. This has led to a large decline in the oak populations native to the island. The reduction of the oak woodland can negatively impact the surrounding ecosystem. The action plan identified specific activities to initiate that would address the negative impacts from browse so as to restore and replenish the native oak populations on the island.

Overall, the Catalina Island Restoration Project will complement and inform the work being done by the Global Conservation Consortium for Oak and advance the collective goals of the broader oak conservation community.

The GCCO is greatly supportive of this restoration project. This is an opportunity to set a baseline for future oak conservation. Oaks are declining globally, so the preservation of the Catalina Island oak populations is critical in contributing to the persistence of these valuable oak species and the many benefits and services they provide to the ecosystem. Please feel free to reach out with any questions or concerns. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Kind regards,
Silvia Alvarez-Clare, PhD
Global Lead of the GCCO
salvarezclare@mortonarb.org

Amy Byrne,
Global Tree Conservation Manager/GCCO Coordinator
abyrne@mortonarb.org

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

25 años Conservación de Islas

Ensenada, Baja California, Mexico.
November 22, 2023.

To Whom It May Concern:

Re: Letter of Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project.

On behalf of Grupo de Ecología y Conservación de Islas (GECI), I want to express our strong support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project led by The Catalina Island Conservancy.

For 25 years, our organization has been devoted to the ecological restoration of Mexican Islands. Based on our experience, it is clear to us that the only way to restore the native flora of an insular ecosystem is through the removal of invasive alien species, followed by active restoration. We have witnessed examples of severe degradation of entire vegetation communities due to the presence of introduced herbivores. Guadalupe, Socorro, and María Magdalena islands in the Mexican Pacific are examples of how goats, sheep, and introduced white-tailed deer modify the native flora composition and promote soil erosion, with negative impacts on the entire ecosystem's functions and services.

On Guadalupe, after goats were introduced, the plant communities either disappeared or remained as isolated individual plants. At least 26 plant taxa became extinct or were extirpated. On Socorro, the ecosystem was impacted by feral sheep for more than 150 years. A vast area on the island was transformed from a rich community of ferns, vines, shrubs, and trees to a savanna-like open habitat with dominance of exotic plants and heavy sheet and gully erosion. On Magdalena Island, introduced white-tailed deer are threatening the populations of at least six plant species, some of them endemic to the archipelago.

On big islands with complex terrain such as Guadalupe, Socorro, and Catalina, the most efficient and therefore humane method to knockdown the population of ungulates is using a skilled hunter targeting animals from a helicopter. This is a method that has been used widely on islands across the world and proved successful in aiding in reducing the duration of eradication campaigns and animal suffering in consequence.

The alteration of these unique ecosystems is the consequence of human intervention, so we are thus ethically responsible to reverse our impact and promote recovery as much and as fast as we can. After sheep were eradicated from Socorro vegetation cover immediately started to increase. Only four years after the eradication, 11% of the island's bare ground surface recovered the vegetation layer. In addition, soil erosion started to decrease, as well as soil compaction which facilitated the recolonization of plants. The island harbors a lot of endemic animal species, such as landbirds and a lizard. As the habitat started to recover, the abundance of these species did. Guadalupe, and the other Channel Islands where herbivores have been removed, are great examples of how insular ecosystems can recover once herbivores are removed. Guadalupe Island shares 153 plant species with Catalina Island. Catalina nightshade (*Solanum wallacei*), Feltleaf ceanothus (*Ceanothus arboreus*), and Island oak (*Quercus tomentella*) have recovered remarkably on Guadalupe once pressure by herbivory was released. On Catalina these species are still considered the highest priority based on rarity, they continue to be threatened by deer browsing. The Catalina Island Conservancy is seeking to change that.

Sincerely,

Dr. Federico Méndez Sánchez
Director General

Grupo de Ecología y Conservación de Islas, A.C.
Av. Moctezuma 836, Zona Centro, Ensenada, B.C., México 22800 Tel. (646) 173 4943 + 173 4987
www.islas.org.mx federico.mendez@islas.org.mx FB: Conservación de Islas

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Hills For Everyone

Southern California comes together at the Puente-Chino Hills



January 21, 2025

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham,

On behalf of Hills For Everyone I am writing to express our organization's support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project. Invasive species have adversely impacted the island for decades, and it is imperative to act to reverse the damage. Catalina Island is a special place for the many species who live on and visit the Island. With more than 60 endemic plant and animal species, 3,500 year-round residents, and a terrain that offers ample recreational opportunities for over one million annual visitors, this Restoration Project is critical. It will help protect the biodiversity that will secure climate resilience for this wonderful and unique landscape.

With the presence of nesting bald eagles in Anaheim Hills and the Prado Basin, those of us who live on the mainland are reaping the benefits with the bald eagle restoration efforts that occurred on Catalina.

The Island's ecosystems are at risk. Without protective measures, many native and endemic species face extinction, and the Island may no longer be able to withstand climate change. The effects of disappearing species are already evident, as native chaparral habitats transition into invasive annual grasslands. Native plants on the Island absorb and retain water and are drought-resistant, acting as natural protection against wildfire while providing important habitat for native animal species. Without them, catastrophic wildfire is inevitable, such as the 2007 Island Fire, in which 10% of the Island burned and 700 residents and visitors were forced to evacuate.

We support the Catalina Island Restoration Project to safeguard the Island from more catastrophic impacts and bolster the Island's ability to recover.

Yours truly,
Claire W. Schlotterbeck

Claire W. Schlotterbeck
Executive Director

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

FROM THE DESK OF

KERI DEARBORN

January 25, 2024

To Whom It May Concern,

As an environmental educator and island fox (*Urocyon littoralis*) advocate since 2003, I am writing to support the Catalina Island Conservancy's (CIC) implementation of their island restoration project and the unfortunate, but necessary, removal of introduced mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*).

It is a tragedy that individual animals must pay the price for misinformed human actions of the past. The human introduction of mule deer in the 1930s to Catalina Island has been a slow-burning disaster for the fragile and isolated island ecosystem. Without natural predators, the deer population lives through boom/bust cycles that devastate rare island endemic plants, reduce mid-story nesting habitat for bird species, impact resources for island foxes and other island endemics, exacerbate island erosion, and cause periodic starvation events in the deer population.

Around the world, island ecosystems face catastrophic destruction because of intentional and accidental human introduction of species. CIC has tried to manage the mule deer population through recreational hunting permits, but this effort has failed. Unfortunately, rapid lethal removal of introduced species is more humane than slow decline and offers the best opportunity for island ecosystem restoration. In the last two decades, the method of aerial sharpshooters has been deployed to remove feral pigs on Santa Cruz Island and mule deer and elk on Santa Rosa Island. In both cases, the island ecosystems have finally began to heal from a century of over browsing. Island fox numbers have recovered to historic highs on these two islands. Native oak seedlings are finally able to survive and island endemic plants are returning to provide habitat for island species and migratory birds.

The lethal removal of a species is never a desired option, but in this situation science and experience demonstrate that the best choice for restoring the island ecosystem and protecting a wide range of endemic island species is the humane removal of the mule deer.

Sincerely,

Keri Dearborn

20982 AVE SAN LUIS, WOODLAND HILLS CA 91364

4animalbytes@gmail.com

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

IRVINE RANCH CONSERVANCY

December 1, 2023

Re: Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project

To whom it may concern,

On behalf of Irvine Ranch Conservancy (IRC), I am writing to express our organization's enthusiastic support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project. As climate change continues to exacerbate threats to the island's ecosystems, including invasive species, fire, and drought, an ambitious and comprehensive approach is essential to preserve and restore critical habitats.

As a mainland counterpart to Catalina Island Conservancy (CIC) with a shared mission, IRC is well positioned to evaluate and endorse this project. Both the State of California and the United States Department of Interior have designated nearly 40,000 acres of open space in Orange County as the Irvine Ranch Natural Landmarks, and my organization protects, restores, and enhances approximately 30,000 acres of this landscape on behalf of a collection of public landowners while ensuring environmentally responsible and sustainable public access. Like Catalina Island, this open space is contained within the California Floristic Province global biodiversity hotspot and is unique due to its proximity to major population centers. In our area, the major threats to habitat quality are also largely rooted in the legacy of grazing, in our case by cattle, which has led to the invasion of native shrubland by non-native grasses that in turn have contributed to increasingly frequent fire.

The challenges facing Catalina are even more urgent due to the more than 60 endemic species, isolation, and introduced deer, whose population is growing unchecked due to the lack of predators. The resultant overgrazing is destroying the ecosystem and pushing several endemic plants toward extinction while compromising ecological functions.

The Catalina Island Restoration Project arose out of an extensive strategic planning process and is consistent with best practices for ecological restoration practiced by my organization and others. Neutralizing critical threats, especially invasive plants and animals, followed by seed-based restoration of native habitats has proven to be a highly effective intervention in Southern California and beyond. Importantly, the limited wild seed collection with bulking at the seed farm will ensure a sustainable supply of genetically appropriate plant materials that will allow CIC to adaptively manage the project even in the face of stochastic conditions.

This project promises to help protect Catalina's precious biological resources for generations to come, and we at IRC look forward to contributing to its success in any way that we can.

Sincerely,

Nathan Gregory, PhD.
Interim Senior Vice President and Chief Programs Officer

4727 Portola Parkway, Irvine, Ca 92602 | 714.508.4757 | FAX 714.508.47[illegible]

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

ISLAND CONSERVATION
Preventing Extinctions

November 27, 2023

Letter of Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project

To Whom It May Concern,

Island Conservation would like to express our full support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project led by the Catalina Island Conservancy (Conservancy). Island Conservation's mission to prevent extinctions by removing invasive species from islands has been the cornerstone of our actions since 1994. With our partners, we have successfully restored 71 islands worldwide, benefiting hundreds of at-risk populations and species. With this experience, we recognize the profound importance of the work the Catalina Island Conservancy is undertaking. The Conservancy's plan to remove the non-native mule deer population from the island is a crucial step towards protecting Catalina's unique biodiversity and delicate ecosystem.

The continued presence of these invasive ungulates threatens the native plant and animal species that call Catalina home, including over 60 species that are found nowhere else on earth. Due to their direct negative impact on native vegetation, mule deer are contributing to the loss of native habitats, increased soil erosion, and decreased water capture on Catalina. The removal of the non-native deer is necessary to address these issues as part of the Catalina Island Restoration Project.

The method proposed by the Conservancy to complete the removal effort, including the use of highly skilled hunters in helicopters, has been proven globally to be an effective and efficient solution. This method was used to complete the removal of goats from Galapagos Islands between 1997 and 2006, pigs from Santa Cruz Island between 2005 and 2007, deer and elk from Santa Rosa Island between 2011 and 2015, and many other successful island restoration efforts. The removal of non-native ungulates allowed for the natural recovery of these ecosystems and for land managers to take more meaningful actions to support recovery, just as the Conservancy plans to do with the development of landscape scale restoration and long-term monitoring plans for Catalina following the removal of deer.

Island Conservation supports the Catalina Island Conservancy's full initiative to restore Catalina Island, a process that must start with the removal of the mule deer to achieve full benefits to the ecosystem. The success of this project will help to create a more resilient Catalina Island and will serve as an inspiration to the field of conservation.

Kind regards,

Penny Becker
Vice President, Conservation
Island Conservation

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY
School of Medicine

17 October 2023

To whom it concerns,

I am writing to express my support for the removal of deer from Catalina island.

As an invasive species, deer cause incontrovertible damage to natural ecosystems. Many dozens of studies across the globe – including quite a few from various islands – have documented the damage. Vegetation disturbance ranges from the architecture of individual plants to the functioning of entire ecosystems, and often affects rare plant species, forest regeneration and structure, understory volume and diversity, and nutrient cycling. Invasive deer also impact animals, including invertebrates, amphibians, small mammals, and songbirds, either directly or through cascading effects. Ample well-designed studies from Catalina Island support some of these findings as well. Collectively, the literature leaves no room for doubt.

If I may say so, the presence of deer on Catalina serves only the self-indulgent interests of humans at the expense of many other organisms.

I have full confidence that the Catalina Conservancy personnel fully understand the ramifications of a non-native deer population. Thus, I encourage thoughtful consideration of their advice.

Sincerely,

William K. Hayes, Ph.D.
Professor of Biology

A Seventh-day Adventist Organization
DEPARTMENT OF EARTH AND BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES · Griggs Hall, Room 101, Loma Linda, California 92350
909-558-4810 · fax 909-558-0369 · whayes@llu.edu

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

United States Department of the Interior
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Channel Islands National Park
1901 Spinnaker Drive
Ventura, California 93001-4354

IN REPLY REFER TO:
1.A.2 (N2219) - CHIS

February 1, 2024

Whitney Latorre
CEO/President, Catalina Island Conservancy
PO Box 2739
Avalon, CA 90704

Ms. Latorre:

Located off the coast of Southern California, the eight Channel Islands encompass a diverse and unique environment like few places on earth. Isolated from the mainland for millennia, the islands support sensitive, unique, and rare plants and animals, fragile ecological communities, and sacred cultural sites. In recognition of the uniqueness and special fragility of these resources, five of the islands—Anacapa, Santa Cruz, Santa Rosa, San Miguel, and Santa Barbara—and the submerged lands and waters within 1 nautical mile of each island, were designated by Congress as Channel Islands National Park (park) on March 5, 1980.

Since that time, the park and other land stewards within the archipelago—The Nature Conservancy, the US Navy, and the Catalina Island Conservancy—have worked to reverse the ecological impacts of over 100 years of degradation caused by past land management practices and the introduction of non-native species that left the islands in various states of ecological degradation. Early park managers recognized that ecological restoration must start by first removing the threats—non-native animals—which were the root cause of ongoing environmental degradation. Subsequently, the park and its partners undertook a comprehensive and sometimes controversial initiative to remove deer, elk, pigs and various other introduced animals from park lands.

As a result of our efforts, the islands are recovering. Just a few months ago, the park and its partners celebrated the removal of two plant species (Santa Cruz Island Dudleya and Island Bedstraw) from the Endangered Species List and we expect to recover additional plant species in the years to come. In 2015, the park and its partners celebrated the delisting of the island fox, one of the greatest conservation success stories of our time, and one that required the removal of introduced pigs from Santa Cruz Island. Vegetation communities and native animal assemblages on all islands where ungulates were present and removed are recovering. These successes show that nature can recover once threats—like non-native animals—are removed.

Now, Catalina Island faces similar ecological challenges. The Catalina Island Conservancy's Catalina Island Restoration Project builds on lessons learned from animal removal projects at the park and from around the world. The plan includes well-established and vetted methods that have been proven to quickly, safely, and humanely remove non-native animals, along with other essential conservation tools such as seed farming, out-planting, and weed control.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

The Catalina Island Conservancy has developed a comprehensive restoration plan that focuses on addressing the root causes of ecological degradation. Based upon our success at the park using similar practices, we believe your plan will bring about substantial environmental benefits for Catalina Island, enhance the Conservancy's ability to effectively manage resources into the future, and contribute to restoration efforts of all partners across the archipelago.

If you have questions or would like to learn more about conservation successes at Channel Islands National Park, please contact Ken Convery, Chief of Natural Resources Management, at ken_convery@nps.gov.

Sincerely,

Ethan McKinley
Superintendent

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Santa Barbara Botanic Garden

November 10, 2023

Letter of Support for the Catalina Island Conservancy's Catalina Island Restoration Project

To Whom It May Concern:

Santa Barbara Botanic Garden has conducted research on the Channel Islands for nearly 100 years. Through this research, which has included documenting damage and recovery from years of ranching or other uses, it is clear that one of the most critical restoration activities for these island ecosystems is the removal of feral non-native animals. This action alone allows for the recovery of many native plants that cannot survive with grazing, browsing, or rooting pressure. Efforts to restore many native species without controlling these feral non-native animals have been unsuccessful. Alternatively, the control of feral animals on San Clemente, San Nicolas, Anacapa, Santa Cruz, Santa Rosa, and San Miguel has yielded positive ecological benefits.

The Channel Islands are home to some of the most unique plant species on the planet, many of which are found nowhere else on Earth. These island species have had no need for protective chemicals, thorns, and other defenses that have otherwise protected mainland species from mule deer overbrowsing. Additionally, the natural predators that help to keep deer populations in check on the mainland do not exist on Catalina Island. The result is severe overbrowsing which destroys natural habitats, causes significant erosion problems, reduces groundwater recharge, and threatens the continued existence of many of the 60 plant species that occur only on Catalina Island as well as the native wildlife that they support. It's also important to recognize the impact on the deer population itself, as degraded environmental conditions lead to starvation and disease.

Even with the research showing the above effects, this type of intervention is not taken lightly, and I know the Catalina Island Conservancy has studied alternative solutions to impacts from introduced mule deer on the plant species of the island extensively. Other alternatives have already been attempted and failed. The only way to restore and maintain the native plant and animal diversity on the island is to remove these animals.

Precision hunting, which is the recommended means of removing these species on other California islands and island systems around the world is at once humane, safe, and effective at starting the fragile island systems on the road to recovery. We understand the concerns of those opposed to the removal of mule deer, but we urge everyone to consider the long-term impacts - on plants, other animals, and people - if we do not act. Please support these efforts to restore the island so it can flourish for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Steve Windhager, Ph.D.
Executive Director

1212 Mission Canyon Road
Santa Barbara, CA 93105
805 682.4726

SBBotanicGarden.org

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Channel Islands
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
DIVISION OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

October 16, 2023

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing in staunch support of the current efforts by the Catalina Island Conservancy (CIC) to remove deer from the island. The presence of the deer has been a long-standing concern, frustration and struggle in managing the restoration and conservation of the lands with which the CIC is charged, and that countless people hold dear.

Having worked on Catalina Island from 2006-2010 conducting Invasive Species control and eradication as well as trapping Island foxes for 5 seasons, I have seen first-hand the devastation the deer have caused, and the poor health in which they constantly struggle to maintain. I have also seen the countless vehicle strikes killing deer, visitors using them as stage props for their children to take photos, as well as deer coming into Avalon to eat peoples landscaping.

It is well known and documented that the deer were introduced to the island by the California Department of Fish & Wildlife for the sole purpose of hunting. That's correct. In short, they were introduced with the sole purpose of being killed. They are not native to the island - on the mainland, deer populations migrate throughout the seasons looking for food and climates that are more tolerable. They do not have this option on islands, which is a major reason they cause so much damage and why they are starving to death. Other Channel Islands land managers have been successful in removing non-native ungulates and the response of island vegetation has been astoundingly dramatic. Santa Rosa Island is the most recent success story in the archipelago on this front. Deer are also one the major contributing factors of tick presence on Catalina Island, which also poses human health concerns. Ticks are known to carry lime disease, recurring fever and other virus loads that can cause long-term health challenges for residents and visitors alike.

Given the opposition related to deer removal for Catalina Island specifically, Catalina now has the highest number of listed plant species in all of the Channel Islands. These are plants that don't occur anywhere else and should be valued by those visiting Catalina and more importantly those calling Catalina Island home. These plants are just one of the many aspects that make Catalina the gem it is. Endemic plant species of the islands do not have the same defenses that mainland plant species have and thus are more susceptible to harm.

The use of helicopters and wildlife biologists as hunters/sharpshooters has been proven **around the globe** to be the most humane and most effective way to remove non-native ungulates from landscapes. The company being hired for the removal on Catalina, is the same company that did the eradication of deer and elk on Santa Rosa Island. I had the privilege of working alongside them, and no one can do it better. They are trained wildlife biologists; they are not mercenaries as many are depicting them. Utilizing helicopters is the surest way to remove the animals in the most efficient and most humane way possible, which will ultimately cause the least disturbance for residents and visitors.

While I acknowledge change can be difficult and disruptive, I implore the residents of Catalina Island and the local mainland coast to envision a green Catalina Island that shimmers like an emerald on the horizon, rather than the mottled

One University Drive, Camarillo, California 93012-8599 Tel: (805) 437-2690 Fax: (805) 437-5717 www.csuci.edu

A campus of The California State University • Bakersfield • Channel Islands • Chico • Dominguez Hills • East Bay • Fresno • Fullerton • Humboldt • Long Beach • Los Angeles
Maritime Academy • Monterey Bay • Northridge • Pomona • Sacramento • San Bernardino • San Diego • San Francisco • San Jose • San Luis Obispo • San Marcos • Sonoma • Stanislaus

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Channel Islands
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
DIVISION OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

landscape it is currently. After the goats were removed, many people once in opposition begrudgingly acknowledged the island looked much healthier and that they didn't truly realize the damage that was being caused. This is another chance for everyone to help support the health of this struggling landscape, in a very tangible way and reap the rewards of the stunning beauty and magic that is currently being suppressed and irreparable damaged.

Good luck to the Catalina Island Conservancy in this effort to remove deer from Catalina Island. The island will thank you and many of your partners and neighbors are staunch supporters.

In solidarity,
Robyn

Robyn Shea
Lead Research Station Specialist, Santa Rosa Island Research Station
2022-24 Chair, Islands of the Californias Botanical Collaborative
2023 California Islands Symposium, Planning Committee

California State University Channel Islands
One University Drive
Bell Tower West 2245
Camarillo, CA 93012

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

September 29, 2025

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham,

I am writing to express our organization's support for a healthy, climate resilient, and fire-resistant Catalina Island where humans and nature can thrive for years to come. Invasive species have had adverse impacts on the island for decades, and it is imperative to act now to halt and reverse the damage. Catalina Island is a special place for the many species who live on and visit the Island, with more than 60 endemic plant and animal species, 3,500 year-round residents, and a terrain that offers ample recreational opportunities for over one million annual visitors. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is critical to protect the biodiversity that will secure climate resilience for an important resource for communities across California to learn about and experience unique landscapes and species.

Catalina Island is a special place for me to recreate and enjoy time with my family. The preservation of the island for future generations is of paramount importance to me.

I support the Catalina Island Restoration Project because Catalina Island serves as a gateway to science, education, and nature for Catalina Island residents and visitors. We urge the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to support the Restoration Project. As the only large, publicly accessible island in Southern California, Catalina is an important entry point for millions of people in Southern California to connect with one of the richest island ecosystems in the world through hiking, camping, snorkeling, and much more. These visitors include thousands of youth per year who participate in overnight camps centered on outdoor science and adventures, creating a foundation for the next generation of environmental leaders and stewards. Catalina Island's unique wildlife and recreation opportunities generate millions in visitor-driven revenue, supporting the people living and working on the island, many of whom have called the Island home for generations.

Catalina Island's ecosystems as we know them are at risk. Without protective measures, many native and endemic species face extinction, and the Island may no longer be able to withstand climate change or support diverse ecosystems for years to come. The effects of disappearing species are already evident, as native chaparral habitats disappear and transition into invasive annual grasslands. Native plants on the Island absorb and retain water and are drought-resistant, acting as natural protection against wildfire and providing important habitat for native animal species. When these native plants are threatened by non-native wildlife and other risks, the Island is vulnerable to devastating climate threats such as wildfire and drought. A catastrophic wildfire is inevitable, such as the 2007 Island Fire, in which 10% of the Island burned and 700 residents and visitors were forced to evacuate. Droughts are similarly unavoidable and disastrous, such as the 2011-2017 drought on the Island, which caused wildlife to die of dehydration and starvation in large numbers and residents to rely on highly polluting desalination plants. Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project will safeguard the Island from similar catastrophic impacts, lessening the damage to the Island and bolstering the Island's ability to recover.

The Catalina Island Conservancy is an exemplary steward of Island resources, successfully balancing conservation, education, and recreation. Their Catalina Island Restoration Project is a science-based, comprehensive plan to protect the Island's biodiversity, reduce erosion, prevent wildfires, and create a


Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

sustainable environment where nature and humans will thrive for years to come. The implementation of the Restoration Project is urgent due to the heightened climate threats to the plant and animal species, residents, and ecosystems of the Island. Without the Restoration Project, communities across Southern California could lose access to one of the largest and most unique outdoor classrooms, thousands of residents could lose their homes, and the world could lose species found nowhere else on earth.

We thank you for your time and greatly look forward to working together to ensure that Catalina Island will be preserved for generations to come.

Best,

Roger Young
209 Calle del Sol
Avalon CA, 90704



Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Channel Islands
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
DIVISION OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

October 16, 2023

Dear Catalina Island Managers, Avalon City Council, and relevant elected officials,

My name is Russell Bradley and I have been the Director of the Santa Rosa Island Research Station for California State University Channel Islands since 2018. For the previous 18 years prior to that I worked on the Farallon Islands for Point Blue Conservation Science as an intern, biologist and 13-year Farallon Program Leader. I have spent well over 2000 days on California Islands. I have committed the majority of my adult life to the study and protection of these extraordinary places – and their globally significant resources.

I am writing today to express my support for removing deer from Catalina Island, using the suggested removal methodology - utilizing helicopters and hunting efforts. These methods have proven to be very effective in previous restoration efforts, including within Channel Islands National Park. I have seen firsthand the negative impacts of introduced mammal species on California's islands, as well as amazing ecosystem recovery after removals of ungulates in places like Santa Rosa Island. The rationale and justification behind this project is strong, and extensive planning efforts will thoroughly address wide ranging issues and concerns in a genuine and non-performative way.

I feel extremely fortunate to be so deeply and directly connected to these special places. I have witnessed with my own eyes, over many years, the incredible recoveries in island ecosystems after restoration actions. I understand the sensitivity and vulnerability of unique island habitats like Catalina and would never support a project I thought would cause long term harm. Catalina deer – introduced for the sole purpose of hunting - face extremely difficult lives with limited resources and removing these populations is the most humane course of action in the long term. Please know that people who have devoted their lives to California's islands will do everything in their power to ensure that this restoration effort, like those protections before it, will be successful and allow Catalina to thrive as a shining example of what Wild California can be.

Sincerely

Russell Bradley

Russell Bradley
Director, Santa Rosa Island Research Station
California State University Channel Islands
russell.bradley@csuci.edu

One University Drive, Camarillo, California 93012-8599 Tel: (805) 437-2690 Fax: (805) 437-5717 www.csuci.edu

A campus of The California State University • Bakersfield • Channel Islands • Chico • Dominguez Hills • East Bay • Fresno • Fullerton • Humboldt • Long Beach • Los Angeles
Maritime Academy • Monterey Bay • Northridge • Pomona • Sacramento • San Bernardino • San Diego • San Francisco • San José • San Luis Obispo • San Marcos • Sonoma • Stanislaus

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

The Nature Conservancy

California Chapter Headquarters
[redacted] S Street
Sacramento, CA [redacted]

Tel (916) [redacted]-2650
Fax (916) [redacted]-2777

nature.org

October 17, 2023

Letter of Support for the Catalina Island Conservancy's Catalina Island Restoration Project

To Whom It May Concern:

The Nature Conservancy (TNC) works in over 70 countries around the world to conserve the lands and waters upon which all life depends. In advance of that mission, TNC owns and manages a multitude of globally significant preserves, including 76% of Santa Cruz Island, the largest of the eight Channel Islands of California.

For decades, managers of the Channel Islands – including the Catalina Island Conservancy, the U.S. Navy, the U.S. National Park Service, and TNC – have worked to address the ecologically devastating consequences of livestock and game animals that were unfortunately introduced to the islands back before it was understood how unique and sensitive these island ecosystems are. In every case, managers reached the same conclusion: the only effective and sustainable way to stop the degradation caused by these animals, prevent extinction of native biodiversity, and ensure the islands will be resilient into the future is to remove those invasive populations.

For decades, the Catalina Island Conservancy (CIC) has analyzed the impacts of introduced mule deer on the island and worked to find ways of mitigating those impacts. Today, the evidence of the severity of the threat the deer pose is overwhelming. And the Conservancy has exhausted all other alternatives. Catalina Island can have either a functional, biodiverse and resilient ecosystem – or it can have deer. It cannot have both.

The CIC has engaged global leaders in large animal eradications and is developing a plan that will incorporate state-of-the-science best practices. These include making sure the project is designed and implemented to meet standards of humane dispatch of the animals, and to ensure the safety of the hunters and the public. In that regard, it is important to emphasize that the science and practice of eradication has been in very rapid development over the past few decades, and the increasing, integral use of helicopters has been transformative. They have made eradication efforts far more efficient, and have enabled conservationists to address a wider variety of devastating pest species, on ever larger and more complex islands. Helicopters are now commonly used in a variety of ways in eradication projects, from the transport of materials and personnel to the monitoring of eradication success.

One critical benefit of helicopters in eradication projects is the way they can improve safety for the eradication team. Island terrains are often remote and rugged, and helicopters can provide a safe means of accessing sites that would be otherwise impossible or dangerous to access. Another key benefit of helicopters is that they can enable a project to proceed more quickly, which can dramatically increase the likelihood of the project's success. Eradications can only succeed if they outpace reproduction of the target species. Completing an eradication quickly reduces replacement and therefore the number of individual animals that need to be dispatched. If a project fails, then animals will have died without a long-term conservation benefit.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Another critical – and perhaps counterintuitive – benefit of using helicopters in projects that require hunting large animals is how, with skilled professionals, the use of helicopters as an aerial hunting platform can increase the humaneness of the overall operation. Precision shooting is recognized by the American Veterinary Medical Association as meeting the standards of euthanasia for wildlife. Skilled, disciplined markspeople in helicopters can minimize the amount of time that an animal is aware it is being hunted, and with a precision shot, can greatly reduce the risk of stress and suffering, and wounding and escape. An exceptionally qualified team hunting from a helicopter can be a highly effective strategy for reducing risk and increasing efficiency of an eradication effort, and enabling a conservation manager to also achieve its animal welfare objectives in the effort.

Helicopter shooting is recognized globally as a methodological best practice in large animal eradication projects. There is a robust scientific literature documenting this.

Helicopters were used on a variety of successful, recent large animal eradication projects in the California Channel Islands, including very high-profile projects of the National Park Service and The Nature Conservancy. For example, aerial shooting was integral to the success of the feral pig eradication project on Santa Cruz Island in the mid-2000s. That project was one of the most rapid eradications of its kind. And upon its completion, managers were at last able to redirect their attention from managing an ecological crisis on the island to restoring and stewarding its extraordinary natural and cultural resources, many of which occur nowhere else on earth. With all the invasive introduced mammals removed from the island, the endemic, endangered island fox underwent the fastest recovery and delisting of any mammal in the history of the Endangered Species Act. Next month, managers will be celebrating the recovery and delisting of two soon-to-be-formerly threatened and endangered endemic plants. Eradication of invasive mammals works.

The Nature Conservancy joins conservationists across and beyond California in commending the Catalina Island Conservancy for its leadership is addressing this difficult and long-standing problem, and for the care they are putting into the planning so as to minimize impacts on the community. The dramatic and inspiring recovery of native plants and animals seen across all the other Channel Islands following removal of invasive herbivores affirms that this is the right – and necessary – thing to do.

Sincerely,



Scott A. Morrison, Ph.D.
Director of Conservation Programs
The Victor E. Shelford Director of Conservation Science
The Nature Conservancy, California

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO • SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE, FISH, AND CONSERVATION BIOLOGY
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION
FAX: (530) 752-4154

ONE SHIELDS AVENUE
DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616-8751

30 November 2023

Lauren Dennhardt
Catalina Island Conservancy
PO Box 2739
Avalon, CA 90704

Dear Dr. Dennhardt,

I am a professor at the University of California, Davis, and I have been doing research on introduced herbivores in island ecosystems for over 40 years. In my opinion, the removal of introduced mule deer from Santa Catalina Island is essential for sound management of island resources. The reason is the damage that introduced herbivores do, and especially in the context of the vulnerability of island species. Plants on islands like Santa Catalina evolved in the absence of herbivores, hence these plants tend to lose their defenses against herbivores. When exotic herbivores are introduced, the consequences are usually devastating, with wholesale destruction of plant communities. But the damage is not limited to plants; animals that depend on plants for habitat are also impacted. Some managers consider density reduction as a solution, instead of eradication. However, reducing deer density will not solve the problem because the plant community is already damaged, and reduced deer numbers will only maintain that damage; also, island plants lack defenses against even low densities of herbivores. Hence, complete removal of introduced mule deer is the only way to conserve island plants and the island vertebrates that depend on these plants for habitat.

Sincerely,

Dirk H. Van Vuren
Professor of Wildlife Biology

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

UCDAVIS
VETERINARY MEDICINE
Karen C. Drayer Wildlife Health Center

December 1, 2023

Subject: Support for Catalina Island Conservancy Restoration Plan and removal of deer from the island

To Whom It May Concern:

I am the Principal Investigator and co-Director of the University of California Davis Wildlife Health Center (UCD-WHC) California Carnivores Project. I have conducted research on mountain lions, Channel Island foxes, and multiple other mammalian and bird species in the region and throughout California – including extensive work on Catalina Island and the other Channel Islands and the Farallons. My work has been involved not only with the animal species but also with integrity of habitat that is critical to their survival.

Catalina Island, like most island ecosystems in the world, has been seriously impacted by the influence of humans and invasive animal and plant species that have accompanied them. I have seen the beneficial effects on multiple islands of removal of invasive species, especially larger mammals that have the power to disrupt the native plant and animal communities the most. Catalina has benefited greatly from past removals of goats and wild pigs, but the deer that are still present are exerting serious negative impacts on the ecosystem there that one can easily see.

I feel that the Catalina Island Conservancy is well positioned to complete the work that they are proposing, and that it deserves support to achieve the goals laid out in their Restoration Plan. I fully support their proposed deer removal plan as part of their overall Restoration Plan for the island.

Sincerely,

T. Winston Vickers DVM MPVM

T. Winston Vickers, DVM, MPVM
Associate Research Veterinarian – UC Davis Wildlife Health Center, Co-Director California Carnivore Project
twvickers@ucdavis.edu
949-929-8643

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES UCLA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

UCLA INSTITUTE OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY
LA KRETZ HALL, SUITE 300
619 CHARLES E. YOUNG DR. EAST
BOX 951496
LOS ANGELES, CA 90095-1496

MAIN: 310-825-5008
DIRECT: 310-247-9719
FAX: 310-825-9663

November 28, 2023

Support for Complete Removal of Mule Deer from Catalina Island

The Catalina Island Conservancy proposes to lethally remove introduced mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) from Catalina Island as part of the larger Catalina Island Restoration Project. The deer were introduced as 3 individuals in 1928 — a buck and two does from Modoc County — followed by 19 animals from Los Angeles County in 1930–1932 (Longhurst et al. 1952). I support complete removal of the descendants of these 22 animals. In my position as an Adjunct Professor in the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at UCLA, I am part of a team that is preparing specific restoration action plans to begin repairing the harm that has been done by the deer and other introduced herbivores over the decades.

Support for removal of the deer is based on several factors. No large mammalian herbivores are native to Catalina Island, meaning that the unique flora has evolved without pressure from such herbivores and is threatened and harmed by their presence. For example, experiments with deer exclosures shows that browsing dramatically reduces the size and vigor of the endemic, federally threatened island rush-rose (*Crocanthemum greenei*) (Dvorak et al. 2016). Researchers also found that seed production of the island rush-rose was greatly reduced when exposed to browsing by mule deer (Dvorak and Catalano 2016). Mule deer browsing furthermore reduces the size of seedlings emerging after fire, influencing vegetation structure (Jacobsen et al. 2018). These results are unsurprising, given that deer browsing in mainland environments is known to influence plant growth, reproduction, and survival (Côté et al. 2004), and island vegetation has evolved free from the pressure of this herbivory. On other Channel Islands, vegetation shows a rapid recovery following the removal of non-native herbivores, including, for example, mule deer and elk from Santa Rosa Island (Thomson et al. 2022). The scientific literature about islands in general (Donlan et al. 2003), the Channel Islands (McEachern et al. 2009, Thomson et al. 2022), and Catalina Island (Dvorak and Catalano 2016, Dvorak et al. 2016, Jacobsen et al. 2018) indicates that the best course of action from an ecological and biodiversity perspective is complete removal of mule deer.

The prospect of lethal removal of the Catalina Island mule deer population has received criticism, both from those describing it as an inhumane slaughter and from hunting interests

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

desiring continued recreational hunting and contending that hunting will be adequate to control the deer population. Neither of these arguments against removal is compelling.

The Catalina Island Conservancy proposes a rapid removal of all mule deer. Such an approach involves a range of aggressive but humane hunting techniques that will kill all the animals, estimated at 1,500–2,000, with limited further reproduction. If the deer were left, and recreational hunting continued, an average of 236 deer would be killed per year indefinitely. Those who find the removal plan to be an "inhumane slaughter" are in fact advocating that even more deer will be killed by similar means within 6–8 years and never stopping. In contrast, after the removal plan is implemented, there will be no further killing of deer on the island. As has been shown in successful removal programs on other Channel Islands (Parkes et al. 2010) and around the world, rapid removal of all individuals is the most humane way forward and minimizes the number of animal deaths.

Some hunting advocacy groups also oppose the plan, for the transparent reason that the recreational hunting opportunity would be ended. The harvest rates from recreational hunting (averaging 236 per year) are, however, too low to reduce the population, given the focus of hunters on bucks rather than does, the logistical limits on accessing much of the island as a recreational hunter, even with a guide, and the expense (Stapp et al. 2022). To even start to control the population, hunters would have to kill two to three times as many deer each year indefinitely (only antlerless; see comparable research on white-tailed deer in Simard et al. 2013) to achieve far less benefit for the environment and its unique endemic species than complete removal.

Although contraception has been effective with bison on Catalina Island (Duncan et al. 2013), contraception of a herd of 1,500–2,000 deer would be impractical (Stapp et al. 2022) and would cause far more stress on animals than rapid lethal removal. Individually identified deer would have to be caught and injected by hand or darted from close range in all terrain across the island (Green 2022). Such a program is not feasible. To quote a recent review of the use of contraception to control deer populations, "… the delivery of the immunocontraceptive to free-living park deer in sufficient numbers with accurate identification of individual animals is currently impossible" (Green 2022).

The island conservation research and management community in California and around the world has developed significant experience in efficiently and humanely removing exotic herbivores from islands. Catalina Island's native birds and other wildlife would benefit substantially from recovery of native vegetation that would become possible with the removal of the introduced deer herd. It is time to take this step toward ecological restoration of Catalina Island.

Travis Longcore, Ph.D.
Adjunct Professor

Disclaimer: *This statement is by the author as an individual; the statements are his own and do not represent a position taken by the University of California, UCLA, or the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability. The UCLA name is used to establish the author's experience and qualifications pursuant to UCLA Policy 110.*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

References Cited

Côté, S. D., T. P. Rooney, J.-P. Tremblay, C. Dussault, and D. M. Waller. 2004. Ecological impacts of deer overabundance. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics **35**:113–147.

Donlan, C. J., D. A. Croll, and B. R. Tershy. 2003. Islands, exotic herbivores, and invasive plants: their roles in coastal California restoration. Restoration Ecology **11**:524–530.

Duncan, C. L., J. L. King, and J. F. Kirkpatrick. 2013. Romance without responsibilities: the use of the immunocontraceptive porcine zona pellucida to manage free-ranging bison (*Bison bison*) on Catalina Island, California, USA. Journal of Zoo and Wildlife Medicine **44**:S123–S131.

Dvorak, T. M., and A. E. Catalano. 2016. Exclusion of introduced deer increases size and seed production success in an island-endemic plant species. Ecology and Evolution **6**:544–551.

Dvorak, T. M., A. E. Catalano, and C. M. Guilliams. 2016. Monitoring within non-native ungulate exclosures documents the inherent size of *Crocanthemum greenei* (Cistaceae). PhytoKeys **70**:11–16.

Green, P. 2022. Alternatives to culling in deer parks. Pages 155-166 *in* J. Fletcher, editor. The Management of Enclosed and Domesticated Deer: International Husbandry Systems and Diseases. Springer.

Jacobsen, A. L., R. B. Pratt, and D. Alleman. 2018. Post-fire ecophysiology of endemic chaparral shrub seedlings from Santa Catalina Island, Southern California. Madroño **65**:106–116.

Longhurst, W. M., A. S. Leopold, and R. F. Dasmann. 1952. A Survey of California Deer Herds: Their Ranges and Management Problems. State of California, Department of Fish and Game, Bureau of Game Conservation.

McEachern, A. K., D. M. Thomson, and K. A. Chess. 2009. Climate alters response of an endemic island plant to removal of invasive herbivores. Ecological Applications **19**:1574–1584.

Parkes, J. P., D. S. L. Ramsey, N. Macdonald, K. Walker, S. McKnight, B. S. Cohen, and S. A. Morrison. 2010. Rapid eradication of feral pigs (*Sus scrofa*) from Santa Cruz Island, California. Biological Conservation **143**:634–641.

Simard, M. A., C. Dussault, J. Huot, and S. D. Côté. 2013. Is hunting an effective tool to control overabundant deer? A test using an experimental approach. The Journal of Wildlife Management **77**:254–269.

Stapp, P., E. Hamblen, C. L. Duncan, and J. L. King. 2022. Status of the introduced mule deer population on Catalina Island, California, based on annual spotlight counts. Page 22 *in* D. M. Woods, editor. Proceedings, 30th Vertebrate Pest Conference.

Thomson, D. M., A. K. McEachern, E. L. Schultz, K. Niessen, D. Wilken, K. Chess, L. F. Cole, R. Y. Oliver, J. D. Phillips, and A. Tucker. 2022. Diverse native island flora shows rapid initial passive recovery after exotic herbivore removal on Santa Rosa Island, California. Biological Invasions **24**:1635–1649.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

VERNON AND MARY CREADLE CENTER
FOR BIODIVERSITY AND ECOLOGICAL RESTORATION (CCBER)
SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA 93106-9615
CENTER FAX (805) 893-4232

KATHERINE SMAT DIRECTOR
(805) 893-2401
COLLECTIONS (805) 893-3401
ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT (805) 893-4159

November 29th, 2023

Regarding: Supporting Catalina Island Restoration Project

To CDFW and Concerned Community Members;

I am writing as a former Catalina Island Conservancy Restoration Ecologist in support of the proposed deer removal project. I resided on Catalina from 1997 to 2005 and implemented restoration trials on the island to establish a diversity of techniques to bring back native flora impacted by deer and invasive plants. One of the primary threats to recovery that we documented was the impact of deer on plant regeneration. Extensive funding and time and effort were and continue to be spent establishing tall fences to exclude deer from rare mountain mahogany habitats and from a variety of chaparral, coastal sage and oak woodland habitat areas and restoration projects.

Over the many years that goats and deer and bison were present together on the island the Island Scrub Oak (*Quercus pacifica*) basal sprouts were repeatedly browsed and over time a phenomenon was observed whereby large areas of the scrub oak woodland were dying out. This is apparently the result of the stems losing hydraulic function at a certain age and the fact that the re-growth strategy of establishing new stems in this scrub oak was thwarted by repeated browsing over nearly 100 years such that this keystone species' underground lignotubor was completely depleted of resources and could no longer regenerate and the whole tree died. There are patches of this oak dieback documented across the island and reflect a system-wide collapse created by the historical impacts of goats and current and ongoing impact of deer.

Many restoration trials reflected impacts from deer and the fact that these island plants are unique, endemic and evolved without browsing and grazing pressure together makes it clear that deer need to be removed to preserve the unique flora and associated fauna on the island. The island's ecosystems are collapsing to support a species of animal that is ubiquitous elsewhere and was only introduced to the island for the sport of hunting and for no ecological function. Clearly current hunting levels and interest are insufficient to manage the impacts to our nation's unique biota. Hunters can find many opportunities elsewhere to hunt, but our nation's people can find the unique plants and animals of Catalina nowhere else but on the island. It is crucial that this proposed restoration plan be supported by all. By quickly

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

removing the animals the least amount of animal suffering will occur compared to years of hunting.

Sincerely



Lisa Stratton, Ph.D.
Director of Ecosystem Management
Cheadle Center for Biodiversity and Ecological Restoration (CCBER)
UC Santa Barbara, 93106-9615

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

United States Department of the Interior
U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Ecological Services
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250
Carlsbad, California 92008

Ecological Services
Ventura Fish and Wildlife Office
2493 Portola Road, Suite B
Ventura, California 93003

In Reply Refer to:
L&R 2023 10-001

October 27, 2023
Sent Electronically

Lauren Dennhardt
Senior Director of Conservation
Catalina Island Conservancy
P.O. Box 2739
Avalon, California 90704

Subject: Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Lauren Dennhardt:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) is writing to express support for projects to restore native habitats and manage threats to listed species, including the Catalina Island Restoration Project.

As the landowner and manager of 88 percent of Catalina Island, the efforts of the Catalina Island Conservancy are critical to conserve the island's unique fauna and flora. The Catalina Island Restoration Project has three pillars: (1) habitat restoration to combat soil erosion, minimize wildfire risk, and conserve species and ecosystems; (2) plant restoration by propagating and reintroducing native plants; and (3) nonnative species management to remove deer and invasive plant species (Catalina Island Conservancy 2023, p. 1).

We anticipate that this project will support recovery of four federally listed plants (Table 1) and enhance habitat for other plant and animal species found only on Catalina Island. Introduced nonnative herbivores threaten rare plants by direct herbivory and habitat degradation and soil erosion (Service 2000, pp. 43, 69; 2019, pp. 6–8; 2021, p. 3). To eliminate these threats and recover ecosystems, we have recommended nonnative herbivore control on all of California's Channel Islands (Service 2000, p. 69; 2019, p. 8).

Nonnative herbivore removal has already contributed to the recovery of federally listed species on two of the California Channel Islands. On San Clemente Island, the removal of nonnative herbivores (goats, sheep, pigs, cattle, and mule deer) led to vegetation and listed plant recovery, resulting in our 2023 delisting of four plant species and one bird (Service 2023, p. 4761). Similarly, on Santa Cruz Island, the removal of sheep and feral pigs—and subsequent soil and vegetation recovery—contributed to our 2022 proposed rule to delist two plant species (Service 2022, pp. 73724, 73730). Therefore, the removal of nonnative herbivores from California's islands conserves and enhances rare plant populations and their habitats.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

We look forward to continuing our partnership with the Catalina Island Conservancy to conserve the endemic flora and fauna of Catalina Island for future generations. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Service biologist Mary Crawford[1] of the Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office.

Sincerely,

Stephen P. Henry
Field Supervisor
Ventura Fish and Wildlife Office

Scott Sobiech
Field Supervisor
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office

cc:
Tim Dillingham,[2] CDFW
Christian Romberger,[3] CDFW

[1] mary_crawford@fws.gov.
[2] Tim.Dillingham@wildlife.ca.gov.
[3] Christian.Romberger@wildlife.ca.gov.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 1. Federally Listed Plant Species on Catalina Island.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Federal Status
Crocanthemum (=*Helianthemum*) *greenei*	Island rush-rose	Threatened
Pentachaeta lyonii	Lyon's pentachaeta	Endangered
Sibara filifolia	Santa Cruz Island rockcress	Endangered
Cercocarpus traskiae	Catalina Island mountain-mahogany	Endangered

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

LITERATURE CITED

Catalina Island Conservancy. 2023. Catalina Island Restoration Project fact sheet. 1 page.

[Service] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2000. Thirteen plant taxa from the northern Channel Islands Recovery Plan. Region 1, Portland, OR. 105 pages.

[Service] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2019. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 5-year review, Island rush-rose (*Crocanthemum* (=*Helianthemum*) *greenei*). Department of the Interior, 10 pages. Ventura Fish and Wildlife Office, Ventura, CA.

[Service] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2021. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 5-year review, *Cercocarpus traskiae*, Catalina Island mountain-mahogany. Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office, Carlsbad, CA. 10 pages.

[Service] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2022. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; removing island bedstraw and Santa Cruz Island dudleya from the list of endangered and threatened plants. *Federal Register* 87:73722–73741.

[Service] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2023. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; removing five species that occur on San Clemente Island from the federal lists of endangered and threatened wildlife and plants. *Federal Register* 88:4761–4792.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Wildlands Conservation Science, LLC
P.O. Box 1846
Lompoc, CA 93438
805-680-8643

22 December 2023

Subject: Santa Catalina Island Restoration Project

To Whom It May Concern:

Wildlands Conservation Science (WCS) is a small business dedicated to effective wildlands stewardship and endangered species management using innovative methods of landscape-level vegetation and wildlife monitoring, invasive species control and habitat restoration. Much of our work utilizes low-flying helicopters as a platform to achieve these goals. This specialty has given us the opportunity to work on and gain a comprehensive understanding of all eight of the California Channel Islands. Our background gives us a unique, comparative perspective that underlines our ardent support for Santa Catalina Island's proposed restoration project.

WCS is a descendant of Native Range Inc., a New Zealand company that specializes in ungulate removal projects throughout the world. This is the same organization that effectively removed 5,036 feral pigs and the last feral sheep from Santa Cruz Island in the mid-2000s and teamed with White Buffalo, Inc. to remove all introduced Kaibab mule deer and Roosevelt elk from Santa Rosa Island in 2011. WCS has experienced first-hand the solemn professionalism and level-headedness that these pilots and hunters bring to their work.

After successful completion of the Santa Cruz and Santa Rosa Island ungulate removals, WCS was brought in to fly every square foot of both islands using the very same Native Range pilots that had just completed the eradication efforts. Our combined goal was now one of documentation. From the air, WCS mapped the extent of rare plant populations and invasive weed infestations to serve as a baseline for habitat conditions following this first meaningful step toward island-wide restoration. These flights have been repeated in the years following the initial assessments. If we were to describe our observations in a single word, it would be revival.

In the two short years following the removal of deer and elk from Santa Rosa Island, once bare canyon slopes that perpetually slumped into dry washes began to stabilize around verdant streams now lined with willows and wetland vegetation. Eight years following the removal of the last pig from Santa Cruz Island, the federally endangered island bedstraw (*Galium buxifolium*) was documented escaping from the sheer sea cliffs where it had only been known to occur. Without the grazing pressure from sheep and ground disturbance from pigs, island bedstraw was able to reclaim its rightful place on the gentle slopes of the open marine terraces. Its recovery was so substantial, island bedstraw and the now aptly named Santa Cruz Island liveforever (*Dudleya nesiotica*) were just removed from the endangered species list on the eve of the 50th anniversary of the Endangered Species Act. The same story is repeated to the south of Catalina, where four federally protected plant

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Wildlands Conservation Science, LLC
P.O. Box 1846
Lompoc, CA 93438
805-680-8643

species and one bird have been deemed fully recovered after the removal of goats from San Clemente Island.

The restoration of these once imperiled species may seem trivial to some. One might ask, "who cares about a couple plants that no one has ever heard of?" But these are more than inconsequential organisms brought back from the brink of extinction. They are more than just canaries in a coal mine. They are testament that on a rare occasion, humanity can do right by the natural world. Even when the means to achieve that goal feels painfully unjust to ALL PEOPLE. Nobody wants to cause broad-scale loss of life, especially not the biologist saddled with the heady responsibility of preventing extinction. None of the dedicated biologists at the Catalina Island Conservancy would choose this path out of simple expediency. These people see beyond the sensational newspaper headlines and endure death threats and alienation from their local community because they are trying to rebuild something that most haven't realized they've almost lost, a delicate insular ecosystem unlike any place on Earth.

The last northern white rhino was seen walking the open plains of central Africa in 2006. Today, only two rhinos are left, both living out their remaining days in captivity. The same situation currently exists on the Channel Islands. However, in this instance, it's not some charismatic creature left in a cage to while away its days until the end comes for its kind. In this scenario, a small number of cages euphemistically referred to as "deer exclosures" have been erected around tiny pieces of what the whole of Catalina Island should be — a species-diverse, drought- and flood-resistant, carbon-storing ecosystem that increases the land's resiliency and ability to support all life.

It's an unfortunate fact that the presence of mule deer on Catalina Island has relegated the native biodiversity to protective confinement. But like the rhino, the problem can't be solved by simply opening the cage doors. To meet an enduring objective, hard decisions must be made and the needs of an island ecosystem must be considered.

We would like to leave you with a snapshot perspective of what can come from choosing the difficult path. Below are two images of Santa Cruz Island separated by a span of 45 years. On that island, hard decisions were made by deliberate and well-intended people to end the lives of beautiful creatures. Those actions have allowed the land to heal and go on to support so much more.

In support,

Morgan Ball, Executive Director
morgan@wildlandscs.org

Katrina Olthof, Conservation Program Manager
katrina@wildlandscs.org

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Wildlands Conservation Science, LLC
P.O. Box 1846
Lompoc, CA 93438
805-680-8643



Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

January 21, 2025

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Sent via email to: Chuck.Bonham@wildlife.ca.gov, cc to: Tim.Dillingham@wildlife.ca.gov

Re: Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham:

As a biologist with many years of experience in the Los Angeles area environmental field, I am writing to express my support for a healthy, climate resilient, and fire-resistant Catalina Island where humans and nature can thrive for years to come. Invasive species have had adverse impacts on the island for decades, and it is imperative to act now to halt and reverse the damage. Catalina Island is a special place for the many species who live on and visit the Island, with more than 60 endemic plant and animal species, 3,500 year-round residents, and a terrain that offers ample recreational opportunities for over one million annual visitors. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is critical to protect the biodiversity that will secure climate resilience for an important resource for communities across California to learn about and experience unique landscapes and species.

In my graduate studies and beyond, I have studied and seen firsthand the devastating effects of invasive species on native species and ecosystems. One of the species I studied, the invasive red swamp crayfish, is unfortunately impossible to remove from invaded streams and the only tactic is to reduce its populations to give endangered and sensitive species a chance. Reducing crayfish populations entails significant time, energy, and a never-ending commitment. Islands, while uniquely vulnerable, also offer a beacon of hope where invasive species removal can actually be successful since there are clear physical boundaries and re-introduction is not a concern. Using a scientific approach, the chance for success is high for the Catalina Island Restoration Project and the long-term benefits will be significant for public and environmental health.

I support the Catalina Island Restoration Project because Catalina Island serves as a gateway to science, education, and nature for Catalina Island residents and visitors. I urge the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to support the Restoration Project. As the only accessible island in Southern California, Catalina is an important entry point for millions of people in Southern California to connect with one of the richest island ecosystems in the world through hiking, camping, snorkeling, and much more. These visitors include thousands of youth per year who participate in overnight camps centered on outdoor science and adventures, creating a foundation for the next generation of environmental leaders and stewards. Catalina Island's unique wildlife and recreation opportunities generate millions in visitor-driven revenue, supporting the people living and working on the island, many of whom have called the Island home for generations.

Catalina Island's ecosystems as we know them are at risk. Without protective measures, many native and endemic species face extinction, and the Island may no longer be able to withstand climate change or support diverse ecosystems for years to come. The effects of disappearing species are already evident, as native chaparral habitats disappear and transition into invasive annual grasslands. Native plants on the Island absorb and retain water and are drought-resistant, acting as natural protection against wildfire and providing important habitat for native animal species. When these native plants are threatened by non-native wildlife and other risks, the Island is vulnerable to devastating climate threats such as wildfire and drought. A catastrophic wildfire is inevitable, such as the 2007 Island Fire, in which 10% of the Island

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

burned and 700 residents and visitors were forced to evacuate. Droughts are similarly unavoidable and disastrous, such as the 2011-2017 drought on the Island, which caused wildlife to die of dehydration and starvation in large numbers and residents to rely on highly polluting desalination plants. Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project will safeguard the Island from similar catastrophic impacts, lessening the damage to the Island and bolstering the Island's ability to recover.

The Catalina Island Conservancy is an exemplary steward of Island resources, successfully balancing conservation, education, and recreation. Their Catalina Island Restoration Project is a science-based, comprehensive plan to protect the Island's biodiversity, reduce erosion, prevent wildfires, and create a sustainable environment where nature and humans will thrive for years to come. The implementation of the Restoration Project is urgent due to the heightened climate threats to the plant and animal species, residents, and ecosystems of the Island. Without the Restoration Project, communities across Southern California could lose access to one of the largest and most unique outdoor classrooms, thousands of residents could lose their homes, and the world could lose species found nowhere else on earth.

I thank you for your time and greatly look forward to working together to ensure that Catalina Island will be preserved for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Katherine M. Pease

Katherine Pease, PhD

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

February 24, 2025

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Bonham,

On behalf of the Conservation Corps of Long Beach (CCLB), I am writing to express our organization's support for a healthy, climate resilient, and fire-resistant Catalina Island where humans and nature can thrive for years to come. Invasive species have had adverse impacts on the island for decades, and it is imperative to act now to halt and reverse the damage. Catalina Island is a special place for the many species who live on and visit the Island, with more than 60 endemic plant and animal species, 3,500 year-round residents, and a terrain that offers ample recreational opportunities for over one million annual visitors. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is critical as it addresses key components of biodiversity conservation, habitat restoration, economic impacts, educational opportunities, and to maintain the Island's cultural history and significance.

CCLB has been working closely with the Catalina Island Conservancy for many years focusing on the workforce development of young adults ages 18-26. Corpsmembers working on Catalina Island are typically involved in a variety of environmental conservation and restoration tasks that contribute significantly to the preservation and improvement of the Island's natural resources. Their work often includes invasive species removal that helps to restore the balance of the ecosystem, trail maintenance that ensures safe and sustainable access for tourists and researchers while minimizing environmental impact, reforestation projects that are crucial for preventing soil erosion, maintaining water quality, and supporting wildlife habitats, erosion control which can be particularly important in maintaining healthy soil conditions and preventing landslides on the island, and much more. Through work like this, our partnership provides hands-on work that contributes to the immediate health of the Island's ecosystem and provides valuable skills and experiences for Corpsmembers themselves, fostering a deeper understanding and commitment to environmental stewardship.

The Conservation Corps of Long Beach supports the Catalina Island Restoration Project because Catalina Island serves as a gateway to science, education, and nature for Catalina Island residents and visitors. We urge the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to support the Restoration Project.

Catalina Island's ecosystems as we know them are at risk. Without protective measures, many native and endemic species face extinction, and the Island may no longer be able to withstand climate change or support diverse ecosystems for years to come. The effects of disappearing species are already evident, as native chaparral habitats disappear and transition into invasive annual grasslands. Native plants on the Island absorb and retain water and are drought-resistant, acting as natural protection against wildfire and

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

providing important habitat for native animal species. When these native plants are threatened by non-native wildlife and other risks, the Island is vulnerable to devastating climate threats such as wildfire and drought. A catastrophic wildfire is inevitable, such as the 2007 Island Fire, in which 10% of the Island burned and 700 residents and visitors were forced to evacuate. Droughts are similarly unavoidable and disastrous, such as the 2011-2017 drought on the Island, which caused wildlife to die of dehydration and starvation in large numbers and residents to rely on highly polluting desalination plants. Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project will safeguard the Island from similar catastrophic impacts, lessening the damage to the Island and bolstering the Island's ability to recover.

The Catalina Island Conservancy is an exemplary steward of Island resources, successfully balancing conservation, education, and recreation. Their Catalina Island Restoration Project is a science-based, comprehensive plan to protect the Island's biodiversity, reduce erosion, prevent wildfires, and create a sustainable environment where nature and humans will thrive for years to come. The implementation of the Restoration Project is urgent due to the heightened climate threats to the plant and animal species, residents, and ecosystems of the Island. Without the Restoration Project, communities across Southern California could lose access to one of the largest and most unique outdoor classrooms, thousands of residents could lose their homes, and the world could lose species found nowhere else on earth.

We thank you for your time and look forward to working together to ensure that Catalina Island will be preserved for generations to come.

Best,

Dan Knapp

Dan Knapp
Executive Director & CEO

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

HUTTOPIA

February 8, 2025,

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham,

On behalf of Huttopia North America Operations inc. ("Huttopia") I am writing to express our organization's support for a healthy, climate resilient, and fire-resistant Catalina Island where humans and nature can thrive for years to come. Invasive species have had adverse impacts on the island for decades, and it is imperative to act now to halt and reverse the damage. Catalina Island is a special place for the many species who live on and visit the Island, with more than 60 endemic plant and animal species, 3,500 year-round residents, and a terrain that offers ample recreational opportunities for over one million annual visitors. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is critical to protect the biodiversity that will secure climate resilience for an important resource for communities across California to learn about and experience unique landscapes and species.

Catalina Island holds a special place in Huttopia's vision, as nature conservation is deeply embedded in our DNA. Our guests choose our destinations for the opportunity to connect with pristine natural landscapes, and Catalina is a rare gem that embodies this experience. Its unique biodiversity, breathtaking scenery, and rich outdoor recreation opportunities make it an invaluable destination for eco-conscious travelers. Supporting the restoration of Catalina is essential to us, not only to preserve its ecological integrity but also to ensure that future generations can continue to experience the island's wild beauty in a responsible way.

Huttopia supports the Catalina Island Restoration Project because Catalina Island serves as a gateway to science, education, and nature for Catalina Island residents and visitors. We urge the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to support the Restoration Project. As the only accessible island in Southern California, Catalina is an important entry point for millions of people in Southern California to connect with one of the richest island ecosystems in the world through hiking, camping, snorkeling, and much more. These visitors include thousands of youths per year who participate in overnight camps centered on outdoor science and adventures, creating a foundation for the next generation of environmental leaders and stewards. Catalina Island's unique wildlife and recreation opportunities generate millions in visitor-driven revenue, supporting the people living and working on the island, many of whom have called the Island home for generations.

Catalina Island's ecosystems as we know them are at risk. Without protective measures, many native and endemic species face extinction, and the Island may no longer be able to withstand climate change or support diverse ecosystems for years to come. The effects of disappearing species are already evident, as native chaparral habitats disappear and transition into invasive annual grasslands. Native plants on the Island absorb and retain water and are drought-resistant, acting as natural protection against wildfire and providing important habitat for native animal species. When these native plants are threatened by non-native wildlife and other risks, the Island is vulnerable to devastating climate threats such as wildfire and drought. A catastrophic wildfire is inevitable, such as the 2007 Island Fire, in which 10% of the Island burned and 700 residents and visitors were forced to evacuate. Droughts are similarly unavoidable and disastrous, such as the 2011-2017 drought on the Island, which caused wildlife to die of dehydration and starvation in large numbers and residents to rely on highly polluting desalination plants. Support for the

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

HUTTOPIA

Catalina Island Restoration Project will safeguard the Island from similar catastrophic impacts, lessening the damage to the Island and bolstering the Island's ability to recover.

The Catalina Island Conservancy is an exemplary steward of island resources, successfully balancing conservation, education, and recreation. Their Catalina Island Restoration Project is a science-based, comprehensive plan to protect the Island's biodiversity, reduce erosion, prevent wildfires, and create a sustainable environment where nature and humans will thrive for years to come. The implementation of the Restoration Project is urgent due to the heightened climate threats to the plant and animal species, residents, and ecosystems of the Island. Without the Restoration Project, communities across Southern California could lose access to one of the largest and most unique outdoor classrooms, thousands of residents could lose their homes, and the world could lose species found nowhere else on earth.

We thank you for your time and greatly look forward to working together to ensure that Catalina Island will be preserved for generations to come.

Best,

Antoine Renaudet, Executive Vice President and COO

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: FCCF10D7-16B5-4A5B-8F7A-DCDF8BBFACB2

LA CONSERVATION CORPS
Transforming Youth, Enhancing Communities

Mailing Address
P.O. Box 861658, Los Angeles, CA 90086-1658

December 5, 2024

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham,

On behalf of the LA Conservation Corps (The Corps), I am writing to express our organization's support for a healthy, climate resilient, and fire-resistant Catalina Island where humans and nature can thrive for years to come. Invasive species have had adverse impacts on the island for decades, and it is imperative to act now to halt and reverse the damage. Catalina Island is a special place for the many species who live on and visit the island, with more than 60 endemic plant and animal species, 3,500 year-round residents, and a terrain that offers ample recreational opportunities for over one million annual visitors. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is critical to protect the biodiversity that will secure climate resilience for an important resource for communities across California to learn about and experience unique landscapes and species.

Catalina is a great example of a place that allows humans to interact in a healthy way with the environment, something that we strive to build here in Los Angeles. We have also had the opportunity to send our crews of Corpsmembers to Catalina to work on various restoration projects that help maintain this healthy environment and ecosystem for years to come.

The Corps supports the Catalina Island Restoration Project because Catalina Island serves as a gateway to science, education, and nature for Catalina Island residents and visitors. We urge the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to support the Restoration Project. As the only accessible island in Southern California, Catalina is an important entry point for millions of people in Southern California to connect with one of the richest island ecosystems in the world through hiking, camping, snorkeling, and much more. These visitors include thousands of youth per year who participate in overnight camps centered on outdoor science and adventures, creating a foundation for the next generation of environmental leaders and stewards. Catalina Island's unique wildlife and recreation opportunities generate millions in visitor-driven revenue, supporting the people living and working on the island, many of whom have called the Island home for generations.

Catalina Island's ecosystems as we know them are at risk. Without protective measures, many native and endemic species face extinction, and the Island may no longer be able to withstand climate change or support diverse ecosystems for years to come. The effects of disappearing species are already evident, as native chaparral habitats disappear and transition into invasive annual grasslands. Native plants on the Island absorb and retain water and are drought-resistant, acting as natural protection against wildfire and providing important habitat for native animal species. When these native plants are threatened by non-native wildlife and other risks, the Island is vulnerable to devastating climate threats

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: FCCF10D7-16B5-4A5B-8F7A-DCDF8BBFACB2

such as wildfire and drought. A catastrophic wildfire is inevitable, such as the 2007 Island Fire, in which 10% of the Island burned and 700 residents and visitors were forced to evacuate. Droughts are similarly unavoidable and disastrous, such as the 2011-2017 drought on the Island, which caused wildlife to die of dehydration and starvation in large numbers and residents to rely on highly polluting desalination plants. Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project will safeguard the Island from similar catastrophic impacts, lessening the damage to the Island and bolstering the Island's ability to recover.

The Catalina Island Conservancy is an exemplary steward of Island resources, successfully balancing conservation, education, and recreation. Their Catalina Island Restoration Project is a science-based, comprehensive plan to protect the Island's biodiversity, reduce erosion, prevent wildfires, and create a sustainable environment where nature and humans will thrive for years to come. The implementation of the Restoration Project is urgent due to the heightened climate threats to the plant and animal species, residents, and ecosystems of the Island. Without the Restoration Project, communities across Southern California could lose access to one of the largest and most unique outdoor classrooms, thousands of residents could lose their homes, and the world could lose species found nowhere else on earth.

We thank you for your time and greatly look forward to working together to ensure that Catalina Island will be preserved for generations to come.

Best,

Signed by:
Wendy Butts
3488 [illegible]

Wendy Butts
Chief Executive Officer

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

LOS ANGELES NEIGHBORHOOD LAND TRUST

January 21, 2025

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham,

On behalf of the Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust (LANLT), I am writing to express our strong support for fostering a healthy, climate-resilient, and fire-resistant Catalina Island — one where both people and nature can flourish for generations to come. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is essential for safeguarding biodiversity and preserving an invaluable resource where communities across California can explore and learn from the Island's unique landscapes and species.

Catalina Island serves as a prime example of the importance of fostering community resilience through equitable access to green spaces, aligning closely with LANLT's mission. Since 2002, LANLT has added 22 acres of green space to Los Angeles through community-driven development. The Catalina Island Restoration Project embodies the balance of conservation, education, and equitable access to nature that we strive to achieve. Thousands of youth benefit annually from outdoor science camps on the Island, where they develop a foundation for environmental stewardship and leadership.

Without protective measures, many native and endemic species are at risk of extinction, and the Island's ability to withstand climate change will be severely diminished. The effects of disappearing species are already evident, as native chaparral habitats are replaced by invasive grasslands. This loss increases the Island's vulnerability to drought and wildfire, as evidenced by past disasters such as the 2007 Island Fire and the severe drought of 2011–2017. These events underscored the importance of resilient native ecosystems that act as natural safeguards against climate threats.

The Catalina Island Conservancy's science-based Restoration Project is a comprehensive plan that aligns with LANLT's commitment to creating green spaces that support both nature and human well-being. The Project will safeguard biodiversity, reduce erosion, prevent wildfires, and create a sustainable environment where ecosystems can thrive. Without its implementation, Southern California risks losing a treasured outdoor classroom, invaluable biodiversity, and the livelihoods of Island residents.

We urge the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to support the Catalina Island Restoration Project. Together, we can ensure that Catalina Island remains a sanctuary for biodiversity, a source of education and inspiration for communities, and a resilient ecosystem that stands strong against climate threats.

Sincerely,

Tori Kjer
Executive Director
Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



2/13/2025

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham,

On behalf of Outward Bound Adventures (OBA), I am writing to express our organization's support for a healthy, climate resilient, and fire-resistant Catalina Island where humans and nature can thrive for years to come. Invasive species have had adverse impacts on the island for decades, and it is imperative to act now to halt and reverse the damage. Catalina Island is a special place for the many species who live on and visit the Island, with more than 60 endemic plant and animal species, 3,500 year-round residents, and a terrain that offers ample recreational opportunities for over one million annual visitors. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is critical to protect the biodiversity that will secure climate resilience for an important resource for communities across California to learn about and experience unique landscapes and species.

[Catalina Island has been an instrumental and foundational location for Outward Bound Adventures (OBA) trips, providing transformative experiences that have served as a catalyst for launching students into the fields of restoration and conservation. As the nation's longest-running nonprofit dedicated to engaging low-income, urban BIPOC youth and adults through environmental education, leadership development, and conservation workforce programs, OBA has empowered over 95,000 participants since its founding in 1962. These immersive experiences on Catalina have not only deepened participants' connections to the natural world but have also equipped them with the knowledge and skills to become environmental stewards. The island's rich biodiversity and unique ecological challenges have made it an invaluable outdoor classroom, seamlessly woven into OBA's history and mission to inspire the next generation of conservation leaders.]

Outward Bound Adventures supports the Catalina Island Restoration Project because Catalina Island serves as a gateway to science, education, and nature for Catalina Island residents and visitors. We urge the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to support the Restoration Project. As the only accessible island in Southern California, Catalina is an important entry point for millions of people in Southern California to connect with one of the richest island ecosystems in the world through hiking, camping, snorkeling, and much more. These visitors include thousands of youth per year who participate in overnight camps centered on outdoor science and adventures, creating a foundation for the next generation of environmental leaders and stewards. Catalina Island's unique wildlife and recreation opportunities generate millions in visitor-driven revenue, supporting the people living and working on the island, many of whom have called the Island home for generations.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Catalina Island's ecosystems as we know them are at risk. Without protective measures, many native and endemic species face extinction, and the Island may no longer be able to withstand climate change or support diverse ecosystems for years to come. The effects of disappearing species are already evident, as native chaparral habitats disappear and transition into invasive annual grasslands. Native plants on the Island absorb and retain water and are drought-resistant, acting as natural protection against wildfire and providing important habitat for native animal species. When these native plants are threatened by non-native wildlife and other risks, the Island is vulnerable to devastating climate threats such as wildfire and drought. A catastrophic wildfire is inevitable, such as the 2007 Island Fire, in which 10% of the Island burned and 700 residents and visitors were forced to evacuate. Droughts are similarly unavoidable and disastrous, such as the 2011-2017 drought on the Island, which caused wildlife to die of dehydration and starvation in large numbers and residents to rely on highly polluting desalination plants. Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project will safeguard the Island from similar catastrophic impacts, lessening the damage to the Island and bolstering the Island's ability to recover.

The Catalina Island Conservancy is an exemplary steward of Island resources, successfully balancing conservation, education, and recreation. Their Catalina Island Restoration Project is a science-based, comprehensive plan to protect the Island's biodiversity, reduce erosion, prevent wildfires, and create a sustainable environment where nature and humans will thrive for years to come. The implementation of the Restoration Project is urgent due to the heightened climate threats to the plant and animal species, residents, and ecosystems of the Island. Without the Restoration Project, communities across Southern California could lose access to one of the largest and most unique outdoor classrooms, thousands of residents could lose their homes, and the world could lose species found nowhere else on earth.

We thank you for your time and greatly look forward to working together to ensure that Catalina Island will be preserved for generations to come.

Best,

Charles Thomas
Executive Director
Outward Bound Adventures

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

February 12, 2025

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham,

I am writing to express my support for a healthy, climate resilient, and fire-resistant Catalina Island where humans and nature can thrive for years to come. Invasive species have had adverse impacts on the island for decades, and it is imperative to act now to halt and reverse the damage. Catalina Island is a special place for the many species who live on and visit the Island, with more than 60 endemic plant and animal species, 3,500 year-round residents, and a terrain that offers ample recreational opportunities for over one million annual visitors. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is critical to protect the biodiversity that will secure climate resilience for an important resource for communities across California to learn about and experience unique landscapes and species.

As a parent of a third grader in the Los Angeles Unified School District, my child talks almost every week about how excited he is to go to Catalina Island when he's in fifth grade. We're excited to sign him up for summer camps on the Island in the nearer term. For the past five years, we have loved going camping on the Channel Islands and seeing the endemic species there like the jays and foxes, and have so appreciated the notable efforts to reduce invasive and non-native species there like eucalyptus. We would love to see Catalina Island be able to enact the same kinds of restoration programming that have already successfully kicked off at other Channel Islands. The extraordinary and unique species that call Catalina Island home deserve to thrive. Additionally, we have just born witness to terrible, catastrophic fires in Los Angeles, and know how important it is to restore fire-resistant native habitats and be able to remove highly flammable brush and non-native grasses from the Island.

I support the Catalina Island Restoration Project because Catalina Island serves as a gateway to science, education, and nature for Catalina Island residents and visitors. I urge the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to support the Restoration Project. As the only accessible island in Southern California, Catalina is an important entry point for millions of people in Southern California to connect with one of the richest island ecosystems in the world through hiking, camping, snorkeling, and much more. These visitors include thousands of youth per year who participate in overnight camps centered on outdoor science and adventures, creating a foundation for the next generation of environmental leaders and stewards. Catalina Island's unique wildlife and recreation opportunities generate millions in visitor-driven revenue, supporting the people living and working on the island, many of whom have called the Island home for generations.

Catalina Island's ecosystems as we know them are at risk. Without protective measures, many native and endemic species face extinction, and the Island may no longer be able to withstand climate change or support diverse ecosystems for years to come. The effects of disappearing species are already evident, as native chaparral habitats disappear and transition into invasive

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

annual grasslands. Native plants on the Island absorb and retain water and are drought-resistant, acting as natural protection against wildfire and providing important habitat for native animal species. When these native plants are threatened by non-native wildlife and other risks, the Island is vulnerable to devastating climate threats such as wildfire and drought. A catastrophic wildfire is inevitable, such as the 2007 Island Fire, in which 10% of the Island burned and 700 residents and visitors were forced to evacuate. Droughts are similarly unavoidable and disastrous, such as the 2011-2017 drought on the Island, which caused wildlife to die of dehydration and starvation in large numbers and residents to rely on highly polluting desalination plants. Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project will safeguard the Island from similar catastrophic impacts, lessening the damage to the Island and bolstering the Island's ability to recover.

The Catalina Island Conservancy is an exemplary steward of Island resources, successfully balancing conservation, education, and recreation. Their Catalina Island Restoration Project is a science-based, comprehensive plan to protect the Island's biodiversity, reduce erosion, prevent wildfires, and create a sustainable environment where nature and humans will thrive for years to come. The implementation of the Restoration Project is urgent due to the heightened climate threats to the plant and animal species, residents, and ecosystems of the Island. Without the Restoration Project, communities across Southern California could lose access to one of the largest and most unique outdoor classrooms, thousands of residents could lose their homes, and the world could lose species found nowhere else on earth.

Thank you for your time and greatly look forward to working together to ensure that Catalina Island will be preserved for generations to come.

Best,

Lauren Ahkiam
Parent, Los Angeles

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

April 9, 2025

Director Charlton "Chuck" Bonham
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Via Email: Director@wildlife.ca.gov; Chuck.Bonham@wildlife.ca.gov

RE: Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project and Fire Resilience Efforts

Dear Director Bonham,

I am writing as a fifth generation Californian, a business owner and dedicated conservationist. I am writing to request your support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project - an essential conservation initiative designed to protect the long-term health and resilience of Catalina Island by creating an environment in which highly flammable invasive grasses are replaced with more fire resilient native plants.

For generations, Catalina has been an ecological and recreational treasure, home to diverse wildlife, rare plant species, and a community that depends on a thriving natural environment. However, the increasing frequency of extreme wildfires has made clear the urgent need for proactive restoration and fire mitigation efforts. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is designed to address these challenges by restoring native habitats, reducing highly flammable invasive vegetation, and strengthening the island's natural defenses against wildfire and other environmental threats.

This project, which is privately funded through generous donations, is not only about protecting Catalina's landscapes—it is about safeguarding the people who live, work, and visit here, ensuring a resilient future for the island's ecosystem and economy. During the recent fires that ravaged Los Angeles County, Catalina was under the same Red Flag warning. Fortunately, the island did not experience the same fate as the mainland. But it did come close when the 2007 Island Fire almost claimed the City of Avalon - a situation we must work to ensure never happens again.

I do hope you recognize the significance of this project and the urgency moving forward. Lending your voice of support will help ensure the goals of the project are fulfilled and the island remains healthy and resilient for future generations to come.

Thank you for your time, your consideration, and for your dedication to protecting one of California's greatest natural resources.

Sincerely,

Terry Grill

cc: Whitney Latorre, President and CEO, Catalina Island Conservancy
Kirsten Peterson Johansen, Chief of External Affairs, Catalina Island Conservancy

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Anthony Michaels

April 7, 2025

Director Charlton "Chuck" Bonham
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Via Email: Director@wildlife.ca.gov; Chuck.Bonham@wildlife.ca.gov

RE: Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project and Fire Resilience Efforts

Dear Director Bonham,

I am writing to request your support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project - an essential conservation initiative designed to protect the long-term health and resilience of Catalina Island by creating an environment in which highly flammable invasive grasses are replaced with more fire resilient native plants.

For generations, Catalina has been an ecological and recreational treasure, home to diverse wildlife, rare plant species, and a community that depends on a thriving natural environment. However, the increasing frequency of extreme wildfires has made clear the urgent need for proactive restoration and fire mitigation efforts. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is designed to address these challenges by restoring native habitats, reducing highly flammable invasive vegetation, and strengthening the island's natural defenses against wildfire and other environmental threats.

This project, which is privately funded through generous donations, is not only about protecting Catalina's landscapes—it is about safeguarding the people who live, work, and visit here, ensuring a resilient future for the island's ecosystem and economy. During the recent fires that ravaged Los Angeles County, Catalina was under the same Red Flag warning. Fortunately, the island did not experience the same fate as the mainland. But it did come close when the 2007 Island Fire almost claimed the City of Avalon - a situation we must work to ensure never happens again.

I do hope you recognize the significance of this project and the urgency moving forward. Lending your voice of support will help ensure the goals of the project are fulfilled and the island remains healthy and resilient for future generations to come.

Thank you for your time, your consideration, and for your dedication to protecting one of California's greatest natural resources.

Sincerely,

Anthony F. Michaels

cc: Whitney Latorre, President and CEO, Catalina Island Conservancy
Kirsten Peterson Johansen, Chief of External Affairs, Catalina Island Conservancy

2625 Via Rivera, Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274 | 310-990-7641 | tony.michaels.renew@gmail.com

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

SGMRC

SAN GABRIEL MOUNTAINS
REGIONAL CONSERVANCY

February 6, 2025

Mr. Charlton Bonham

Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife

715 P St.

Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Bonham,

I am writing to express my unwavering support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project, and Scientistic Collection Permit for the eradication of invasive mule deer which aims to preserve and enhance the natural ecosystem of this unique and treasured island. This initiative is crucial for maintaining biodiversity, protecting endangered species, and ensuring the longevity of Catalina Island's natural beauty for future generations.

The Catalina Island Restoration Project represents a collaborative effort based on the expertise of their scientists and partners in conservation. By implementing science-based strategies and sustainable practices, this project will address critical environmental challenges such as habitat degradation, invasive species, restoration/preservation of native flora and climate change impacts.

Our organization, the San Gabriel Mountains Regional Conservancy, has long been committed to environmental preservation and sustainable land management. We believe that the success of the Catalina Island Restoration Project will serve as a model for similar conservation efforts across California and beyond.

Sincerely,

Jackie Doornik

Jackie Doornik

Co-President San Gabriel Mountains Regional Conservancy 501c3

PO Box 963

Glendora, CA 91740

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

CATALINA ISLAND CONSERVANCY

February 28, 2025

Benefactors
Alison Wrigley Rusack
Chair
Trevor Fetter
Tony Michaels
Maria Pellegrini

Board of Directors
Terry Grill
Chair
Maureen Ramer
Vice Chair
Bob Breech
Randy Boelsems
Victoria Dean
Blanny Hagenah
Will Hagenah
Geraldine Knatz
Calen Offield
Austin Rusack
Shaun Tucker

Dear Director Bonham,

As Chair of the Benefactors and Chair of the Board of Directors, respectively, of the Catalina Island Conservancy, we are sharing our strong support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project and its vital importance to the safety and future resilience of Catalina.

This initiative represents a critical step toward ensuring the long-term health and viability of the Island, particularly as we face growing threats from wildfire, invasive species, and climate change.

For generations, Catalina has been an ecological, cultural and recreational treasure, home to diverse wildlife, rare plant species and a community that depends on a thriving natural environment. However, the increasing frequency of extreme wildfires has made clear the urgent need for proactive restoration and fire mitigation efforts. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is designed to address these challenges by restoring native habitats, reducing highly flammable invasive vegetation and strengthening the Island's natural defenses against wildfire and other environmental threats.

This project is not only about protecting Catalina's landscapes—it is about safeguarding the people who live, work and visit here, ensuring a resilient future for the Island's ecosystem and economy. We are committed to working with the State to advance this plan, and we hope you recognize its significance, will support our efforts, and authorize our permit.

Thank you for your time and for your dedication to protecting California's natural resources. We look forward to keeping you updated on our progress and working together to preserve Catalina Island for future generations.

Sincerely,

Signed by:
Alison Wrigley Rusack
7A1B5A5C05E8D47...
Alison Wrigley Rusack
Chair, Benefactors

Terry M Grill
Terry Grill
Chair, Board of Directors

cc: Whitney Latorre, President and CEO
Kirsten Peterson Johansen, Chief of External Affairs

Avalon Office
P.O. Box 2739
Avalon, CA 90704
310-510-2595 x0

Long Beach Office
320 Golden Shore, Suite 220
Long Beach, CA 90802
562-437-8555

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

CATALINA
ISLAND COMPANY

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

March 24, 2025

Re: Support the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham:

On behalf of Catalina Island Company (Island Company), I am writing to express our support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project (CIRP).

Our parent corporation, the 'Santa Catalina Island Company' was founded in 1894 and, for over 80 years, owned almost the entire island. Both before and during that time, we learned about ecological devastation that can occur from certain non-native species, including invasive plants and animals. Then, in 1972, with the help of members of the Wrigley family, we created the Santa Catalina Island Conservancy and, in 1975, deeded over 88% of the island to that special non-profit organization. (The company kept its land in Avalon and Two Harbors, along with some other island parcels.) The hope and dream of the Island Company was that the Conservancy would advance the stewardship of this incredible undeveloped land in the best ways that science and land management could provide.

Our belief is that the Conservancy's CIRP is, in fact, based on the best research and science available and builds on the restoration results of other channel islands. Those studies and efforts have shown that the CIRP is critical not only to protect the native biodiversity of Catalina Island but also to expand it in the most beneficial ways possible.

Aside from believing in and supporting the Conservancy's restoration efforts, the Island Company and many other businesses, as well as hundreds of thousands of individuals, will directly benefit from the CIRP. The company itself owns over 10% of the island. Our team (often over 500 people) live and work here. We rely on the Conservancy and its land for eco-tourism, access to our various properties, fire prevention and more. In addition, the CIRP will better enable our tour guides to tell the story of Catalina's incredible biodiversity and its restoration – including that the CIRP will help secure climate and fire resilience. The CIRP will also be a significant resource for

PO Box 737 150 Metropole Avenue Avalon CA 90704
VisitCatalinaIsland.com

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

communities across California to learn about and experience unique landscapes and species.

All in all, we at the Catalina Island Company believe that the CIRP is one of the most exciting ecological programs not only for Catalina Conservancy and for the island itself, but for the entire world. We look forward to seeing what it will do for the beauty, biodiversity and ecological resilience of the Conservancy's lands and we can't wait to educate our many visitors about this amazing project as we share with them the treasure that is Santa Catalina Island.

Very Truly Yours,

Geoffrey Claflin Rusack
President and Chief Executive Officer

Cc: Whitney Latorre
Terry Grill

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Jill C. Anderson
Executive Vice President
& Chief Operating Officer

March 3, 2025

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham,

On behalf of Southern California Edison (SCE), I am writing to express our strong support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project. As the electric, water and gas utility service provider to Catalina Island, SCE recognizes the urgent need to protect its unique ecosystems, ensuring long-term resilience against climate change, wildfire risks, and biodiversity loss.

Invasive species have severely impacted Catalina's native habitats, threatening its 60+ endemic species and increasing the risk of devastating wildfires and drought. The loss of native chaparral to invasive grasses reduces the island's ability to retain water and resist fire, endangering both residents and infrastructure.

Catalina is Southern California's only large, publicly accessible island, attracting over a million visitors annually for recreation, education, and nature-based tourism. It serves as an outdoor classroom for thousands of students each year, fostering the next generation of environmental stewards. Preserving the island's biodiversity is not only crucial for conservation but also vital to the local economy and the well-being of its residents.

The Catalina Island Conservancy's science-based restoration plan offers a proactive approach to reversing habitat degradation, reducing wildfire risks, and ensuring a sustainable future. SCE urges the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to support this critical initiative. Investing in Catalina's restoration today will protect its ecosystems, safeguard its communities, and preserve an invaluable natural resource for all Californians.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to working together to protect Catalina Island for generations to come.

Best regards,

Jill C. Anderson

Jill C. Anderson

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

USC Viterbi
School of Engineering

March 30, 2025

Charlton Bonham, Director
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento. CA 95814

Dear Director Bonham

I am writing to express my support for the Catalina Island restoration plan. What we are trying to do is not a novel idea. This action has been taken on hundreds of islands around the globe including every other island along the California coast. The science supports the action pending before the CA Fish and Wildlife Service. Unfortunately, the 2024 hunting season did not have the results we all would have hoped for.

The economy of the island is based on tourism. The non-profit Catalina Island Conservancy is essentially responsible for the livelihood and the **lives** of the 4000 people that live on the islands. Can you imagine the impacts if we have a fire like the recent ones experienced in Los Angeles County? We can't make a more fire-resilience island without the help of your agency. The time to act is now.

Sincerely,

Geraldine Knatz

Geraldine Knatz, Ph. D.

University of Southern California
1234 Trousdale Parkway, Los Angeles, California 90089-1234 • Tel: 213 740 1234 • Fax: 213 740 1234

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

February 28, 2025

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham,

I am a concern Catalina Island resident begging you to support the Catalina Island Conservancy's efforts to eradicate the island's invasive species namely the mule deer that impact our restoration efforts. It's discouraging that our endangered plants and animals are surviving only because of volunteer and staff efforts to errect and maintain protective refuges:



Volunteers building an exclosure at Little Harbor



Contrast resuting from exclosure on Stage Coarch Road

Deer predation invites the growth of non-native fire-prone grasses which prevent the growth of water-retaining plants native to the island. This system of exclosures is an unsustainable solution to our restoration efforts to prevent desertification.

The inevitable droughts create inhumane conditions for deer that suffer starvation and disease. Their deplorable condition is a reminder that they do not belong on Catalina.





Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Fields of coreopsis used to grace most of Catalina Island. Because it is a prefered deer fodder, these plants are found only in the exclosures and on inaccessible cliffs. This photo of Santa Cruz Island shows a field of coreopis, the result of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service support of that restoration project. It's remarkable what deer removal acheived:



Scorpion Rock, on Santa Cruz Island, is an active restoration site. The first photo (left) is pre-restoration in 2007 the second photo (right) is from 2015 after active restoration. The plant in center of first photo is single plant coreopsis (*Leptosyne gigantea*) in a sea of dried oxeplant. It has become one of the dominant plants since restoration efforts began. Photos by David Mazurkiewicz.

Every year thousands of youth participate in overnight camps centered on outdoor science and adventures, creating a foundation for the next generation of environmental leaders and stewards. Even more thousands of visitors have access to the educational programs and volunteer opportunities to embrace this nature-rich land. Catalina Island Restoration could be the exemplary conservation model for the world.

The CDFW approval is urgent due to the heightened climatic threats to the plant and animal species and ecosystems of the Island. The Catalina Island Conservancy employs some of the nation's most skilled scientists and educators to reveal to the world what a great restoration project should look like. I strongly urge the CDFW to support their efforts.

Sincerely,

Patricia McCormick

PO Box 673
Avalon, CA 90704
georgesandpatricia@mac.com

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

January 28, 2025

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support the Permit for the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham,

On behalf of the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA), I am writing to express our organization's support for the Catalina Island Conservancy's efforts to secure the requisite state permit to ensure a healthy, climate resilient, and fire-resistant Catalina Island where humans and nature can thrive for years to come. Invasive species have had adverse impacts on the island for decades, and it is imperative to act now to halt and reverse the damage. The presence of mule deer on the Island disrupts the Island's ecosystem balance and sustainability, increasing the risk of wildfires that threaten Island residents, biodiversity, and infrastructure. Catalina is a special place for the many species who live on and visit the Island, with over 60 endemic plant and animal species, 3,500 year-round residents, and a terrain that offers ample recreational opportunities for over a million annual visitors. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is critical to protecting the biodiversity that will secure climate resilience for an important resource for communities across Southern California to learn about and experience unique landscapes and species.

NPCA is very familiar with island ecosystem restoration activities in California, and perspectives of stakeholders. At the nearby Channel Islands National Park, the NPCA worked to protect Santa Rosa Island from non-native elk and deer that were harming endangered species and their habitat. The restoration required the National Park Service to remove the non-native elk and deer using aerial culling, the same scientifically supported, most humane method that is being proposed at Catalina Island.

During the past 30 years, the removal of non-native species from Channel Islands National Park has helped ensure the survival and recovery of imperiled and native species. At its most fundamental level, human intervention for the benefit of natural ecosystems raises issues of not only science and ecology, but philosophy and ethics. The issues are seldom, if ever, black and white. As Dr. Adrian M. Wenner, Professor Emeritus in the Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Marine Biology at UCSB wrote in response to opposition to feral pig eradication efforts on Santa Cruz Island:

> "As a biologist, I have had extensive experience on the island and can report firsthand about the pig situation there. Feral pigs on the island number in the thousands. In good years, they reproduce to their full ability and soon exceed their food source. As they run out of easily obtainable food, such as acorns, they desperately plow up the ground in search of bulbs, roots and tubers, leaving the soil open to being washed away in future rains; and thereby exterminating native plants. They then eat non-nourishing grass as they starve. During the 1988 and 1989 droughts, for example,

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

perhaps nine-tenths of the pigs died of starvation. But pigs don't starve immediately; as the weaker ones succumb, they get attacked and eaten by stronger pigs. At those times we could hear the squeals of pigs in such fights. By the end of 1989, nearly every pig I encountered was nothing more than a bag of bones that could hardly move. When they noticed us, they most often fell over as they tried to move. Even in good years feral pigs suffer. Last week we grabbed a piglet for examination. Dozens of blacklegged ticks -- vectors of Lyme disease, fleas and lice lived on its soft underside. Island feral pigs, when they overpopulate, cannot migrate to greener pastures; they starve. Is it more humane to let these feral pigs continue their overpopulation, starvation and cannibalism or eliminate a few thousand from the island now, before untold thousands die in the future during such cycles?"

NPCA supports the Conservancy's permit application for the eradication of the invasive mule deer as part of the Catalina Island Restoration Project because Catalina Island is a gateway to science, education, and nature for Catalina Island residents and visitors. We urge the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to support the permit. As the only accessible island in Southern California, Catalina is an important entry point for millions of people in Southern California to connect with one of the richest island ecosystems in the world through hiking, camping, snorkeling, and much more. These visitors include thousands of youth per year who participate in overnight camps centered on outdoor science and adventures, creating a foundation for the next generation of environmental leaders and stewards. Catalina Island's unique wildlife and recreation opportunities generate millions in visitor-driven revenue, supporting the people living and working on the island, many of whom have been there for generations.

Catalina Island's ecosystems as we know them are at risk. Without protective measures, many native and endemic species face extinction, and the Island may no longer be able to withstand climate change or support diverse ecosystems for years to come. The effects of disappearing species are already evident, as native chaparral habitats disappear and transition into invasive annual grasslands. Native flora on the island absorb and retain water and are drought-resistant, acting as natural protection against wildfire and providing important habitat for native animal species. When these native plants are threatened by non-native wildlife, namely the mule deer, the Island is vulnerable to succumbing to devastating climate threats such as wildfire and drought. A catastrophic wildfire is inevitable, such as the 2007 Island Fire, in which 10% of the Island burned and 700 residents and visitors were forced to evacuate. Droughts are similarly unavoidable and disastrous, such as the 2011-2017 drought on the Island, which caused wildlife to die of dehydration and starvation in large numbers and residents to rely on highly polluting desalination plants. Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project will safeguard the Island from similar catastrophic impacts, lessening the damage to the Island and bolstering the Island's ability to recover.

Invasive species are one of the greatest threats to biodiversity worldwide. Removal of invasive species is imperative to preserving biodiversity and to reaching the state's goal of conserving 30% of lands and coastal waters by 2030. Eradicating the mule deer is a vital and foundational component of the Restoration Project, and will enable the ecosystem to recover from overgrazing and trampling. Studies have shown that aerial hunting, as proposed in the permit, is the most humane and effective method of deer removal, minimizing stress levels of deer significantly more than translocation and birth control. Despite Catalina Island having the longest recreational hunting season in the state, the mule deer population continues to grow unchecked, indicating that recreational hunting alone is not a viable method of controlling mule deer population.

The Catalina Island Conservancy is an exemplary steward of Island resources, successfully balancing conservation, education, and recreation. Their Catalina Island Restoration Project is a science-based, comprehensive plan to protect the Island's biodiversity, reduce erosion, prevent wildfires, and create a sustainable environment where nature and humans will thrive for years to come. The implementation of the Restoration Project is urgent given the heightened climate threats to the species, people, and ecosystems of the land. Without the Restoration Project, communities across Southern California could lose access to one

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

of the most unique outdoor classrooms in the region, thousands of residents could lose their homes, and the world could lose species found nowhere else on earth.

We thank you for your time and greatly look forward to working together to ensure that Catalina Island will be preserved for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Neal Desai

Neal Desai
Senior Director, Pacific Region
National Parks Conservation Association

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

COASTAL CORRIDOR ALLIANCE

January 22, 2025

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham,

On behalf of the Coastal Corridor Alliance I am writing to express our organization's support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project. Invasive species have adversely impacted the island for decades, and it is imperative to act to reverse the damage. Catalina Island is a special place for the many species who live on and visit the Island. With more than 60 endemic plant and animal species, 3,500 year-round residents, and a terrain that offers ample recreational opportunities for over one million annual visitors, this Restoration Project is critical. It will help protect the biodiversity that will secure climate resilience for this wonderful and unique landscape.

Similar to the island, properties we have worked to preserve sit along the Southern California coast. From providing habitat for nesting shorebirds to perches for osprey high above the landscape, it is vital to take actionable steps while funding is available to support restoration of native ecosystems.

As you know, the Island's ecosystems are at risk. Without protective measures, many native and endemic species face extinction, and the Island may no longer be able to withstand climate change. The effects of disappearing species are already evident, as native chaparral habitats transition into invasive annual grasslands. Native plants on the Island absorb and retain water and are drought-resistant, acting as natural protection against wildfire while providing important habitat for native animal species. Without them, catastrophic wildfire is

P.O. Box 15333 • Newport Beach, CA 92659 • (949) 216-0880 • CoastalCorridor.org

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

inevitable, such as the 2007 Island Fire, in which 10% of the Island burned and 700 residents and visitors were forced to evacuate.

We support the Catalina Island Restoration Project to safeguard the Island from more catastrophic impacts and bolster the Island's ability to recover.

Sincerely,

Terry Welsh

Terry M. Welsh, MD
President

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Victoria Dean
866 Toulon Drive, Pacific Palisades, CA 90272
vsdean4@gmail.com

11 April 2025

Director Charlton "Chuck" Bonham
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Via Email: Director@wildlife.ca.gov; Chuck.Bonham@wildlife.ca.gov

RE: Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project and Fire Resilience Efforts

Dear Director Bonham,

I am writing to request your support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project - an essential conservation initiative designed to protect the long-term health and resilience of Catalina Island by restoring the native habitat, which is resilient to fire, with native trees, shrubs and plants and so, eliminating the existing highly flammable invasive grasses.

For generations, Catalina has been a recreational destination as well as the ecological home to unique and rare plants and animals. The threat of more frequent and the possibility of extreme wildfires in California has made it clear that there is an urgent need for proactive restoration which will improve fire mitigation on the Island. The Catalina Island Restoration Project will address these threats by restoring native habitats to strengthen the island's natural defenses against wildfire and other environmental threats.

This project, which is funded through private donations, is not only about protecting Catalina's landscapes and ecosystems but also, about safeguarding the people who live, work, and visit here. During the recent fires that ravaged Los Angeles County, Catalina was under the same Red Flag warning. Although the Island did not burn this time, the 2007 Island Fire burned almost a quarter of the Island and nearly claimed the City of Avalon - a threat we hope to prevent.

I do hope you recognize the significance of this project and the urgency to act on the Catalina Island Restoration Plan now. Lending your voice of support will help us achieve the goals of the project which is to create a healthy and resilient Catalina now and for future generations.

Thank you for your time and consideration and hope you will support the restoration of one of California's valuable resources.

Sincerely,



cc: Whitney Latorre, President and CEO, Catalina Island Conservancy
Kirsten Peterson Johansen, Chief of External Affairs, Catalina Island Conservancy

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

STATE CAPITOL
P.O. BOX 942849
SACRAMENTO, CA 94249-0069
(916) 319-2069
FAX (916) 319-2169

Assembly
California Legislature

JOSH LOWENTHAL
ASSEMBLYMEMBER, SIXTY-NINTH DISTRICT

March 26, 2025

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham,

On behalf of the California 69th Assembly District, I write to express my support for a healthy, climate resilient, and fire-resistant Catalina Island where humans and nature can thrive for years to come. Invasive species have had adverse impacts on the island for decades, and it is imperative to act now to halt and reverse the damage. Catalina Island is a special place for the many species who live on and visit the Island, with more than 60 endemic plant and animal species, 3,500 year-round residents, and a terrain that offers ample recreational opportunities for over one million annual visitors. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is critical to protect the biodiversity that will secure climate resilience for an important resource for communities across California to learn about and experience unique landscapes and species.

Without protective measures, many native and endemic species face extinction, and the Island may no longer be able to withstand climate change or support diverse ecosystems for years to come. Native plants on the Island absorb and retain water and are drought-resistant, acting as natural protection against wildfire and providing important habitat for native animal species. When these native plants are threatened by non-native wildlife and other risks, the Island is vulnerable to devastating climate threats such as wildfire and drought. Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project will safeguard the Island from similar catastrophic impacts, lessening the damage to the Island and bolstering the Island's ability to recover.

The Catalina Island Restoration Project is a science-based, comprehensive plan to protect the Island's biodiversity, reduce erosion, prevent wildfires, and create a sustainable environment where nature and humans will thrive for years to come. The implementation of the Restoration Project is urgent due to the heightened climate threats.

We thank you for your time and greatly look forward to working together to ensure that Catalina Island will be preserved for generations to come.

Sincerely,

JOSH LOWENTHAL
Assemblymember, 69th District

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

NATURAL RESERVE SYSTEM

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

June 18, 2025

RE: Letter of Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project

To: Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project proposed by the Catalina Island Conservancy (Conservancy). As a system of 42 reserves, the UC Natural Reserve System has a long history of mitigating the impact of invasive species across its 50,000 acres of managed lands.

The mule deer population on Catalina Island far exceeds the ecosystems' carrying capacity. This has resulted in devastating adverse impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem function on the island, including the loss of native vegetation, increased soil erosion, and reduced water capture. In addition, mule deer overabundance can lead to animal suffering, starvation, and increased disease risks—issues that cannot be successfully mitigated with interventions such as fencing, recreational hunting, the introduction of predators, translocation, or reproductive management.

The Conservancy has consulted widely with global experts, exploring all available options for mitigating the destructive impacts of mule deer on the Island. The proposed lethal removal of non-native mule deer using skilled shooters deployed from helicopters is a long-used, humane method for extirpating invasive species, as experience shows with its successful application on Santa Cruz and Santa Rosa Islands. After removal of mule deer, the Conservancy will implement a comprehensive land restoration plan that will help bring island ecosystem back into balance, making it more resilient in the face of climate threats such as wildfire and drought.

I fully support the Conservancy as they seek to address this is a very challenging situation by undertaking the lethal removal of mule deer, which is the only truly effective solution for addressing the ecosystem degradation caused by these animals.

Sincerely,

Steven L. Monfort, DVM, PhD
Executive Director, UC Natural Reserve System

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE
EX-OFFICIO MEMBER

WES ADAMS AT
www.schiff.house.gov

FACEBOOK
www.facebook.com/repadamschiff

ADAM B. SCHIFF

WASHINGTON OFFICE
2309 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-4176
FAX: (202) 225-5828

☑ DISTRICT OFFICE
245 EAST OLIVE AVENUE
SUITE 200
BURBANK, CA 91502
(818) 450-2900
FAX: (818) 450-2928
EMAIL: SCHIFF.CONSTITUENT@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV

☐ DISTRICT OFFICE
5500 HOLLYWOOD BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES, CA 90028
(323) 315-5555
(BY APPOINTMENT ONLY)

November 26, 2024

Charlton Bonham, Director
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham:

I am writing to you today in support of the *Catalina Island Restoration Project*, which will work to address and mitigate the ongoing effects of climate change on the diverse fauna and flora of Catalina Island. Catalina is a popular destination for Southern California residents to enjoy our natural environment, and its preservation is critical to ensure that future generations have access to our region's natural resources.

Currently, Catalina Island is facing two critical challenges brought about by mule deer and other invasive species. Over the past decade, the trampling of the native drought-resistant flora has led to a 150% average increase in the island's fire risk. Unfortunately, this also comes with a debilitating pattern of drought that only serves to perpetuate the increasing risk of fires and further natural deterioration.

The *Catalina Island Restoration Project* directly addresses these concerns with pointed, strategic measures to combat soil erosion, preserve endangered species, humanely and systematically remove invasive species, and rebuild a healthy native ecosystem.

The success of this initiative is likely to benefit the island for decades to come and inspire further restoration efforts across California. I urge you to give full and fair consideration to support this project.

Sincerely,

ADAM B. SCHIFF
Member of Congress

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

December 10, 2024

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham,

On behalf of SLATE-Z, I am writing to express our organization's support for a healthy, climate resilient, and fire-resistant Catalina Island where humans and nature can thrive for years to come. Invasive species have had adverse impacts on the island for decades, and it is imperative to act now to halt and reverse the damage. Catalina Island is a special place for the many species who live on and visit the Island, with more than 60 endemic plant and animal species, 3,500 year-round residents, and a terrain that offers ample recreational opportunities for over one million annual visitors. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is critical to protect the biodiversity that will secure climate resilience for an important resource for communities across California to learn about and experience unique landscapes and species.

As the backbone entity to the South LA Promise Zone, SLATE-Z follows five levers of change: education, jobs, small business and entrepreneurship, transit, and public safety. The Catalina Island Restoration Project emulates these levers, with its emphasis on educational opportunities for youth and providing protection to the island's residents, both human and wildlife.

SLATE-Z supports the Catalina Island Restoration Project because Catalina Island serves as a gateway to science, education, and nature for Catalina Island residents and visitors. We urge the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to support the Restoration Project. As the only accessible island in Southern California, Catalina is an important entry point for millions of people in Southern California to connect with one of the richest island ecosystems in the world through hiking, camping, snorkeling, and much more. These visitors include thousands of youth per year who participate in overnight camps centered on outdoor science and adventures, creating a foundation for the next generation of environmental leaders and stewards. Catalina Island's unique wildlife and recreation opportunities generate millions in visitor-driven revenue, supporting the people living and working on the island, many of whom have called the Island home for generations.

Catalina Island's ecosystems as we know them are at risk. Without protective measures, many native and endemic species face extinction, and the Island may no longer be able to withstand climate change or support diverse ecosystems for years to come. The effects of disappearing species are already evident, as native chaparral habitats disappear and transition into invasive annual grasslands. Native plants on the Island absorb and retain water and are drought-resistant, acting as natural protection against wildfire and providing important habitat for native animal species. When these native plants are threatened by non-native wildlife and other risks, the Island is vulnerable to devastating climate threats such as wildfire and drought. A catastrophic wildfire is inevitable, such as the 2007 Island Fire, in which 10% of the Island burned and 700 residents and visitors were forced to evacuate. Droughts are similarly unavoidable and disastrous, such as the 2011-2017 drought on the Island, which caused wildlife to die of dehydration and starvation in large numbers and residents to rely on highly polluting desalination plants. Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project will safeguard the Island from similar catastrophic impacts, lessening the damage to the Island and bolstering the Island's ability to recover.

The Catalina Island Conservancy is an exemplary steward of Island resources, successfully balancing conservation, education, and recreation. Their Catalina Island Restoration Project is a science-based, comprehensive plan to protect the Island's biodiversity, reduce erosion, prevent wildfires, and create a

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

sustainable environment where nature and humans will thrive for years to come. The implementation of the Restoration Project is urgent due to the heightened climate threats to the plant and animal species, residents, and ecosystems of the Island. Without the Restoration Project, communities across Southern California could lose access to one of the largest and most unique outdoor classrooms, thousands of residents could lose their homes, and the world could lose species found nowhere else on earth.

We thank you for your time and greatly look forward to working together to ensure that Catalina Island will be preserved for generations to come.

Best,



Manny Sanchez
Deputy Director

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

VENTURA LAND TRUST

Board of Trustees

Mark Watkins
President

Sylvia Schnopp
Vice President

Doug Trapp
Secretary

Meridith Thompson
Treasurer

Brian Clark

Russell Galipeau

John Krist

Kate Larramendy

Jane Montague

Drew Powers

Osmany Rios

Executive Director

Melissa Baffa

17 December 2024

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham,

On behalf of the Ventura Land Trust, I am writing to express our organization's support for a healthy, climate resilient, and fire-resistant Catalina Island where humans and nature can thrive for years to come. Invasive species have had adverse impacts on the island for decades, and it is imperative to act now to halt and reverse the damage. Catalina Island is a special place for the many species who live on and visit the Island, with more than 60 endemic plant and animal species, 3,500 year-round residents, and a terrain that offers ample recreational opportunities for over one million annual visitors. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is critical to protect the biodiversity that will secure climate resilience for an important resource for communities across California to learn about and experience unique landscapes and species.

As part of the "Galapagos of North America", Catalina Island is profoundly special, requiring the science-based, bold management outlined in this restoration project that supports its unique ecology and highly specialized endemic species. My organization also manages extensive acreage of biodiverse wildlands, and I know how vital it is to support ecological function through invasive species management. Invasive species are considered the most significant threat to biodiversity after habitat loss and are pivotal in affecting both public safety and local economies. From a conservation perspective, it is absolutely vital to address invasive species threats in such a geographically limited, biologically exceptional protected area.

Ventura Land Trust supports the Catalina Island Restoration Project because Catalina Island serves as a gateway to science, education, and nature for Catalina Island residents and visitors. We urge the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to support the Restoration Project. As the only accessible island in Southern California, Catalina is an important entry point for millions of people in Southern California to connect with one of the richest island ecosystems in the world through hiking, camping, snorkeling, and much more. These visitors include thousands of youth per year who participate in overnight camps centered on outdoor science and adventures, creating a foundation for the next generation

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

VENTURA LAND TRUST

of environmental leaders and stewards. Catalina Island's unique wildlife and recreation opportunities generate millions in visitor-driven revenue, supporting the people living and working on the island, many of whom have called the Island home for generations.

Catalina Island's ecosystems as we know them are at risk. Without protective measures, many native and endemic species face extinction, and the Island may no longer be able to withstand climate change or support diverse ecosystems for years to come. The effects of disappearing species are already evident, as native chaparral habitats disappear and transition into invasive annual grasslands. Native plants on the Island absorb and retain water and are drought-resistant, acting as natural protection against wildfire and providing important habitat for native animal species. When these native plants are threatened by non-native wildlife and other risks, the Island is vulnerable to devastating climate threats such as wildfire and drought. A catastrophic wildfire is inevitable, such as the 2007 Island Fire, in which 10% of the Island burned and 700 residents and visitors were forced to evacuate. Droughts are similarly unavoidable and disastrous, such as the 2011-2017 drought on the Island, which caused wildlife to die of dehydration and starvation in large numbers and residents to rely on highly polluting desalination plants. Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project will safeguard the Island from similar catastrophic impacts, lessening the damage to the Island and bolstering the Island's ability to recover.

The Catalina Island Conservancy is an exemplary steward of Island resources, successfully balancing conservation, education, and recreation. Their Catalina Island Restoration Project is a science-based, comprehensive plan to protect the Island's biodiversity, reduce erosion, prevent wildfires, and create a sustainable environment where nature and humans will thrive for years to come. The implementation of the Restoration Project is urgent due to the heightened climate threats to the plant and animal species, residents, and ecosystems of the Island. Without the Restoration Project, communities across Southern California could lose access to one of the largest and most unique outdoor classrooms, thousands of residents could lose their homes, and the world could lose species found nowhere else on earth.

I urge you to support this excellent opportunity to meaningfully protect the unique ecological resources on Catalina Island.

Sincerely,

Daniel Hulst

Daniel Hulst
Deputy Director, Ventura Land Trust
(805) 643 8044 dan@venturalandtrust.org

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

February 10, 2025

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham,

On behalf of Orange County Coastkeeper, I am writing to express our organization's support for a healthy, climate resilient, and fire-resistant Catalina Island where humans and nature can thrive for years to come. Invasive species have had adverse impacts on the island for decades, and it is imperative to act now to halt and reverse the damage. Catalina Island is a special place for the many species who live on and visit the Island, with more than 60 endemic plant and animal species, 3,500 year-round residents, and a terrain that offers ample recreational opportunities for over one million annual visitors. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is critical to protect the biodiversity that will secure climate resilience for an important resource for communities across California to learn about and experience unique landscapes and species.

Catalina Island is important to Orange County Coastkeeper because of the public's accessibility to the Channel Islands and experiencing unique endemic species that live on the island. Additionally, climate resiliency is a priority for us across Southern California, and Catalina's conservation efforts align with our commitment to long-term environmental health.

Orange County Coastkeeper supports the Catalina Island Restoration Project because Catalina Island serves as a gateway to science, education, and nature for Catalina Island residents and visitors. We urge the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to support the Restoration Project. As the only accessible island in Southern California, Catalina is an important entry point for millions of people in Southern California to connect with one of the richest island ecosystems in the world through hiking, camping, snorkeling, and much more. These visitors include thousands of youth per year who participate in overnight camps centered on outdoor science and adventures, creating a foundation for the next generation of environmental leaders and stewards. Catalina Island's unique wildlife and recreation opportunities generate millions in visitor-driven revenue, supporting the people living and working on the island, many of whom have called the Island home for generations.

Catalina Island's ecosystems as we know them are at risk. Without protective measures, many native and endemic species face extinction, and the Island may no longer be able to withstand climate change or support diverse ecosystems for years to come. The effects of disappearing species are already evident, as native chaparral habitats disappear and transition into invasive annual grasslands. Native plants on the Island absorb and retain water and are drought-resistant, acting as natural protection against wildfire and providing important habitat for native animal species. When these native plants are threatened by non-native wildlife and other risks, the Island is vulnerable to devastating climate threats such as wildfire and drought. A catastrophic wildfire is inevitable, such as the 2007 Island Fire, in which 10% of the Island burned and 700 residents and visitors were forced to evacuate. Droughts are similarly unavoidable and disastrous, such as the 2011-2017 drought on the Island, which caused wildlife to die of dehydration and starvation in large numbers and residents to rely on highly polluting desalination plants. Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project will safeguard the Island from similar catastrophic impacts, lessening the damage to the Island and bolstering the Island's ability to recover.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

The Catalina Island Conservancy is an exemplary steward of Island resources, successfully balancing conservation, education, and recreation. Their Catalina Island Restoration Project is a science-based, comprehensive plan to protect the Island's biodiversity, reduce erosion, prevent wildfires, and create a sustainable environment where nature and humans will thrive for years to come. The implementation of the Restoration Project is urgent due to the heightened climate threats to the plant and animal species, residents, and ecosystems of the Island. Without the Restoration Project, communities across Southern California could lose access to one of the largest and most unique outdoor classrooms, thousands of residents could lose their homes, and the world could lose species found nowhere else on earth.

We thank you for your time and greatly look forward to working together to ensure that Catalina Island will be preserved for generations to come.

Best,

Kaysha Kenney
Marine Restoration Director
Orange County Coastkeeper
kaysha@coastkeeper.org

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Newport Whales
WHALE WATCHING

Newport Landing Sportfishing & Whale Watching
309 Palm St
Suit A
Newport Beach, CA 92661

Dear Senator Adam Schiff,

As a business owner on Catalina Island, I am writing to express my support for Operation Protect Catalina Island and the Catalina Island Conservancy's Island restoration work. This effort is about more than land management; it is about safeguarding our community's future by making Catalina more resilient to climate change and catastrophic wildfire. Invasive species have harmed Catalina for decades, and it is imperative to act now to halt and reverse the damage. Catalina is home to more than 60 plant and animal species found nowhere else on Earth, nearly 4,000 year-round residents, and more than one million annual visitors contributing to its tourism economy. On a personal level, Catalina is also where I enjoy recreational diving multiple times a year. Preserving the Island for future generations is deeply important to me. I support this restoration work because Catalina serves as a gateway to science, education and nature-based experiences for both residents and visitors. As the only large, publicly accessible island in Southern California, Catalina offers millions of people the chance to connect with one of the richest island ecosystems in the world through hiking, camping, snorkeling and other outdoor activities. Every year, thousands of young people attend overnight camps here, building a foundation for the next generation of environmental leaders. Catalina's unique wildlife and recreation opportunities also generate millions in visitor-driven revenue, supporting local businesses and families who have called this Island home for generations. Without protective action, Catalina's ecosystems are at serious risk. Many native and endemic species face extinctions.

as invasive plants and animals spread, leaving the Island less able to withstand climate change. The loss of native chaparral, now giving way to invasive annual grasslands, is already visible. Native plants provide essential habitat, help the soil hold water, withstand drought, and serve as natural protection against wildfire. When they are threatened, whether by non-native wildlife such as mule deer or by worsening

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Newport Landing Sportfishing & Whale Watching
309 Palm St
Suit A
Newport Beach, CA 92661

climate pressures, the Island becomes increasingly vulnerable to wildfire and drought. The Palisades and Eaton fires in January 2025 remind us that fire season is every season. For an island community, evacuation is complex, and options are limited. A fire like the 2007 Island Fire, which burned 10% of Catalina and forced 700 residents and visitors to evacuate, would again endanger lives, homes, businesses and our tourism economy. From 2011–2017, drought also devastated Catalina, causing wildlife to die of thirst and forcing residents to depend on desalination plants. These plants are energy-intensive and release pollutants that harm aquatic life and raise ocean salinity. Operation Protect Catalina Island is a forward-looking investment that will help prevent these crises and strengthen Catalina's ability to recover from natural disasters. This science-based, comprehensive plan will restore native plants, reduce erosion, lower wildfire risk and protect biodiversity. With climate threats increasing, the time to act is now. Thank you for your leadership and for all you are doing to protect the people, wildlife and natural beauty of Catalina. With your support, we can ensure a healthy, resilient Island for everyone.

Best regards,

Jessica Rodriguez

Communications Manager

Newport Landing Whale Watching

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

April 21, 2025

Director Charlton "Chuck" Bonham
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Via Email: Director@wildlife.ca.gov; Chuck.Bonham@wildlife.ca.gov

RE: Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project and Fire Resilience Efforts

Dear Director Bonham,

I am writing to request your support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project - an essential conservation initiative designed to protect the long-term health and resilience of Catalina Island by creating an environment in which highly flammable invasive grasses are replaced with more fire resilient native plants. My family is one of many that have enjoyed Catalina Island for decades and value it uniqueness. Your support is vital to protect this island for future generations.

For generations, Catalina has been an ecological and recreational treasure, home to diverse wildlife, rare plant species, and a community that depends on a thriving natural environment. However, the increasing frequency of extreme wildfires has made clear the urgent need for proactive restoration and fire mitigation efforts. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is designed to address these challenges by restoring native habitats, reducing highly flammable invasive vegetation, and strengthening the island's natural defenses against wildfire and other environmental threats.

This project, which is privately funded through generous donations, is not only about protecting Catalina's landscapes—it is about safeguarding the people who live, work, and visit here, ensuring a resilient future for the island's ecosystem and economy. During the recent fires that ravaged Los Angeles County, Catalina was under the same Red Flag warning. Fortunately, the island did not experience the same fate as the mainland. But it did come close when the 2007 Island Fire almost claimed the City of Avalon - a situation we must work to ensure never happens again.

I do hope you recognize the significance of this project and the urgency moving forward. Lending your voice of support will help ensure the goals of the project are fulfilled and the island remains healthy and resilient for future generations to come.

Thank you for your time, your consideration, and for your dedication to protecting one of California's greatest natural resources.

Sincerely,

Maureen H Ramer

Maureen H. Ramer
Vice-Chair Catalina Island Conservancy Board of Directors

cc: Whitney Latorre, President and CEO, Catalina Island Conservancy
Kirsten Peterson Johansen, Chief of External Affairs, Catalina Island Conservancy

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Blanny Avalon Hagenah
One Crescent Avenue
Avalon, CA 90704

April 16, 2025

Director Charlton "Chuck" Bonham
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Via Email: Director@wildlife.ca.gov; Chuck.Bonham@wildlife.ca.gov

RE: Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project and Fire Resilience Efforts

Dear Director Bonham,

I am writing to request your support for the Catalina Island Restoration Project. This is an essential conservation initiative designed to protect the long-term health and resilience of Catalina Island by creating an environment in which highly flammable invasive grasses are replaced with more fire resilient native plants.

As a part-time resident of Catalina I have experienced first-hand what a special place Catalina is. For generations, Catalina has been an ecological and recreational treasure, home to diverse wildlife, rare plant species, and a community that depends on a thriving natural environment. However, the increasing frequency of extreme wildfires has made clear the urgent need for proactive restoration and fire mitigation efforts. The Catalina Island Restoration Project is designed to address these challenges by restoring native habitats, reducing highly flammable invasive vegetation, and strengthening the island's natural defenses against wildfire and other environmental threats.

This project, which is privately funded through generous donations, is not only about protecting Catalina's landscapes—it is about safeguarding the people who live, work, and visit here, ensuring a resilient future for the island's ecosystem and economy. During the recent fires that ravaged Los Angeles County, Catalina was under the same Red Flag warning. Fortunately, the island did not experience the same fate as the mainland. But it did come close when the 2007 Island Fire almost claimed the City of Avalon - a situation we must work to ensure never happens again.

I do hope you recognize the significance of this project and the urgency moving forward. Lending your voice of support will help ensure the goals of the project are fulfilled and the island remains healthy and resilient for future generations to come.

Thank you for your time, your consideration, and for your dedication to protecting one of California's greatest natural resources.

Sincerely,

Blanny Avalon Hagenah

cc: Whitney Latorre, President and CEO, Catalina Island Conservancy
Kirsten Peterson Johansen, Chief of External Affairs, Catalina Island Conservancy

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Catalina Adventure Tours
6400 East Marina Driver, Suite #2
Long Beach, CA 90803
September 23, 2025

Dear Senator Shiff,

As someone who lives and works on Catalina Island, I wanted to share my support for the Catalina Island Conservancy's *Island Restoration Project.* I believe this effort is an important step toward protecting our island, our community, and our way of life.

The fires we saw earlier this year were a real wake-up call that fire season isn't just a few months anymore, it's all year long. On an island, evacuations are complicated and can quickly become dangerous. Another fire like the one we had in 2007 could put lives at risk, damage homes, and wildlife, and cause lasting harm to our local economy and tourism.

While there's been some conversation about the management of mule deer, this project really goes beyond that. It's about making sure Catalina stays safe, healthy, and resilient for residents, businesses, and future generations.

The Conservancy's plan is a proactive, science-based approach that gives us a chance to get ahead of the problem instead of reacting to disaster later. I hope you'll support this project and help protect the future of Catalina Island.

Thank you for your leadership and for always keeping the well-being of our community in mind.

Thank you,

Heather Milburn
President of Operations

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Channel Islands Restoration

restoring habitat and promoting environmental education

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Ken Owen
Executive Director
Connie Jenkins
President
Art Levitt
Vice President
Chris Allen
Treasurer
Scott Orlosky
Secretary
Alex Brodie
Geoff Coster
Gabrielle Coulousi
Helene Finger
Jeffrey Light
Oscar Martinez
Alikoi Parra
Alana M. Rader
Aireona Raschke
Caleb Stumberg
Taylor Viens

STAFF

Natasha Booth
Volunteer and Project Coordinator
Lauren Harris
Staff Ecologist
Doug Morgan
Operations Manager
Lizzy Sorce
Director of Administration
Holly Wright
Senior Project Manager
John Ziegler
Marketing Manager

January 27, 2025

Charlton Bonham
Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
715 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Channel Islands Restoration Support the Scientific Collection Permit for the Catalina Island Restoration Project

Dear Director Bonham,

I am Executive Director of Channel Islands Restoration, and on behalf of our nonprofit organization, I am writing to express our support of the Santa Catalina Island Restoration Plan, including the Scientific Collection Permit application for the eradication of the invasive mule deer. I have first-hand experience working on Santa Rosa Island, where invasive mule deer disrupted efforts to restore endangered species populations. Mule deer on Santa Rosa Island denuded the island of vegetation, which created severe erosion problems and directly threatened endangered plants, many found nowhere else in the world, and endangered animals that depended on those plants for survival. Like on Santa Rosa, mule deer on Catalina disrupt the island's ecosystem balance and sustainability, increasing the risk of wildfires that threaten Island residents, biodiversity, and infrastructure, plus rare and endemic plants and animals that live there. With over 60,000 plant and animal species that are found nowhere else in the world, 4,000 year-round residents, and a terrain that offers ample recreational opportunities for over a million annual visitors, Catalina Island is a special place where nature and people thrive interdependently. The Catalina Island Restoration Plan is critical to protecting the biodiversity that will secure present and future climate resilience for an important community resource for Southern California and beyond.

Channel Islands Restoration supports the Scientific Collection Permit application for the eradication of the invasive mule deer as part of the Catalina Island Restoration Plan because Catalina Island is a gateway to science, education, and nature for Catalina Island residents and visitors. We urge the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to support the Permit as well. As the only large, publicly accessible island in Southern California, Catalina is an important entry point for millions of people in

PO Box 40228 Santa Barbara, CA 93140 • (805) 448-5726 • www.cirweb.org

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Channel Islands Restoration

restoring habitat and promoting environmental education

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Ken Owen
Executive Director

Connie Jenkins
President

Art Levitt
Vice President

Chris Allen
Treasurer

Scott Orlosky
Secretary

Alex Brodie
Geoff Coster
Gabrielle Coulousi
Helene Finger
Jeffrey Light
Oscar Martinez
Alikoi Parra
Alana M. Rader
Aireona Raschke
Caleb Stumberg
Taylor Viens

STAFF

Natasha Booth
Volunteer and Project Coordinator

Lauren Harris
Staff Ecologist

Doug Morgan
Operations Manager

Lizzy Sorce
Director of Administration

Holly Wright
Senior Project Manager

John Ziegler
Marketing Manager

Southern California to connect with one of the richest island ecosystems in the world through hiking, camping, snorkeling, and much more. These visitors include thousands of young people per year who participate in overnight camps centered on outdoor science and adventures, creating a foundation for the next generation of environmental leaders and stewards. Catalina Island's endemic wildlife and recreation opportunities generate millions in visitor-driven revenue, supporting the people living and working on the island, many of whom have been there for generations. I have worked on all eight of the California Channel Islands, and when I was five years old, Catalina Island wad the first island I visited. As an adult I participated in invasive plant surveys and weed removal there and toured large portions of the island. It is truly a wonderful place that should be protected from introduced animal populations and instead be cherished living biological museum.

Catalina Island's ecosystems as we know them are at risk. Without protective measures, many native and endemic species face extinction, and the Island may no longer be able to withstand climate change or support life for years to come. The effects of disappearing species are already evident. Native flora on the island absorb and retain water and are drought-resistant, acting as natural protection against wildfire and providing important habitat for native animal species. When these native plants are threatened by non-native wildlife, namely the mule deer, the Island is vulnerable to succumbing to devastating climate threats such as wildfire and drought. This is evidenced, for example, by the devastating 2007 Island Fire, in which 10% of the Island burned and 700 residents and visitors were forced to evacuate. Another example is the 2011-2017 drought on the Island, which caused wildlife to die of dehydration and starvation in large numbers and residents to rely on highly polluting desalination plants. Support for the Catalina Island Restoration Plan will safeguard the Island from similar catastrophic impacts, lessening the damage to the Island and bolstering the Island's ability to recover. The Restoration Plan must be urgently implemented.

Invasive species are one of the greatest threats to biodiversity worldwide. Removal of invasive species is imperative to preserving biodiversity and to reaching the state's goal of conserving 30% of lands and coastal waters by 2030. Eradicating the mule deer is a vital component of the Restoration Plan, and it will enable the ecosystem to recover from overgrazing and trampling. Studies have shown that aerial hunting, as proposed in the Scientific Collection Permit, is the most humane and effective method of deer removal, minimizing stress levels of deer significantly more than translocation and birth control. Despite Catalina Island having the longest recreational hunting season in the state, the mule deer population continues to grow unchecked, indicating that recreational hunting alone is not a viable method of controlling mule deer population. This was also the case on Santa Rosa Island, where the National Park Service eventually removed the deer population through a hunting program.

PO Box 40228 Santa Barbara, CA 93140 • (805) 448-5726 • www.cirweb.org

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Channel Islands Restoration

restoring habitat and promoting environmental education

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Ken Owen
Executive Director
Connie Jenkins
President
Art Levitt
Vice President
Chris Allen
Treasurer
Scott Orlosky
Secretary
Alex Brodie
Geoff Coster
Gabrielle Coulousi
Helene Finger
Jeffrey Light
Oscar Martinez
Alikoi Parra
Alana M. Rader
Aireona Raschke
Caleb Stumberg
Taylor Viens

STAFF

Natasha Booth
Volunteer and Project Coordinator
Lauren Harris
Staff Ecologist
Doug Morgan
Operations Manager
Lizzy Sorce
Director of Administration
Holly Wright
Senior Project Manager
John Ziegler
Marketing Manager

I have first-hand and long-term experience of management on the Channel Islands, and I know that the Catalina Island Conservancy is an exemplary steward of Island resources, successfully balancing conservation, education, and recreation. Their restoration plan is a science-based, comprehensive plan to protect the Island's biodiversity, reduce erosion, prevent wildfires, and create a sustainable environment where wildlife and humans will thrive for years to come.

We thank you for your time and greatly look forward to working together to ensure that Catalina Island will be preserved for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Ken A. Owen

Ken Owen
Executive Director
Channel Islands Restoration

PO Box 40228 Santa Barbara, CA 93140 • (805) 448-5726 • www.cirweb.org

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit E: White Buffalo Inc. Portfolio

White Buffalo Inc.
Conserving Native Species and Ecosystems

White Buffalo Inc., founded in 1995, is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit wildlife management and research organization dedicated to conserving native species and ecosystems through damage and population control. We also sponsor, support, and conduct scientific research and educational efforts to improve the understanding of natural resources for the purpose of conservation. Our approach is unique, in that we generate funding for conservation research by providing management alternatives in non-traditional settings.

Contact Information

Phone: (860) 385-4725
Email: info@whitebuffaloinc.org
Web: www.whitebuffaloinc.org

Population Reduction Programs

To date, White Buffalo Inc. personnel have lethally removed over 10,000 deer. As a result of these programs more than 200,000 pounds of venison have been donated to various food shelters.

Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY:
February 2015 - 300 deer harvested over 3.5 days
March 2017 - 202 deer harvested over 6 days
April 2019 - 250 deer harvested over 7 days

Burnsville, Minnesota (38 square miles):
November 2001 - 21 deer harvested in 2 days
November 2002 - 67 deer harvested in 7 days
January 2003 - 24 deer harvested in 7 days
March 2004 - 36 deer harvested in 4 days

Catoctin Mountain Park, Thurmont, Maryland (8 square miles):
February 2021 - 67 deer harvested in 5 days
February 2022 - 57 deer harvested in 7 days
February 2023 - 86 deer harvested in 10 days
February 2024 - 83 deer harvested in 9 days
February 2025 - 79 deer harvested in 9 days

Crystal Airport, Minnesota:
October 2000 - 11 deer were removed regional airport, over 2 days, to eliminate the chance of deer strikes on the runway.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Des Peres, Missouri:
January 2023 - 55 deer harvested over 11 days
January/February 2024 - 37 deer harvested over 5 days
January/February 2025 - 27 deer harvested over 7 days

Dune Acres, Indiana (1 square mile):
February 1998 - 50 deer harvested over 5 days

Eden Prairie, Minnesota (36 square miles):
November 1997 - 160 deer harvested over 15 days
November 1998 - 124 deer harvested over 11 days
November 1999 - 125 deer harvested over 8 days
November 2001 - 125 deer harvested over 7 days
November 2002 - 154 deer harvested over 14 days
March 2004 - 135 deer harvested over 11 days
November 2004 - 115 deer harvested over 8 days
November/December 2005 - 115 deer harvested over 14 days
November 2007 - 106 deer harvested over 11 days
November 2010 - 115 deer harvested over 14 days
November 2012 - 110 deer harvested over 14 days
November 2014 - 120 deer harvested over 12 days

Edina, Minnesota:
December 1999 - 40 deer harvested in 1 day
November 2001 - 30 deer harvested over 3 days
November 2002 - 26 deer harvested over 4 days

Elk Mills, Maryland (FMC Stine Research Center):
March 2023 - 50 deer harvested in 2 days

Fairfax County, Virginia: (Pilot program - 2 County-owned Parks)
January - February 2014 - 98 deer harvested, reduced densities below 20/mile^2
February 2015 - 40 deer harvested, reduced densities below 20/mile^2

Fire Island National Seashore, New York:
February 2020 - 230 deer harvested in 8 days
February 2021 - 98 deer harvested in 6 days
February 2022 - 113 deer harvested in 7 days
February 2023 - 112 deer harvested in 5 days
February 2024 - 98 deer harvested in 6 days
February 2025 - 75 deer harvested in 5 days

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



George Reserve (University of Michigan), Pinckney, Michigan (2 square miles enclosed):
March 2001 - 103 deer harvested over 3 days for tuberculosis testing.

Greenwich, Connecticut: (Pilot program - 3 town-owned parcels)
March 2005 - 80 deer harvested over 4 days

Iowa City, Iowa (6 square mile area):
January 2000 - 360 deer harvested over 10 days
December/January 2001 - 340 deer harvested over 21 days
December 2001 - 250 deer harvested over 18 days
November 2003 - 200 deer harvested over 14 days
February 2005 - 154 deer harvested over 9 days
January/February 2006 - 150 deer harvested over 11 days
January 2007 - 199 deer harvested over 14 days
January 2008 - 89 deer harvested over 8 days
February 2009 - 69 deer harvested over 15 days (2 Biologists only)
February 2010 - 57 deer harvested over 11 days (2 Biologists only)
December 2019 - February/March 2020 – 500 deer harvested over 38 days

Long Island, New Hampshire (2 square mile peninsula):
November 1996 - 90 deer harvested over 3 days

Lower Makefield, Pennsylvania (Pilot program - 6 town-owned parcels)
February/March 2010 - 94 deer harvested over 9 days

Monhegan Island, Maine (1 square mile):
April 1997 - 52 deer harvested over 3 days
April 1998 & March 1999 - remaining 27 deer harvested*
* Successful eradication of all deer on the island

Mount Lebanon, Pennsylvania (6 square mile):
February/March 2016 - 115 deer harvested over 13 days
February 2017 - 55 deer harvested over 7 days
February 2018 - 57 deer harvested over 9 days
February 2019 - 44 deer harvested over 11 days
February 2020 - 35 deer harvested over 12 days

National Park Service, Northeast Region: We won this grant through a competitive process with the National Park Service to help address the ecological impacts of overabundant white-tailed deer in northeastern parks. Our duties include collaborating on deer management plans, supporting deer population monitoring, designing multi-acre exclosures to protect sensitive habitats, and implementing deer population reduction where needed. Throughout the project, we will coordinate closely with NPS staff, adaptively manage our activities, and provide annual progress and financial reports to ensure the project's conservation objectives are achieved over the full five-year period (2005–2009).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Northern Indiana Public Service Company, Wheatfield, Indiana:
March 1996 - 100 deer harvested over 4 days from a 2500-acre enclosed facility*
* Population estimated at 130 deer prior to reduction.

Peaks Island, Maine (1 square mile):
February/March 2000 - 223 deer harvested over 8 days*
* Population was estimated at 240 before reduction.

Princeton Township, New Jersey:
February/March 2001 - 322 deer harvested over 15 days
January/February 2002 - 303 deer harvested over 27 days
February/March 2003 - 280 deer harvested over 21 days
January/February 2004 - 276 deer harvested over 27 days
January 2005 - 124 deer harvested over 13 days
February 2006 - 150 deer harvested over 15 days
February 2007 - 126 deer harvested over 14 days
February 2008 - 107 deer harvested over 15 days
January/February 2009 - 154 deer harvested over 19 days (2 Biologists only)
February/March 2010 - 148 deer harvested over 16 days (2 Biologists only)
February/March 2012 - 116 deer harvested over 16 days (2 Biologists only)
February/March 2013 - 159 deer harvested over 17 days (2 Biologists only)
February/March 2014 - 127 deer harvested over 18 days (2 Biologists only)
February/March 2015 - 250 deer harvested over 28 days (2 Biologists only)
February/March 2016 - 119 deer harvested over 21 days (2 Biologists only)
February/March 2017 - 63 deer harvested over 11 days (2 Biologists only)
February/March 2018 - 196 deer harvested over 21 days (3 Biologists)
February/March 2019 - 263 deer harvested over 26 days (3 Biologists)
February/March 2020 - 143 deer harvested over 20 days (3 Biologists)
February/March 2021 - 142 deer harvested over 20 days (3 Biologists)
February/March 2022 - 147 deer harvested over 15 days (3 biologists)
February/March 2023 - 125 deer harvested over 17 days (3 biologists)
February 2024 - 123 deer harvested in 17 days (3 biologists)
February 2025 - 124 deer harvested in 17 days (3 biologists)

Ramsey County, Minnesota (Maplewood, St. Paul):
November/December 2005 - 200 deer harvested over 12 days

Rancho Santa Fe, California (SDRE Investments LLC):
Lethal removal of coyotes, including site assessment, planning, and execution of removal operations using firearms. 2025 (pending)

Roanoke, Virginia:
January 2005 - 109 deer harvested over 7 days

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Solon, Ohio:

March 2005 - 602 deer harvested over 37 days.
January/March 2006 - 400 deer harvested over 40 days
January/February 2007 - 150 deer harvested over 15 days
March 2008 - 175 deer harvested over 22 days
January/March 2009 - 250 deer harvested over 33 days (2 Biologists only)

Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania:

December 2009/January 2010 - 31 deer harvested over 4 days
December 2010/January 2011 - 21 deer harvested over 4 days
December 2011/January 2012 - 9 deer harvested over 4 days
January-March 2013 - 21 deer harvested over 8 days
January-March 2014 - 19 deer harvested over 8 days
January-March 2015 - 28 deer harvested over 10 days
January-March 2016 - 19 deer harvested over 11 days
January-March 2017 - 21 deer harvested over 8 days
March 2018 - 15 deer harvested over 7 days
January-March 2019 - 20 deer harvested over 8 days
January-March 2020 - 21 deer harvested over 9 days
January-March 2021 - 31 deer harvested over 7 days
January-February 2022 - 19 deer harvested over 7 days
January-February 2023 - 20 deer harvested over 6 days
January-February 2024 - 22 deer harvested over 6 days
February-March 2025 - 23 deer harvested over 7 days

Tega Cay, South Carolina:

October-November 2024 - 200 deer sterilized via ovariectomy in 14 days

Town and Country, Missouri:

December 2009 - 112 deer harvested over 7 days
December 2010 - 75 deer harvested over 7 days
December 2011- Jan 2012 - 288 deer harvested over 28 days
December 2012 - 115 deer harvested over 11 days
January 2014 - 87 deer harvested over 8 days
January 2015 - 100 deer harvested over 9 days
January 2016 - 210 deer harvested over 21 days
January 2017 - 225 deer harvested over 19 days
January 2018 - 361 deer harvested over 35 days
January 2019 - 150 deer harvested over 18 days
January 2020 - 134 deer harvested over 19 days
January 2022 - 51 deer harvested over 7 days
January 2023 - 50 deer harvested over 7 days
January 2024 - 89 deer harvested over 11 days
January 2025 - 79 deer harvested over 11 days

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Tuxedo Park, New York:
February 2012 - 98 deer harvested over 9 days

Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, New York:
January 2010 - 64 deer harvested over 2 days

Wildwood, Missouri:
January/February 2024 - 300 deer harvested over 26 days
January/February 2025 - 361 deer harvested over 31 days

Capture

We are experienced and fully equipped to provide capture services (i.e., drop-nets, rocket-nets, remote immobilization equipment). Using various techniques, White Buffalo Inc. personnel have captured over 4,000 deer as well as feral pigs, water buffalo, feral goats, and elk.

Bald Head Island, North Carolina: We captured 18 deer using darting techniques for a GonaCon research project. In addition, we trained employees of the Conservancy and local volunteers in deer capture and handling techniques (January–March 2014).

Bedford and Lewisboro, New York, USDA-ARS 4 Poster Lyme Disease Research*:
May 1998 - 8 deer captured using darting techniques over 3 days
October 1998 - 12 deer captured using darting techniques over 3 days
Oct. /November 1999 - 40 deer captured using darting techniques over 8 days
*All deer captured were checked for number and distribution of ticks.

Bluff Point/Mumford Cove, Groton, Connecticut: Urban white-tailed deer habitat use and home range study - We volunteered our service and equipment to assist in capturing white-tailed deer as part of a state-conducted research project. Deer were captured using darting equipment (Winter 1995–96).

Bridgeport, Connecticut: We captured 18 deer using a combination of drop nets and darting techniques to apply an experimental Amitraz-impregnated collar to control ticks as part of a CDC Lyme disease research project (March 1999).

Carlisle, Massachusetts: We captured 27 deer using darting techniques and applied radio transmitter collars as part of a state organized research project to assess mortality rates of suburban deer populations in eastern Massachusetts (March 1999).

Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, New Haven, Connecticut: Genesis Laboratories is leading a two-year field trial in partnership with the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station to evaluate an oral fipronil-laced bait for controlling blacklegged and lone star ticks on white-tailed deer. The study will be conducted at large, wooded sites in and around Bridgeport and Norwalk, Connecticut, including Lake Success Business Park and Manresa Island.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, New Haven, Connecticut: The CDC-funded study aims to optimize and standardize the suppression of host-seeking Ixodes scapularis (blacklegged tick) and interrupt pathogen transmission by administering systemic acaricides orally to white-tailed deer and Peromyscus species across high-risk sites in the Northeast. The research is scheduled over five years, with Year 1 (baseline) beginning in 2023 and intervention years spanning 2024–2026, potentially extending into 2027 for final analyses and publication.

Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, New Haven, Connecticut: We captured 38 deer using darting techniques for researchers to assess the effectiveness of oral delivery of the systemic acaricide Moxidectin to white-tailed deer in the management of the pathogen vectors *Amblyomma americanum* and *Ixodes scapularis*. Part of a Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station research project (Summer and Fall 2021–2022).

Connecticut College Arboretum: We removed deer completely to prevent damage to native plant collections and research plots. We inspected and repaired the perimeter fence to ensure it was deer-proof. We then captured the 3 remaining deer enclosed in the 100-acre arboretum using darting techniques. Deer were released outside the fence on Connecticut College property (January 1996).

Fort Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania: We captured, tagged, and radio-collared 61 deer for a research project for the National Guard Training Center (March 2019, February 2021).

George Reserve, Pinckney, Michigan: We captured 25 deer over 3 days using darting techniques for a doctoral research project (University of Michigan). In addition, we trained a doctoral student and technician in deer capture and handling techniques (November 1997).

Lake Gaillard Reservoir, Connecticut, Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station:
We captured, tagged, and radio-collared 35 deer for a research project (November 2000).

Michigan DNR, Midland, Michigan: Captured feral pigs to deploy GPS collars to assess their movements and habitat usage (August 2015).

Old Lyme, Connecticut, USDA-ARS 4 Poster Lyme Disease Research:
We captured 11 deer using darting techniques to apply radio-transmitter collars and to assess the number and distribution of ticks (April 1999).

Point Reyes National Seashore, California: Captured elk to deploy GPS collars to assess elk movements relative to conflicts with ranches (October 2012).

Staten Island, New York: Captured over 2,500 white-tailed deer as part of an intensive sterilization program for New York City Parks and Recreation (2016–2023). Captured an additional 60 deer to deploy GPS collars in 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 to determine the behavioral impact of the sterilization program.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Staten Island, New York (Columbia University): Captured 45 white-tailed deer to deploy GPS collars (March 2023). Captured 30 and 16 deer for a SARS CoV2 study in January and March 2024, respectively. Captured 47 deer for a SARS CoV2 study (August 2025).

Towson, Maryland, USDA-ARS 4 Poster Lyme Disease Research:
We captured 11 deer using darting techniques over 3 days to assess the number and distribution of ticks (November 1998).

Research

We are committed to further understanding causes and solutions to wildlife/human conflicts. We assess alternative management techniques for a variety of species.

Fertility Control Research

"South Euclid, Ohio White-Tailed Deer Combined Surgical Sterilization and Sharpshooting Program", South Euclid, Ohio: This study is designed to compare the combination of sharpshooting and surgical sterilization to sharpshooting only zones within South Euclid, Ohio.

December 2021 - Captured and sterilized 61 deer over 9 days
January 2023 - Captured and sterilized 43 female deer over 6 days
January 2024 - Captured and sterilized 24 female deer over 5 days
January 2025 - Captured and sterilized 40 female deer over 5 days

"Demographic and behavioral impacts of an intensive male sterilization program for free-ranging white-tailed deer", Staten Island, New York: We captured >2,400 male deer (≥98% of the male population) using darting techniques and performed vasectomies on these animals (September 2016–February 2025).

"Examining the effectiveness of surgical sterilization and sharpshooting as a combined approach for managing suburban white-tailed deer populations", Ann Arbor, Michigan: We captured 54 females over 7 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies. We also culled 96 deer over 7 days in select open spaces (January/February 2017 - Year 1 of a five-year project). We captured 18 females over 5 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies. We also culled 115 deer over 13 days in select open spaces (January 2018 – Year 2). We captured 6 females over 3 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies. We also culled 112 deer over 16 days in select open spaces (January 2019). In the final year we culled 109 deer over 17 days in select open spaces (January 2020).

"Field sterilization of white-tailed deer", Mt Storm Park, Cincinnati, Ohio: We captured 41 females over 6 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (December 2015). We captured 10 females over 3 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (January 2017). We captured 11 females over 6 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (January 2018). We captured 4 females over 3 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (August

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



2018). We captured 7 females over 4 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (January 2019). In the final year we captured 9 females over 7 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies resulting in >98% of the females sterilized (November 2019 – February 2020).

"Field sterilization of white-tailed deer", Village of East Hampton, New York: We captured 114 females over 12 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (January 2015). We captured 46 females over 8 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies. We also performed 50 vasectomies on males (November 2015).

"Field sterilization of white-tailed deer", National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland: We captured 24 females over 3 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (December 2014). We captured 5 females in 1 day using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (December 2015). We captured 8 females in 1 day using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (December 2016). We captured 2 females in 1 day using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (December 2017). We captured 3 females in 1 day using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (February 2019).

"Field sterilization of white-tailed deer", Fairfax City, Virginia: We captured 18 females over 6 days (January/February 2014), 18 females over 5 days (January 2015), 6 females over 3 days (December 2015), 5 females over 3 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies/tubal ligations (December 2016), and 5 females over 3 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies/tubal ligations (January 2018).

"Field sterilization of black-tailed deer", The Villages Golf and Country Club, San Jose, California: We captured all females (99) over 9 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies/tubal ligations (January/February 2013). We captured 9 females using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (October 2013). Population estimates were derived using local demographics and the known number of females in conjunction with Distance sampling surveys. Detailed data on immigration and survival rates also were collected (November 2014).

"Field sterilization of white-tailed deer", Cayuga Heights, New York: We captured 137 females (>97% of females present) over 14 days using a combination of drop nets and darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (December 2012). We captured all remaining females (n = 12) using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (December 2013). We captured 6 females over 2 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (March 2016). Population estimates were derived using local demographics and the known number of females in conjunction with camera surveys at baited locations. Detailed data on immigration and survival rates also were collected.

"Field sterilization of white-tailed deer", Wildlife Rescue, Phoenix, Maryland: We captured 32 dogs over 8 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (February 2011). We captured 14 does over 5 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (February 2012). We captured 9 does over 3 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (February 2013 and 2014). We captured 11 does over 4 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (February 2015). We captured 14 does over 6 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (February

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



2022). We captured 15 does over 6 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (February 2023). Population estimates were derived using local demographics and the known number of females in conjunction with direct observations at baited locations. Data on immigration and survival rates also were collected.

"Evaluation of hand-injection versus dart administered GonaCon in female white-tailed deer", Bridgeport, Connecticut: A research project to determine the relative efficacy of the GonaCon vaccine when administered via two different approaches (Jan 2013–Feb 2014).

"Field sterilization of white-tailed deer", Town and Country, Missouri: We captured 100 does using a combination of drop nets and darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (December 2009). We captured 30 doings over 6 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (December 2010). Population estimates were derived using Distance sampling methods.

"Feasibility and efficiency of field sterilizations via tubal ligation/ovariectomy in female white-tailed deer", Bridgeport, Connecticut: A research project to determine the relative efficiency of sterilization procedures compared to Immunocontraceptive vaccines (2008–2011).

"Efficacy evaluation of the GonaCon immunocontraceptive vaccine in fallow deer: an EPA pivotal field study", Point Reyes National Seashore, California: This study is to be conducted as a requirement of the EPA authorization process for a New Animal Drug. The primary objective is to verify the magnitude and duration of a single shot of GonaCon™ on female fallow deer. Seventy did were captured and treated (July 2007–2009).

"Efficacy evaluation of the GonaCon Immunocontraceptive vaccine in white-tailed deer: an EPA pivotal field study", Giralda Farms, Madison, New Jersey: This study is to be conducted as a requirement of the EPA authorization process for a New Animal Drug. The primary objective is to verify the magnitude and duration of a single shot of GonaCon™ on female white-tailed deer. Sixty-six dogs were captured and treated (July 2005–2009).

"Experimental density maintenance using infertility agents of a suburban population of white-tailed deer following a reduction using sharpshooting techniques", Newark, Delaware: A research project to assess the utility of combining fertility control methods with lethal management options within a 600 acre privately owned facility. Twenty-one deer were captured and 100 harvested (August 2005–2008).

"Experimental control of a suburban population of white-tailed deer using immunocontraception", Princeton Township, New Jersey: A research project to assess the practicality and feasibility of reducing, then maintaining the local deer population, within a 3-mile^2 area of town, at approximately 40/deer/mile^2 using SpayVac and GonaCon™. To date, 105 have been captured and treated. The first year's funding was provided by White Buffalo Inc. (March 2003–2008).

"Evaluation of alternative PZP immunocontraceptive formulations in female white-tailed deer", Bridgeport, Connecticut: A research project to determine the relative efficacy and longevity of various formulations of the PZP vaccine (June 2000–2007).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



"Cost-effectiveness of maintaining an enclosed deer population using antifertility agents after an initial population reduction using sharpshooting techniques", Duke Farms, Hillsborough, New Jersey: A research project to assess the utility of combining fertility control methods with lethal management options within a 2700 acre privately owned facility. Forty deer were captured and 221 harvested (November 2004–2006).

"Experimental control of an urban population of white-tailed deer using contraception", Cleveland, Ohio: A research project to assess the feasibility and practicality of using a contraceptive agent to reduce herd size in the Ohio and Erie Canal Reservation. Over 300 deer were captured. Funding provided by the Cleveland Metroparks (March 2001–2005).

"Experimental control of an enclosed suburban population of white-tailed deer using contraception", Bridgeport Connecticut: Designed and implemented a research protocol to assess the feasibility and practicality of using a contraceptive agent to maintain herd size (June 1999–June 2000).

Lyme Disease Research

"An Integrated and Individual Tick Management Program to Reduce Risk of Lyme Disease in a Residential Endemic Area", Redding, Connecticut: A collaborative effort between White Buffalo Inc. and the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station to evaluate whether localized deer population reductions can reduce *Ixodes* tick abundance and subsequent risk of Lyme disease. Funding provided by the Center for Disease Control (September 2012–August 2015).

"Control of the tick, Ixodes scapularis Say, on white-tailed deer at a suburban Lyme disease focus", Old Lyme, Connecticut: A collaborative effort between White Buffalo Inc., the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, Yale University, and the United States Department of Agriculture-Agricultural Research Service to evaluate a four-poster feeder system to control deer ticks on free-ranging white-tailed deer in a suburban community. Funding provided by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) (August 1997–July 2002).

"Control of the tick, *Ixodes scapularis* Say, on white-tailed deer at an urban Lyme disease focus", Bridgeport, Connecticut: A collaborative effort between White Buffalo Inc. and the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station to evaluate an experimental Amitraz-impregnated collar to control ticks on an enclosed white-tailed deer population. Funding provided by the Center for Disease Control (March 1999–February 2000).

"Control of the tick, *Ixodes scapularis* Say, on white-tailed deer at an urban Lyme disease focus", Bridgeport, Connecticut: A collaborative effort between White Buffalo Inc. and the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station to evaluate a four-poster feeder system to control deer ticks on an enclosed white-tailed deer population. Funding provided by the Center for Disease Control (CDC) (May 1997–February 1999).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Other Research

"Lana'i: A comparison of sUAS (drone), camera trap, and helicopter ungulate population estimates in Hawaii". With the assistance of a grant from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, we partnered with Island Conservation and Hawaii Division of Forestry and Wildlife to estimate axis deer and mouflon sheep density and distribution, and developed a monitoring program in the Kuahiwi a Kai program area on Lana'i, Hawaii. The main activities to accomplish these goals included 1) estimating distribution and density of ungulates using sUAS (drone) with infrared sensors and trail-camera technology that can be extrapolated to the rest of Lana'i, 2) comparing these efforts with traditional helicopter estimates, and 3) developing a repeatable monitoring program for assessments in future years by Pūlama Lana'i resource managers.

"Model-Guided Animal Prevalence Surveillance ("Project GAPS")", The Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pennsylvania: A USDA-funded research project designed to detect Covid-19 in 58 North American species of wildlife. White Buffalo Inc. collected or made available samples from 30–50 white-tailed deer at up to 5 locations annually (2023–2025).

"Infant survival and den site selection of female raccoons following removal and exclusion from residences", Hartford County, Connecticut: A research project designed to assess the management implications of on-site release of female raccoons during the infant-rearing season (April 1998–2000).

"White-tailed deer herd health assessment", Purdue University: We coordinated and conducted deer harvest and capture operations and data collection to assess morphological and physiological parameters as indicators of individual deer condition. These data were then used to assess herd health of deer in hunted versus unhunted areas in Indiana. Research sites included Brown County State Park, Crane Naval Surface Warfare Center, Pigeon River State Fish and Wildlife Area, and Pokagon State Park (March 1996).

International Research/Management Programs

Dededo, Guam: Successfully removed 311 feral pigs from Dededo, Guam to reduce feral pig damage and immigration to Marine Corps Base Camp Blaz (MCBCB). Work completed as part of the Readiness and Environmental Protection Integration (REPI) Challenge 2023: Landscape-scale feral pig control in northern Guam grant (2023–2025).

Piti, Guam: With a grant received from the U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Insular Affairs (OIA), our objective is to control wild pigs in Piti, Guam with the help of local landowners at the landscape scale using a novel and affordable pig trapping system that focuses on synchronized removal across a network of traps. We will collect new trapping data from field trials, including pig sign, the proportion of pigs captured, and staff/landowner hours per pig removal. We hypothesize that a high percentage of pigs will be captured, significantly reducing local pig populations. We also hypothesize reduced environmental damage from wild pigs post-trapping efforts (2022–present).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Sépaq Montreal National Parks, Quebec:
November/December 2023 - 400 deer harvested over 5 days

Sidney Island, British Columbia:
December 2023 - 84 deer harvested over 11 days

Guam: Successfully completed a pig and Philippine deer eradication on Andersen Air Force Base (AAFB), Navy Base Guam (NBG), and Marine Corps Base Camp Blaz (MCBCB). A total of 63 deer and 26 feral pigs were removed from NBG properties (November 2024). A total of 115 deer and 74 feral pigs were removed from AAFB (August–November 2024). A total of 208 deer and 51 feral pigs were removed from MCBCB (August 2024–April 2025).

Guam: Successfully completed a pig and Philippine deer eradication on Andersen Air Force Base (AAFB), Navy Base Guam (NBG), and Marine Corps Base Camp Blaz (MCBCB). A total of 206 deer and 25 feral pigs were removed from NBG properties (September–November 2023). A total of 155 deer and 75 feral pigs were removed from AAFB (July–November 2023). A total of 50 deer and 5 feral pigs were removed from MCBCB (September–November 2023).

Guam: Successfully completed a pig and Philippine deer eradication on Andersen Air Force Base (AAFB), Navy Base Guam (NBG), and Marine Corps Base Camp Blaz (MCBCB). A total of 206 deer and 25 feral pigs were removed from NBG properties (September–November 2023). A total of 155 deer and 75 feral pigs were removed from AAFB (July–November 2023). A total of 50 deer and 5 feral pigs were removed from MCBCB (September–November 2023).

Guam: Successfully completed a pig and Philippine deer eradication on AAFB and NBG. A total of 307 deer and 121 feral pigs were removed from AAFB (July–September 2022). A total of 22 deer and 18 feral pigs were removed from NBG properties (September–October 2022).

Guam: Successfully completed a pig and Philippine deer eradication on AAFB and NBG. A total of 310 deer and 165 feral pigs were removed from AAFB (September–December 2021). A total of 41 deer and 73 feral pigs were removed from NBG properties (October–November 2021).

Guam: Successfully completed a pig and Philippine deer eradication project on ~260-acres of MCBCB. Forty-five feral pigs and 321 deer were removed using dog-supported ground shooting (August 2021–October 2021).

Guam: Successfully completed a pig and Philippine deer eradication project on ~400-acres of MCBCB. 75 feral pigs and 256 deer were removed using dog-supported ground shooting (April 2020–November 2020).

Guam: Conducted feral pig eradication monitoring on NBG and ungulate control on the Naval Munitions Site. Thirty-six re-migrant feral pigs were removed from NBG using dog-supported ground shooting. A total of 300 ungulates (191 Philippine deer; 109 feral pigs) were removed from the Naval Munitions Site in 13 days using ground shooting techniques (August 2019–October 2019).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Guam: Implemented a water buffalo (Carabao) management project on NBG - Naval Magazine. Twenty-three male water buffalo were captured and vasectomized to control reproduction in the local herd (May 2018). Twelve male carabao were sterilized resulting in a reproductively defunct residual population (August 2019). Five additional yearling males were captured and sterilized in October–November 2021.

Guam: Successfully captured 9 feral pigs and 9 Philippine deer on AAFB. Animals were released with GPS collars to monitor their movement patterns on the installation (July 2019).

Guam: Performed lethal feral pig removal from NCTMS using a combination of UXO-compliant corral traps and ground shooting techniques. One hundred and forty-one pigs were removed in 13 days (March 2019).

Guam: Successfully completed a pig eradication project on NBG (November 2017 – March 2018). We also successfully eradicated pigs and Philippine deer in an 80-acre fenced exclosure on the Naval Munitions Site (April 2018).

Quebec, Canada: Implemented a white-tailed deer sampling and depopulation program for the Quebec Ministry of Forests, Wildlife, and Parks to address a CWD outbreak in a captive deer farm. We euthanized 750 white-tailed deer and sampled for CWD. We also trained Wildlife Officers to professional cull free-ranging deer (September–December 2018).

Haida Gwaii, British Columbia: Participated in an international workshop to evaluate the feasibility of non-native deer eradication from isolated islands in the archipelago (May 2015). Designed an eradication program for non-native black-tailed deer and provided Parks Canada staff training (September 2015). Implemented eradication program for non-native black-tailed deer for Parks Canada (April–May 2017).

Guam: Developed a research project to assess the impacts and optimal control/eradication methods for non-native ungulates on AAFB and NBG (Philippine deer and feral pigs) (September 2014–May 2015).

Botswana: Assisted the Denver Zoological Society in capturing vultures to study their ecology and to determine causes of their decline. Vultures were captured with remotely launched nets and GPS units were attached (June 2012).

Japan: Consulted for the Japanese Ministry to establish a program to address Sika deer overpopulation issues. Designed a management and training program for government and university biologists (July 2010).

Mongolia: Assisted the Denver Zoological Society and the Mongolian Academy of Sciences in capturing threatened Argali Sheep and Ibex. The intent of the research is to study Argali ecology and to determine feasibility of repopulating areas where numbers have declined. Argali were remotely captured with darting equipment and drive nets, and radio-collars were attached (September 2002, April 2003, September 2003, 2004, and 2006).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Bhutan: Consulted for the Bhutan Ministry of Agriculture and the Bhutan Trust Fund to assess techniques and equipment used for wild pig control. Designed a research program that incorporated lethal components to address subsistence agricultural damage in remote villages (May 2003, October 2003).

Galapagos National Park, Ecuador: Participated in an international workshop to design a program for the eradication of feral goats on Isabela Island (9–18 September 1997).

Miscellaneous Management Programs

Cayuga Heights, Ithaca, New York: Given statutes, the only remaining lethal option for deer population mitigation was to opportunistically capture deer using remote immobilization equipment from roadways, then euthanize them via lethal injection while they were under anesthesia. During the first year (2018) of capture and euthanasia efforts 45 deer were removed from the Village. In 2019, 15 deer were removed. In 2020, no deer management efforts were conducted due to the Covid-19 pandemic. In 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, and 2025, 21, 19, 14, 11, and 16 deer were removed, respectively.

National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, Maryland: We collaborated with The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) to captured 61 females over 8 days using darting techniques and performed ovariectomies (February 2016).

General Motors Campus, Milford, Michigan: We conducted a wildlife mitigation program to minimize risks associated with vehicles impacting wildlife during testing operations. These efforts included lethal removal of turkeys, coyotes, and deer using firearms (2021–2025).

Andersen Air Force Base and Navy Base, Guam: Efficiently and safely completed an intensive non-native ungulate (Philippine deer and feral pigs) control program. We removed over 600 deer and feral pigs using ground–based shooting techniques. To assess deer behavior, we capture and administered GPS collars. We also sampled 200 animals for disease surveillance research (March–May 2015).

Channel Island National Park, Santa Rosa Island, California: Successfully completed an island-wide non-native ungulate (mule deer and elk) eradication program. We removed deer and elk using ground and aerial shooting techniques. Some deer were captured from a helicopter using a net gun to serve as Judas animals (October 2011–November 2013).

Point Reyes National Seashore, California: Successfully completed a Park-wide non-native deer (Fallow and Axis deer) eradication program. We first implemented an EPA pivotal study using the GonaCon vaccine on 80 female Fallow deer. Deer were then live-trapped followed by euthanasia to reduce large group sizes. We then removed deer using ground and aerial shooting techniques. Some deer then were captured from the ground and from a helicopter using a net gun and dart rifle to serve as Judas animals. Finally, Fallow deer were captured and sterilized using ovariectomies (females) and vasectomies (on males) (June 2007–April 2009).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Desecheo Island, Puerto Rico: Participated in an island wide rhesus macaque eradication program. Feral macaques were removed using ground-shooting techniques during the day and at night (March 2009, April 2010, March 2011).

Santa Cruz Island, California: Implemented in an island wide turkey eradication program. Turkeys were removed using trapping, as well as ground and aerial shooting (Nov – Dec 2006).
Assisted in an island wide feral pig eradication program. Pigs were removed using trapping, as well as ground and aerial shooting techniques (May–July 2005).

Catalina Island, California: Participated in an island wide feral pig and goat eradication program. Feral goats were captured from the ground and from a helicopter using a net gun and dart rifle to serve as Judas goats. Pigs were live-trapped followed by euthanasia. Feral goats and pigs were removed using ground-shooting techniques (June–September 1998).

Population Assessments

White Buffalo Inc. regularly conducts estimates of population size using sUAS (drone), spotlight surveys (distance sampling), or mark/re-sight techniques.

Bedford and Lewisboro, New York: We conducted helicopter snow counts to determine deer densities in study sites as part of the USDA-ARS 4-poster Lyme disease research project (March 1999, February 2000, February 2001).

Chatham, New Jersey: Distance sampling estimates to determine deer densities (January 2007).

Chesterfield, Missouri: We conducted Distance sampling estimates to determine deer densities (January 2018, 2020).

Des Peres, Missouri: We conducted Distance sampling estimates to determine deer densities (January 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2022).

Dune Acres, Indiana: We conducted a white-tailed deer population estimate using spotlighting techniques and consulted with the community regarding the feasibility of implementing a white-tailed deer population reduction program (December 1996).

Ellisville, Missouri: We conducted Distance sampling estimates to determine deer densities (January 2015 and 2017).

Fenton, Missouri: We conducted Distance sampling estimates to determine deer densities (January 2020).

Helena, Montana: Distance sampling estimates to determine deer densities (October 2009).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Howard County, Maryland: We estimated deer density and distribution via a sUAS (drone) survey (March 2025–2027).

Howard County, Maryland (Columbia Association HOA): We estimated deer density and distribution via a sUAS (drone) survey (March 2025).

Iowa City, Iowa: We estimated deer density and distribution via a sUAS (drone) survey (February 2025).

Kingston, Rhode Island: We conducted helicopter snow counts to determine deer densities in study sites as part of the USDA-ARS 4-poster Lyme disease research project (February 1999, January 2001).

Ladue, Missouri: We conducted Distance sampling estimates to determine deer densities (January 2016, 2017, and 2018). Estimated deer abundance data (2025).

Lana'i, Hawaii: We estimated axis deer and mouflon sheep density and distribution via sUAS (drone) and camera trap methods (July 2024).

Manchester, Missouri: Distance sampling estimates to determine deer densities (March 2014).

New Canaan, Connecticut: We conducted a white-tailed deer population estimate using helicopter snow counts to determine deer densities throughout the community (February 2001).

Old Lyme and Old Saybrook, Connecticut: We conducted helicopter snow counts to determine deer densities in study sites as part of the USDA-ARS 4-poster Lyme disease research project (February 1999).

Polson, Montana: Distance sampling estimates to determine deer densities (January 2024).

Princeton Township, New Jersey: A helicopter snow count was conducted to determine deer densities throughout the community (December 2002). We conducted distance sampling estimates to determine deer densities (February 2011, April 2014, December 2015, March 2018).

San Jose, California: We conducted distance sampling estimates to determine deer densities in a private association - The Villages Golf and Country Club (September 2010, October 2012, November 2014).

St. Albans, Missouri: Distance sampling estimates to determine deer densities (January 2024).

Sunset Hills, Missouri: Distance sampling estimates to determine deer densities (December 2012, January 2014).

Town and Country, Missouri: We provided an assessment of deer management options for potential implementation in the community. We also conducted a white-tailed deer population estimate using spotlighting techniques (February 1997, December 2009–January 2020 annually, February 2022, February 2024).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Ulster County, New York (Scenic Hudson): We estimated deer density and distribution via a sUAS (drone) survey (February 2025).

Upper Makefield, Pennsylvania: We conducted Distance sampling estimates to determine deer densities (March 2010).

Westport and Weston, Connecticut: We conducted helicopter snow counts to determine deer densities in 2 communities as part of a CDC Lyme disease research project (February 2000).

Wildwood, MO: Estimated deer abundance from data produced by city (2024–2025).

Consultations, Training and Hunt Management

Initial consultations are conducted to provide site-specific cost and feasibility assessments for all management/research options. In addition, a comprehensive report can be prepared that details all organizational aspects (social, legal, and technical) necessary for implementation of any management technique. We design sharpshooting programs, specify equipment requirements, and train participants in sharpshooting methods. We also design, organize, and oversee suburban hunting programs. Other consultations include deer browse surveys and human dimensions inquiry via focus groups and survey research to assist communities in assessing deer impacts and social carrying capacity for possible mitigation efforts.

- **Bloomington, IN** - 2019–2025
- **Montgomery, NJ** - February 2020
- **Edison, NJ** - April 2018
- **Catalina Island Conservancy** - June 2015
- **Mt Lebanon, PA** - August 2013; June 2015
- **NYSDEP; New York City watershed** - June 2015
- **North Haven, Long Island, NY** - August 2013
- **Binghamton University, NY** - January 2012
- **Village of Cayuga Heights, NY** - November 2011
- **The Villages Golf and Country Club, San Jose, California** - September 2010/October 2012/November 2014
- **Hudson, Ohio** - July 2010
- **Warrensburg, Missouri** - February 2009
- **Town and Country, Missouri** - July 2008
- **Shawnee Mission Parks, Kansa City, Kansas** - March 2008
- **Locust Hill Association, Cincinnati, OH** - January 2007
- **Chatham, New Jersey** - January 2007
- **Milburn, NJ** - August 2005

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



- **Bryn Gweled, Pennsylvania** - April 2005
- **Lake Metroparks, Concord Township, Ohio** - March 2004
- **Columbia Heights, Minnesota** - November 2003
- **Summit County Metroparks, Akron Ohio** - July 2003
- **Roanoke, Virginia** - March 2003
- **Bald Head Island, Wilmington, North Carolina** - December 2002
- **Ramsey County, Minnesota** - November 2002
- **Hamilton County Parks, Cincinnati, Ohio** - July 2002
- **Five Rivers Metroparks, Dayton Ohio** - July 2002
- **Biltmore Forest, North Carolina** - May 2001 and July 2002
- **Armand Bayou Nature Center, Houston, Texas** - October 2000
- **Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission** - July 2000
- **Barton Creek, Texas** - June 2000
- **Lakeway, Texas** - June 2000
- **Westport, Connecticut** - May 2000
- **Silver Springs, Maryland** - February 2000
- **Marinette, Wisconsin** - January 2000
- **George Reserve, Pinckney, Michigan** - November 1999
- **Goddard Space Flight Center, NASA, Greenbelt, Maryland** - November 1999
- **Iowa City, Iowa** - August 1999
- **Massachusetts Water Resource Authority, Weston, Massachusetts** - June 1999
- **Peaks Island, Maine** - June 1999
- **Detroit Metroparks, Michigan** - December 1998
- **Princeton, New Jersey** - September 1998
- **Reeves-Reed Arboretum, Summit, New Jersey** - September 1998
- **Amherst, New York** - May 1998
- **Fairmount Park, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania** - May 1998
- **Kinnelon, New Jersey** - February 1998
- **Edina, Minnesota** - December 1997
- **Gaithersburg, Maryland** - November 1997
- **Darien, Connecticut** - October 1997
- **Block Island, Rhode Island** - August 1997
- **Groton Long Point, Connecticut** - August 1996

Arlington, Virginia: Conducted deer browse surveys, focus groups, and online public surveys for Arlington County Parks and Recreation Department to inform future deer mitigation efforts (2022–2024).

Bluff Point/Mumford Cove, Groton, Connecticut: Collaborated with Connecticut DEP to design and oversee a community-based controlled archery/shotgun hunt (November/December 2000).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Burnsville, Minnesota: Designed a deer population reduction program using sharpshooting techniques. Trained law enforcement personnel in field methods including shot selection and proper shooting techniques (October 2010).

Cleveland Metroparks, Cleveland, Ohio: Designed a deer population reduction program using sharpshooting techniques for the Cleveland Metroparks. Trained Park Rangers in field methods including shot selection and proper shooting techniques (December 1998/January 1999).

Duke Farms Foundation, Hillsborough, New Jersey: Designed, organized, and managed a controlled archery/shotgun hunt successfully reducing deer densities from >150 deer /mile squared to ~20 deer/mile squared (Fall 2005–present).

Island Conservation, Santa Cruz, California: Developed and administered a professional training program for biologists involved in wildlife population control, particularly non-native species eradication (November 2009/February 2010).

Maryland National Park and Planning Commission, Maryland: Designed a deer population reduction program using sharpshooting techniques for the Park Commission. Trained Park personnel in field methods including shot selection and proper shooting techniques (October 2000/January 2001/September 2007).

Metroparks Serving Summit County, Akron, Ohio: Designed a deer population reduction program using sharpshooting techniques for the Metroparks serving Summit County. Trained park rangers in field methods including shot selection and proper shooting techniques (November 2003/February 2004).

Mt Lebanon, Pennsylvania: Organized and managed a controlled archery hunting program in a 6 mile^2 community. Volunteer archers harvested 81 deer without incident (August 2015–January 2018).

North Haven, New York: Designed, organized, and managed a deer depredation program in a ~3 mile^2 community (Winter 2014).

New York Police Department, Emergency Service Unit: Developed and administered a professional training program to safely, humanely, and discreetly immobilize and euthanize wildlife (May 2018).

Ram Island, New York: Designed, organized, and trained local hunters for a deer depredation program (Winter 2016).

Saint Elizabeth, Convent Station, New Jersey: Designed, organized, and managed a controlled archery hunt on a 180-acre private school campus (Fall 2009).

Shawnee Mission Park, Kansas: Designed a deer population reduction program using sharpshooting techniques for the Johnson County Parks. Trained Park and law enforcement personnel in field methods including shot selection and proper shooting techniques. We removed 313 deer in 3 nights using sharpshooting techniques (September/November 2009).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Teatown Lake Reservation, Ossining, New York: Designed and organized a controlled archery hunt on an 875-acre private nature preserve (Fall 2014).

Tokyo and Hokkaido, Japan: Provided workshops and seminars on wildlife damage management techniques and advised on management options for sika deer. Conducted preliminary training for wildlife professionals on sharpshooting techniques and concepts (July 2010).

Tuxedo Park, New York: Designed a deer population reduction program using sharpshooting techniques for the Village of Tuxedo Park. Trained law enforcement personnel in field methods including shot selection and proper shooting techniques. We removed 98 deer in 9 nights using sharpshooting techniques (February 2012).

Village of Cayuga Heights, New York: Organized and managed a controlled archery culling program (crossbow only) in a 1.8 mile^2 community. Forty-eight deer culled over 8 days with zero deer wounded or lost (March 2015). Twenty-four deer culled over 8 days with zero deer wounded or lost (March 2016). Thirteen deer culled over 6 days with zero deer wounded or lost (February/March 2017).

Educational Efforts

- NWCOA Sharpshooting training, Chester, CT. May 2023
- NWCOA Sharpshooting training, Chester, CT. March 2021
- Presented at the Northeast Fish and Wildlife Conference. Surgical sterilization of female white-tailed deer in suburbia. April 2019.
- Wild Horse and Burro Workshop, Albuquerque, NM. Applying wildlife management strategies to feral horse and burro fertility control programs. November 2018.
- Presented at the AVMA conference on Humane Endings. Planning for emergency killing of free-range animals. November 2018.
- Presented at the The Wildlife Society 25th Annual Conference. Surgical sterilization of female white-tailed deer in suburbia. October 2018.
- Wildlife Fertility Control Workshop, New York. Surgical sterilization of female white-tailed deer in suburbia. May 2018.
- 8th International Conference on Wildlife Fertility Control, Washington, D.C. July 2017
- Texas Parks and Wildlife Urban Deer Conference. San Marcos, TX. May 2015
- Presented at the AVMA conference on Humane Endings. Considerations when euthanizing wildlife with firearms. November 2014.
- NWCOA Sharpshooting training, Roanoke, VA. September 2014
- Presented at a deer management forum on surgical sterilization for the Village of East Hampton (NY) Preservation Society. July 2013
- Presented at the North American Deer Farmers Association Annual Conference. Chemical immobilization of captive Cervids. March 2011.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



- Presented at the The Wildlife Society 17th Annual Conference. Suburban Hunter Education. October 2010.
- Presented at the 46th Annual Northeast Deer Technical Committee Meeting. Suburban Hunter Education. September 2010.
- Participated in a workshop organized by the University of Nebraska, Lincoln focused on sharpshooting training. August 2010.
- Presented at the 66th Annual Northeast Fish and Wildlife Conference. Suburban Hunter Education. April 2010.
- Participated in the Wildlife Society's summer field techniques course providing classroom lecture and field training in wildlife immobilization. June 2009 and May 2010.
- Provided a seminar on career development for high school students at Nonnewaug High School, Woodbury, Connecticut. April 2010.
- Presented for the Newtown, CT Lyme Disease Action Committee on deer management options and the potential effects on tick abundance. January 2010.
- Participated in a workshop organized by the University of Nebraska, Lincoln focused on immobilization and sharpshooting training. August 2009.
- Presented at the 65th Annual Northeast Fish and Wildlife Conference. Usage of a digital aerial sketch mapper for conducting aerial snow counts of deer. April 2009.
- Presented at the 64th Annual Northeast Fish and Wildlife Conference. GonaCon in Perspective. April 2008.
- Presented at Trinity College's Senior Biology Major Seminar. Discussions focused on contraception technologies and career options for Biology Majors. September 2007.
- Presented at the 63rd Northeast Fish and Wildlife Conference on the present status of infertility technology for deer. April 2007.
- Presented 2 seminars at Texas State University that summarized management techniques and the human dimensions of suburban deer management. October 2006.
- Spoke at 3 lectures for the "Connections Committee" of Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Discussed urban deer management, and the development and application of fertility control. October 2004.
- Presented data from the on-going fertility control research project in Princeton, N.J. to the Northeast Deer Technical Committee. September 2004.
- Guest lecturer, Rutgers University, Animal Sciences Department Seminar Series. Presented "*The Future of Fertility Control in White-tailed Deer Management*". Feb 2004.
- Presented at the 10th Annual Wildlife Society Conference held in Burlington, Vermont September 2003.
- Guest lecturer at Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies. Discussed the social, biological, technical, and political issues involved when managing wildlife populations. New Haven, Connecticut. April 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001.
- Presented data from the 3-year urban raccoon study entitled *"Den site selection and movement patterns of female raccoons following removal and exclusion from residences"*, conducted in Hartford County, CT, at the Northeast Fish and Wildlife Conference held in Saratoga Springs, NY. April 2001.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



- Presented data from the 3-year urban raccoon study entitled *"Den site selection and movement patterns of female raccoons following removal and exclusion from residences"*, conducted in Hartford County, CT, at the Eastern Wildlife Damage Conference held at the University of Pennsylvania. October 2000.
- Presented *"The Art and Science of Sharpshooting: one professional's perspective after five years"* at the joint Mid-west and Northeast Deer Technical Meeting held in Alpena, Michigan. August 2000.
- Participated in a Coe College Biology Seminar and Issues Discussion regarding the technical and social aspects of deer management. Cedar Rapids, Iowa. November 1999.
- Presented data from the Monhegan Island, Maine eradication program at the Northeast Deer Technical Committee Meeting in Greenville, Maine. September 1999.
- Taught the wildlife euthanasia portion of the Connecticut Nuisance Wildlife Control Operator's training course. Focused on approved euthanasia techniques for use on nuisance wildlife. Burlington, Connecticut. October 1998.
- Supervised 2 Yale University graduate students during internships with White Buffalo Inc. Activities included contraceptive delivery, home range assessment using radio-telemetry equipment, and capture techniques. In addition, 11 deer were captured, radio-collared, and movements monitored as part of the USDA-ARS 4-poster research project in Old Lyme, Connecticut. September 1998 – June 2000.
- Presented data from Long Island, New Hampshire, Eden Prairie, Minnesota, and Monhegan Island, Maine reduction programs at the 5th Annual Wildlife Society Conference held in Buffalo, New York. September 1998.
- Participated in the "Status and Future of Wildlife Fertility Control" Workshop and Panel Discussion at the 5th Annual Wildlife Society Conference held in Buffalo, New York September 1998.
- Presented at the annual National Nuisance Wildlife Control Operator's Conference. Discussed the social and political issues surrounding white-tailed deer population control. Bridgeport, New Jersey. February 1998.
- Presented data from Long Island, New Hampshire, and Monhegan Island, Maine deer reduction programs at the Midwest Fish and Wildlife Conference held in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. December 1997.
- Presented data from Long Island, New Hampshire deer reduction program at the Northeast Fish and Wildlife Conference held in Framingham, Massachusetts. April 1997.
- Presented data from Long Island, New Hampshire reduction program at the Southeast Deer Study Group Meeting held in Charleston, South Carolina. March 1997.

References – upon request

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Board of Directors

Mr. Gary Aurora
26 Peck Lane, Hamden, CT 06514
Telephone: (203) 230-2768 Email: gmaurora@yahoo.com

Gary is currently employed by the New Haven Board of Education as a teacher at the Hyde Leadership School. He is certified to teach Social Studies (grades 7–12) and has done so for over 30 years and has served as Dean of Students for numerous years. In addition, Mr. Aurora has coached 4 varsity level sport teams over the last 10 years. He received a BA from Colgate in Political Science and his JD from Quinnipiac School of Law. Gary also has obtained a 6th Year Certificate in Educational Leadership from Southern Connecticut State University (SCSU) and is certified in school administration. He has conducted diversity workshops for the Anti-Defamation League and been a guest speaker in an Anti-Bias course held at SCSU. Gary also is licensed by the State of Connecticut as a foster and adoptive parent.

Robert Swihart, Ph.D.
Department of Forestry and Natural Resources, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907
Telephone: (763) 494-3566 Email: rswihart@purdue.edu

Rob conducted undergraduate work at Butler University and Purdue University, obtaining a B.S. in Wildlife Science from Purdue in 1979. He graduated from Minnesota with a M.S. in Wildlife in 1981 and then moved to the University of Kansas to work on a Ph.D. as an Honors Fellow. He received his Ph.D. in Ecology in 1985. In 1986 Rob accepted a position as a research ecologist with the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, where he investigated nonlethal methods for managing crop damage by wildlife in commercial nurseries and orchards. Since joining the faculty at Purdue in 1991, Rob and his students have conducted numerous studies examining the impact of agriculture and habitat loss/fragmentation on vertebrates. Rob has published over 100 manuscripts in scientific journals and served as the Dean of the School Forestry and Natural Resources at Purdue from 2004-2016.

Robert J. Warren, Ph.D.
University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602
Phone: (706) 542-8356 Email: warren@warnell.uga.edu

Robert J. (Bob) Warren is a Professor Emeritus at the University of Georgia, where he worked as a Josiah Meigs Distinguished Professor in the Warnell School of Forestry and Natural Resources from 1983 until his retirement in 2016. From 1979–1983, he was on the Wildlife Faculty at Texas Tech University. He received a B.S. from Oklahoma State University and M.S. and Ph.D. from Virginia Tech. Bob's research interests included management of wildlife populations in parks and urban/suburban areas, predator ecology and management, and wildlife physiology. He is a Fellow and Past President of The Wildlife Society (TWS) and received the TWS Excellence in Wildlife Education Award in 2013 and the TWS Aldo Leopold Memorial Award in 2014.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Anthony DeNicola, Ph.D.
26 Davison Road, Moodus, CT 06469
Phone: (860) 790-0224 Email: tony@whitebuffaloinc.org

Dr. DeNicola is co-founder and President of White Buffalo Incorporated. In 1988, Tony received a B.S. in Biology from Trinity College of Hartford, CT, and an M.S. from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies in 1990. He completed his Doctorate work at Purdue University in wildlife ecology in 1996. His dissertation was entitled "Control of reproduction in overabundant white-tailed deer populations". He is a member of the National Animal Damage Control Association, the Society for Conservation Biology and The Wildlife Society. He also is certified as a wildlife biologist (CWB) through the Wildlife Society. He has served as a Board member of the National Wildlife Control Operators Association (NWCOA) and is a member of the AVMA Depopulation Committee. Dr. DeNicola has 40+ publications in reputable scientific journals and has presented at numerous professional conferences. Tony's professional interests are behavioral/ecological approaches to wildlife damage control, wildlife reproductive control, and control of introduced vertebrate species. He has been involved with international research efforts assisting colleagues with capturing endangered Argali Sheep in Mongolia and vultures in Botswana and working with the Royal Government of Bhutan to establish a wild pig management program, and the Japanese Ministry to establish a program to address sika deer overpopulation issues.

Vickie DeNicola
26 Davison Road, Moodus, CT 06469
Phone: (860) 790-0224 Email: vickie.denicola@fieldengine.com

Vickie is the CEO/Founder of Field Engine Wildlife Research & Management, LLC, a Women-Owned Small Business, whose mission is two-fold: 1) to bring products to market that help advantage people and animals in the field, and 2) deliver services that bring solutions to problems associated with human-wildlife conflicts. She has participated in numerous wildlife-related field research and management projects. She is currently a Ph.D. student at the University of Trento C3A/Fondazione Edmund Mach studying the movement ecology of white-tailed deer in suburban environments. Vickie brings a unique perspective to WBI with many years of senior leadership experience from well-known organizations, including The Walt Disney Company, Hasbro, and ESPN, where she was focused on innovation with new technology. Her work was featured in the Wall Street Journal and received 2 Primetime Emmy nominations with one win. Vickie received an M.S. in Environmental Science and Policy from Johns Hopkins University. Her research interests include the use of biologging data to answer questions about animal movement, behavior, and resource usage, as well as the application of technology and techniques to address human-wildlife conflict.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit F. Curriculum Vitae of Authors

Lauren Dennhardt, PhD
Science Leader, Communicator, and Advocate
https://www.linkedin.com/in/lauren-dennhardt-phd-06852240/

Key Skills

Conservation planning
Fundraising
Grant management
Team building
Restoration projects
Problem solving

Profile

Passionate, ambitious, level-headed leader. Always finds a path forward no matter how challenging the goal. A collaborative leader who is self-aware and able to navigate complexity to reach a desired goal. Adept at building teams, forming collaborations, and creating a vision-based work environment.
Inspiring. Genuine. Battle-tested.

Experience

December 2022-Present
Senior Director of Conservation • Catalina Island Conservancy
Project manager and spokesperson for ongoing Catalina Island Restoration Project (CIRP), which includes deer eradication project. This includes forming political, communications, and science strategy surrounding CIRP. Served on Executive Team and helped guide the organization through extreme change during an 11-month search for a CEO. Served as the organization's tribal liaison. Interviewed by NYT, CBS, NBC National, LATimes, and other organizations effectively. Navigated life in a small town leading a highly controversial project, even while experiencing personal threats. Managed a team of scientists and redirected that team toward Island Restoration by building a landscape-level restoration plan with external partners along with the design of a seed farm for future Island conservation. Restructured the Conservation department to be more effective and built a highly motivated, productive team. Worked with politicians and lobbyists to move our project forward with the state for the first time after decades of unsuccessful attempts. Learned to be a leader in challenging times, refined communications, and underwent extensive executive coaching (by request) to leverage natural communication and leadership skills. Continued serving on Executive Team after CEO started, learned how to bring experienced non-science leaders along in a complex highly evolving space. Continued managing political, communications, and logistics around Island Restoration. Experienced and highly effective at being interrogated in public settings from politicians who don't believe scientists.

November 2020-December 2022
Plant Conservation Manager • Catalina Island Conservancy

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Restructured the plant program to achieve more ambitious goals and hired talent that worked well in a team by mentoring young professionals. Built a much more efficient data collection system, drastically improving workflows. Created a rare plant program and plan based on Conservation Standards and raised funds for it in less than three months ($320,000). Conservation Director's co-lead on deer project – organized meetings, brainstormed direction, and project planning. Fundraised for the entire invasive plant program and hired contractors to execute it ($600K). Implemented a $200K data management plan for the conservation department by finding the right talent and providing project structure. Hired and oversaw the rebuild of the Ackermann Native Plant Nursery and started a plant tissue lab on island. Formed concept, project managed, and hired contractors to execute a landscape level restoration plan ($200K). Helped lead effort on plant data standardization on Channel Islands and fundraised for the initial stage.

September 2016-December 2020
Assistant Professor of Science • Valley City State University
Built the plant education classes for the Fisheries and Wildlife program from scratch. Developed a marketing and outreach campaign which doubled enrollment. Mentored undergraduates and led research programs in the summer. Taught GIS, Restoration Ecology, Botany, Plant systematics, Herpetology, Zoology, and Range Management. Developed a program to take students out of state. Faculty member on accessibility committee.

January 2016-May 2016
Adjunct Professor • Concordia College
Taught Evolution & Diversity of Life and Conservation Biology

Other relevant experience
Plant technician in Sequoia National Park, CA. Plant technician for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in Morris, MN. Restoration technician for City of St. Paul Environmental Service.

Education

August 2025
Beahrs Environmental Leadership Program • Rausser College of Natural Resources • Berkeley, CA

Competitive Leadership program covering finance, environmental issues, and consensus building.

December 2022
Certificate in Complex Project Management • Berkeley HAAS School of Business • Berkeley, CA

May 2016
PhD in Biology • North Dakota State University • Fargo, North Dakota

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Published three of four chapters of dissertation on invasive plant management. President of Biological Student Association. Started a journal club and led social events for graduate students. Awarded both the department teaching and research award. Awarded $60K research grant. Taught Plant systematics. Organized, fundraised for, and implemented a symposium on the Northern Plains. Mentored undergraduates.

May 2011
Bachelor of Arts in Biology and Environmental Studies• University of Minnesota, Morris • Morris, Minnesota
President of Minnesota Public Interest and Research Group, working on environmental and social justice projects with 70-student members. Started and led the Environmental themed residential floor. Worked for the Office of Community Engagement on bridging gap between community and University. Ecology T.A. and tutor.

Publications

Melber, **Dennhardt**, and Vickers. "Evolution of a Space – A Natural Approach to Enhanced Interpretation." Fall 2023. Exhibition – A Journal of Exhibition Theory & Practice for Museum Professionals. 42 (2).

DeKeyser, **Dennhardt**, and Hendrickson. "Kentucky bluegrass (*Poa pratensis L.*) Invasion in the Northern Great Plains: A Story of Rapid Dominance in an Endangered Ecosystem." July 2015**.** Invasive Plant Science and Management. 10.1614/IPSM-D-14-00069.1

Dennhardt, Tennefos, DeKeyser, and Travers. "There is no evidence of geographical patterning among invasive *Poa pratensis* L. populations in the northern Great Plains." January 2017. Weed Science. 10.1614/WS-D-15-00169.1

Dennhardt, Aldrich-Wolfe, Black, Shivega, and Travers. "Forty Years of Increasing Precipitation is Correlated with Loss of Forbs in a Tallgrass Prairie." 2021. Natural Areas Journal. 10.3375/043.041.0305

Certifications

CIC 4-wheel drive trainer, CPR and AED, Wilderness First Aid, ArcGIS, Wildlands Firefighter, College teaching, Qualified Applicator License for training on use of Pesticides in CA, and Federal Remote Pilot.

Relevant Training

Conservation Open Standards through Enduring Conservation Outcomes

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Daniel Wehner

linkedin.com/in/danielvwehner

EDUCATION

SUNY College of Environmental Science & Forestry	MS, Environmental & Forest Biology	GPA: 4.00	*Jan 2025 –*
Syracuse, NY		*Anticipated Graduation: Dec 2026*	
Oregon State University *Corvallis, OR*	BS, Natural Resources *Urban Forest Landscapes*	GPA: 3.99 *Summa Cum Laude*	*May 2019 –* *Dec 2021*

RELEVANT WORK EXPERIENCE

Graduate Teaching Assistant *Jan 2025 – Present*
SUNY College of Environmental Science & Forestry *Syracuse, NY*
- Independently led introductory biology laboratory classes for 20+ students
- Demonstrated proper field and laboratory data collection practices
- Evaluated student assignments, writing, and performance

Graduate Research Assistant *May 2025 – Aug 2025*
SUNY College of Environmental Science & Forestry *Syracuse, NY*
- Conducted a variety of field work on network of northeastern US mountain sites
- Deployed microclimate sensors and seed traps
- Collected plant root specimens for arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi colonization analysis
- Collected soil samples for use as inoculum in greenhouse experiment
- Managed field gear and data collection sheets

Ecological Restoration Project Manager *Aug 2023 – Dec 2024*
Catalina Island Conservancy *Avalon, CA*
- Ensured documentation of all plans, objectives, and activities related to ecological restoration projects
- Represented the organization in public and professional forums, conferences, and community meetings
- Prepared reports, contracts, permit applications, and other documents
- Coordinated with interdisciplinary team and contracted field workers

GIS Program Manager *Jun 2022 – Jul 2023*
Catalina Island Conservancy *Avalon, CA*
- Provided GIS support, data management, and analysis for the organization
- Produced species distribution models using Maxent software
- Developed standardized data collection fields for rare plant occurrences across the Channel Islands
- Created detailed maps for projects, grants, presentations, board meetings, and reports

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Restoration Technician *Mar 2022 – May 2022*
Catalina Island Conservancy *Avalon, CA*
- Removed invasive plant species through chemical and manual methods
- Collected seed, propagated, and planted native plants
- Supported studies on plant composition at deer exclosure sites
- Identified native and invasive plants of the California Channel Islands using dichotomous key

Natural Resource Assistant *May 2021 – Feb 2022*
Monmouth County Park System *Middletown, NJ*
- Conducted surveys of plant communities for deer exclosure and forest health studies using established protocols
- Identified native and invasive plants of the northeastern US using dichotomous key
- Maintained accurate records, updated existing inventory of resource data, and drafted reports
- Analyzed environmental data using R to determine statistical trends and significance

Assistant Naturalist *Oct 2018 – May 2019*
Monmouth County Park System *Middletown, NJ*
- Led educational programs on local ecology and natural history for school groups
- Provided guidance to visitors of 380-acre park through exhibits of historic environmental center
- Interpreted natural resource topics to school age children during outdoor recreation programs

AWARDS & HONORS

BSA Bill Dahl Graduate Student Research Award	*2025*
New York Flora Association Research Grant	*2025*
Lowe-Wilcox Graduate Scholarship	*2025*
Natural Resources Ecampus Outstanding Student Award, OSU	*2022*
Honor Roll, Oregon State University	*Summer 2019 – Fall 2021*
Dean's List, Marymount Manhattan College	*Fall 2016*
Dean's List, Brookdale Community College	*Fall 2014 – Spring 2016*
NJ Student Tuition Assistance Reward Scholarship (NJ STARS)	*2014*

PRESENTATIONS

Dennhardt L, and **Wehner D.** 2023. Restoration on Santa Catalina Island – past, present, and future. California Islands Symposium, Ventura CA.

LICENSES & CERTIFICATIONS

Conservation Project Management & Design	*Conservation Careers*	*Jan 2024*
Certified Associate Ecologist	*Ecological Society of America*	*Dec 2023*
Boating Safety Certificate	*State of New Jersey*	*Jun 2012*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

SKILLS & TRAINING

- Field data collection
- Data management & analysis
- Plant identification
- Plant materials collection
- Invasive plant management
- Restoration planting management
- 4WD & hiking on rugged terrain
- Microsoft Office & Google suites
- Grant & report writing
- Teaching & presenting
- Communicating with public
- GIS & ESRI products
- Python and R programming languages
- MaxEnt modeling

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Aaron Kreisberg

akberg90@gmail.com | +1 (805) 679-1578 | Avalon, CA | LinkedIn

EDUCATION

Master of Environmental Science and Management (June 2022)
Bren School of Environmental Science & Management – University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB)
Specialization: Conservation Planning | Focus: Strategic Environmental Communication & Media
Courses: Landscape Ecology, Conservation Planning, Biological Community Survey/Analysis, CEQA/NEPA

Bachelor of Science, Hydrological Sciences & Policy | Bachelor of Arts, History of Public Policy (June 2012)
University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB)
Emphasis: Policy | Senior Thesis: The Williamson Act—Protecting California's Agricultural Heritage

RESTORATION & MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE

Invasive Plant Program Manager (7/24–Present) | Plant Conservation Manager (5/23–7/24)
Catalina Island Conservancy, Avalon, CA

- Manage invasive plant program, including 3+ staff, contractors, conservation corps crews, and volunteer workers in management, control, removal, survey, and monitoring of invasive plants on Catalina Island
- Continually strive for excellence in invasive plant management, interpersonal relations with supervisors, direct reports, crews, colleagues, and community members while stewarding the biodiversity of Catalina
- Engage professionally and productively with the wider invasive plant management community through groups such as the Islands of the Californias Botanical Collaborative, Los Angeles County Weed Management Area, California Native Plant Society, and California Invasive Plant Council

Staff Ecologist (4/22–Present) | Volunteer (10 trips, 10/13–10/19) | Restoration Technician (4/20–8/20)
Channel Islands Restoration, Santa Barbara, CA

- Write grants and project proposals, conduct research and monitoring for conservation and restoration projects, maintain professional relationships with clients, partners, and regulators, and conduct biological assessments and surveys
- Conducted treatment and removal of non-native species, including noxious weeds including star-thistle (*Centaurea*), giant reed (*A. donax*), and Tamarix, for multiple projects across Santa Barbara, Ventura, and Los Angeles counties
- Completed restoration fieldwork on 10 volunteer trips, including Tamarix removal in Sisquoc/Santa Ynez River backcountry and trips to Santa Rosa Island, San Nicolas Island, Anacapa Island, and San Marcos Foothills Preserve

Graduate Student Researcher – La Kretz Center, Sedgwick Reserve, CA (10/21–6/22)

- Conducted vegetation monitoring for a planned prescribed fire at Midland School in Santa Ynez Valley, including vegetation line intercepts for species and fuel loads and using a densiometer to estimate canopy cover
- Participated in preparation and field surveys for SHIFT remote sensing campaign lead by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory centered on Sedgwick Reserve and the Nature Conservancy's Dangermond Preserve
- Collected field samples of vegetation, monitored functional traits, and prepared hundreds of samples for analysis and transport, including preparing samples by drying in an oven and freezing with liquid nitrogen

Watershed Restoration Intern – South Coast Habitat Restoration, Carpinteria, CA (6/21–9/21)

- Created plant palette in collaboration with project manager for 5 restoration sites in Carpinteria watershed that were impacted by catastrophic debris flows, collaborating with Santa Barbara Natives to purchase 700 plants
- Conducted California Rapid Assessment Methodology Assessment (CRAM) for riparian habitat in Los Padres National Forest as team of 3; completed night survey for three special status species as member of team of 6.

Habitat Restoration Manager (1/14–6/18) | Board Member (5/15–9/18, 6/21–6/22)
Santa Barbara Audubon Society, Santa Barbara, CA

- Monitored local conservation issues on Conservation & Science Committee; host talks as Programs Co-chair
- Planned, developed, obtained grant funding, and monitored 2.5-year Dune Swale Pond Fire Recovery Project, a $35,000 budgeted habitat restoration project of 6 acres mitigating wildfire impacts at Coal Oil Point Reserve
- Oversaw interns and volunteers in removing *B. nigra, F. vulgare,* and *D. odorata* exotic species, planting native species to enhance wetland function and habitat quality, and vegetation monitoring for 20+ workdays

Island Manager (8/17–11/19) | Tour Guide (3/13–11/19, 6/20–6/21)
Santa Barbara Adventure Company, Santa Barbara, CA

- Managed 20+ employees for guided kayaking concession in Channel Islands National Park on Santa Cruz Island
- Maintained relations and communicated with National Park Service (NPS) and Island Packers transportation staff. Upheld standards for risk management, natural and cultural history interpretation, and customer service

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

ADDITIONAL FIELDWORK EXPERIENCE

-Environmental Field Technician – Wildlands Conservation/ManTech SRS Technologies, Inc., Lompoc, CA (11/16–3/17)
-Restoration Intern (9/10–3/11) | Student Worker (4/11–2/13) | Laboratory Assistant (8/12–2/13) Cheadle Center for Biodiversity and Ecological Restoration (CCBER), UCSB, Santa Barbara, CA
-Working Holiday, New Zealand (11/19–3/20)

CERTIFICATIONS & SKILLS

Certifications: Wildland Fire Fighter Type 2, FAA Part 107 Licensed UAV Pilot, Qualified Applicator License (Exp. 12/26), Wilderness First Responder (Exp. 6/26), CA Driver License (Exp. 7/27)
Skills: Microsoft Office, Google Earth & Suite, Zoom, ESRI platform/GIS, R, Data Visualization, Plant Ecology & Botany

COURSES & PRESENTATIONS

Courses: Fundamentals of Remote Sensing – NASA Applied Remote Sensing Training Program (11/25), California Native Plant Society Plant Identification Class (7/25), Jepson Herbarium Flora of the San Jacinto Mountains (7/2025), Jepson Herbarium Cacti of Anza Borrego (4/25), Santa Barbara Training and Exchange Prescribed Burn Training (11/24), Leadership Principles Certificate – Harvard Business School Online (10/24), Conservation Project Management & Design (9/24), Grasses of California (4/23)
Presentations: Early Detection, Rapid Response, and Invasive Plant Management on Santa Catalina Island (North America Invasive Species Management Association Conference, 11/25), Riding the Invasion Curve: Invasive Plant Management on Santa Catalina Island (California Invasive Plant Council Symposium, 11/24)

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Kevin Alison

Summary

Skilled Horticulturist and Restoration Ecologist focused on conserving the native biodiversity on Catalina Island.

Core Skills & Expertise

- Catalina Landscape Ecology
- Leadership & management
- Technical field work
- Laboratory management
- Project planning & adaptive management.
- Public speaking & communication

Education

Master of Science - University of California Irvine **Sept. 2018 - June 2020**

Conservation and Restoration Science

Bachelor of Science - University of Hawaii at Hilo **Aug. 2012 – Dec. 2014**

Coastal Resources and Watershed Management
Minor: Cell and Molecular Biology

Certificates:

- Forest Resource Management and Conservation
- Plant Tissue Culture

Associate of Science (Two)**-** College of the Desert **Sept. 2010 - May 2012**

Environmental Horticulture Natural Resource Management

Additional Certificates:

- Arborist technician
- Landscape and Irrigation Technician
- Pest Management Technician
- Desert Naturalist

Professional Experience

Native Plant Conservation Manager **May 2024 - Present**
Rare Plant Ecologist **August 2022 – May 2024**
Catalina Island Conservancy – Avalon, CA

- Lead plant scientist conserving the flora of Santa Catalina.
- Develop and manage the rare plant program focused on preventing rare and endangered plant extinction.
- Strong engagement with the scientific community providing collaboration and educational presentations.
- Provide development with content for social media platforms.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- Lead wildflower and conservation tours into the interior of the island.

Production & Research Manager **Sept. 2015 – August 2022**

Tree of Life Nursery – San Juan Capistrano, CA

- Oversee large-scale production of California native plants for restoration and horticulture.
- Established and maintained best management practices (BMPs) for plant disease and pests.
- Detailed propagation and accession records of seed and cutting material.
- Established and maintains a research laboratory focused on the development of efficient propagation protocols of rare, endangered, and difficult-to-grow species using traditional and contemporary methods, such as *in-vitro* plant tissue culture.
- Developed native fern production protocols.
- Beneficial soil microbe production to be used as soil inoculant for improved crop quality and disease prevention.
- Performed effective outreach to create and grow native plant interest.
- Lead and provided lectures on natural history, horticulture, and maintenance of native plants.
- Provided expert consultation of restoration, ex-situ gardens, and rare species propagation.

Board of Directors Member – Plant Science Committee **Jan. 2021 - Present**

California Native Plant Society - Orange County Chapter

- Plan, reviews, and discuss initiatives of conservation, preservation, education, and horticulture of California native plants locally in Orange County.
- Oversee grant submissions, review, and funding for plant research, conservation, education, and horticulture projects.

Lead Horticulturist **Dec. 2014 – Sept. 2015**

Disneyland Resort - Anaheim, CA

- Lead a team of professional horticulturists to perform high-quality installation and maintenance of large and diverse landscapes (including native) throughout the resort.
- Ensured proper use, maintenance, and sterilization of landscape equipment with a focus on safety and sanitation.
- Received and inspected incoming plant material to be planted throughout the resort for pathogen and disease and maintained high-quality control.

Assistant Garden Manager **Aug. 2012 – Dec. 2014**

Univ. of Hawaii at Hilo Botanical Garden - Hilo, HI

- Upheld educational and *ex-situ* conservation gardens focused on native, cultural, and biologically important species to successful botanical garden standards.
- Achieved successful integrated pest management through efficient cultural practices, accurate invasive species identification and control, and encouraged beneficial organisms.
- Maintained effective greenhouse operations, propagation, equipment maintenance and sanitation.

Volunteer Technician **July 2012 – May 2014**

U.S. Forest Service: Institute for Pacific Island Forestry **–** Hilo, HI.

- Established and maintain research plots in lowland tropical wet forest on the Big Island, HI.
- Monitored and assessed plant establishment and recruitment of native and non-native plant species.
- Processed and analyzed litterfall and of seed viability of keystone species.
- Performed installation and maintenance of native species to sufficient establishment.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- **Biology Intern** **June 2011 – Aug. 2011**

American Conservation Experience (ACE) - El Centro, CA.

- Record physiological and environmental measurements for the Bureau of Land Management's conservation efforts of the Flat-Tail Horned Lizard.
- Monitored diverse habitats throughout the Southern Colorado Desert of California.
- Developed a native plant reference manual for the department and future interns.

- **Propagation & Nursery Associate** **Dec. 2010 – June 2012**

The Living Desert Zoo & Botanic Gardens - Palm Desert, CA

- Propagated a wide selection of desert plants, including rare and endangered species, for gardens, *in-situ,* and *ex- situ* conservation.
- Provided sales and customer service to the public with the focus on promoting native plant use and water conservation.

Public Speaking Presentations

- "A Calendar of Color: The Art and Science of Catalina's Flora" – Last Friday Lecture Series, Catalina Island Conservancy.
- "Micropropagation of Catalina Island's Rarest Plants" – Center for Plant Conservation, SD Zoo.
- "Plant Clones for Conservation" – The Natural History Museum of Los Angeles
- "Propagating Catalina's Rarest Plants" – Last Friday Lecture Series, Catalina Island Conservancy.
- "Saving the Catalina Island Mountain Mahogany" – Islands of California Botanical Collaborative.
- "Plant Babies: Propagating Native Plants" – California Native Plant Society
- "Micropropagation of Catalina's Rarest Plants" – Channel Islands Restoration
- "Plants of Catalina Island" – California Native Plant Society
- "Preventing Plant Poaching & Extinction: Conservation Strategies for *Dudleya*" – UCLA
- "Plants of the Channel Islands" - Tree of Life Nursery
- "Create and Caring for a Native Plant Garden" - Tree of Life Nursery
- "California Native Plant Propagation" – California Native Plant Society, Orange County
- "The Use of Beneficial Microbes in Nursery Production" – Dominican University of Californica
- "Our Plant Choices Matter: The Importance of CA Native Plants" – California Garden Clubs
- "Conservation Through Cultivation" California Native Plant Society, San Diego Chapter
- "The California Coastal Garden" California Native Plant Society, South Coast

Awards

- California Native Plant Society- Charlie O'Neill Research Grant 2020
- Palms Garden Club Scholarship 2011-2012
- Voth Family Fellowship 2019-2020

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Rachel Boyce

EXPERIENCE

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife – ***Springfield, OR***

- **Fish Technician**, July 2025 – December 2025
  - Assisted in population monitoring and life history attributes evaluation of the ESA listed bull trout.
  - Conducted night-snorkeling surveys and redd surveys.
  - Installed and maintained video weirs, rotary screw traps, and remote PIT tag antennas.
  - Captured bull trout by operating screw traps and angling.
  - Implanted PIT tags using both injection and incision methods.
  - Handled and identified freshwater fish.
  - Used Garmin GPS devices for field data collection and navigation.

University of Washington – ***Tinian Island, MP***

- **Research Technician**, May 2024 – December 2024
  - Conducted territory mapping research using radio telemetry.
  - Banded 20 Tinian monarchs, a currently vulnerable and previously endangered species.
  - Deployed 15 telemetry units on Tinian monarchs using glue.
  - Handled over 50 birds across 10 species, including rare and endemic species.
  - Deployed and positioned mist nets, surveyed nests, and identified nests.
  - Identified and resighted color-banded birds with binoculars.
  - Deployed and monitored acoustic recorders, later analyzing the recordings and identifying birds by song.
  - Deployed and monitored camera traps and chew cards for detection of invasive predators, later identifying bite marks.
  - Used Garmin GPS devices for field data collection.
  - Used ArcGIS Pro and Garmin BaseCamp to produce maps for daily field activities, data collection, and use in reports.
  - Presented at public meetings and collaborated with landowners for research activities on private properties.

Catalina Island Conservancy – ***Catalina Island, CA***

- **Restoration Ecologist**, July 2023 – May 2024
  - Managed, designed, planned, implemented, monitored, and maintained restoration projects.
  - Used ArcGIS Pro and ArcGIS Online to produce maps for daily field activities, data collection, and use in reports.
  - Managed and produced grant reports and proposals.
  - Oversaw maintenance of equipment/field gear, vehicles, and project base yard (including proper storage of herbicides).
- **Lead Plant Technician**, November 2022 – July 2023
  - Led, scheduled, and managed about 20 field and nursery workers for the Conservancy's Plant Program.
  - Directly monitored field staff to ensure completion of invasive plant management, restoration projects, and surveys.
  - Trained all field staff and volunteers in standard operating procedures for all programmatic operations.
  - Managed, monitored, and maintained fenced deer exclosures.
- **Field Associate**, June 2022 – November 2022
  - Led field and nursery workers for the Conservancy's Plant Program.
  - Led native/invasive plant surveys, vegetation monitoring, invasive plant removal, and restoration project maintenance.
  - Assisted in training field staff and volunteers on standard operating procedures for all operations.
  - Ensured proper use of personal protective equipment and safety in the field.
- **Restoration Technician**, March 2022 – June 2022
  - Conducted invasive plant management in the field, using manual and chemical methods.
  - Collected data, using Field Maps, and plant materials such as seeds, tissue samples, vouchers, and cuttings.
  - Conducted vegetation plot and transect surveys, measuring quantity and abundance of native and invasive plants.
  - Conducted office administrative tasks including photo management, data entry, data proofing, and inventory.

Ohio Center for Ecological and Evolutionary Studies – ***Ohio University, Athens, OH***

- **Research Technician**, September 2020 – May 2021
  - Assisted in studies on parental provisioning in Hooded Warblers, Eastern Bluebirds, and Tree Swallows.
  - Organized, quantified, and input wildlife video data in Microsoft Excel.
  - Sexed and identified birds and invertebrate feed species to determine quality and quantity of feed.
  - Assisted in positioning mist nets and handling birds for bird banding.
- **Field Assistant**, August 2020 – October 2020
  - Assisted in studying phylogeography of Northern ravine salamanders and Red-backed salamanders.
  - Conducted transect habitat surveys in Wayne National Forest.
  - Collected environmental data such as: soil moisture, soil temperature, canopy cover, humidity, and leaf litter depth.
  - Captured salamanders along transects, recorded sex, size using a caliper, and coordinates using Trimble GPS unit.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

EDUCATION

Bachelor of Science in Wildlife and Conservation Biology – *Ohio University,* August 2018 - December 2021
GPA of 3.53
Dean's List: Fall 2019, Fall 2020, Spring 2021 and Fall 2022
Awards: OHIO Trustee Award, OHIO Pathway Scholarship, OHIO Success Scholarship
Relevant Courses: Field Ecology, Ornithology, Mammalogy, Animal Conservation Biology, Animal Ecology, Plant Ecology

SKILLS

Field Research:

- Off trail hiking on rugged terrain while carrying large packs in all weather conditions
- 4WD on steep, rocky, muddy, uneven terrain
- Bird banding
- Radio telemetry tracking
- PIT tagging
- Wildlife handling

Software:

- ArcGIS (Pro, Online, and Field Maps)
- Microsoft Office (including Access)
- Garmin BaseCamp
- RStudio
- Image J

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

John Joseph Knapp

PROFESSIONAL OBJECTIVE

Advance conservation science to improve island ecosystems

EDUCATION

Master of Science in Agriculture, California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo, 2005. Specialization: Invasive Plant Ecology. Thesis title- *Catalina Island Invasive Plant Ranking Plan.* Synopsis- developed and implemented a landscape-scale ranking system to prioritize invasive plant management strategies.

Bachelor of Arts in Physical Geography, University of California at Santa Barbara, California, 1998. Concentration: Ecology, and Atmospheric and Oceanographic Interactions

WORK EXPERIENCE

Senior Conservation Scientist (9/25 to present), Catalina Island Conservancy, Avalon, CA

Serves as a lead scientist in co-developing priorities and implementing landscape-scale restoration across the Island. Conducts monitoring and surveys for endemic and listed plants and vegetation change associated with restoration activities. Provides technical writing for project scoping, permitting, implementation, and reporting.

Senior Island Scientist (08/2013 to 3/2025), The Nature Conservancy, Ventura, CA

Served as a science lead in setting conservation priorities, and developing and exporting conservation tools, methodologies, and strategies. Developed and strengthened key relationships with partner entities- primarily with the U.S. Navy, National Park Service, and local non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Served as lead author in the development of the Santa Cruz Island Ecological Management Strategy 2015-2025 which is the primary document for setting conservation objectives for the Santa Cruz Island Preserve. Led the development of a binational collaboration (Islands of the Californias Botanical Collaborative) between 20 plus NGO's, county, state, and federal agencies, research institutions, and for-profit companies to identify threats and conservation priorities, secure funding, and implement joint projects. Secured over $4 million dollars in state, federal, and private foundation grants and from private donors to date. Managed an annual operating budget ranging from $150,000-$500,000. Conceptualized and managed three key programs: Invasive Plant Eradication (second largest in the world), Extirpated Plant Reintroduction, and Plant Extinction Prevention. Produced gray literature to scientific publications annually. Represented TNC and exported novel conservation tools, strategies and methodologies at major conservation conferences.

Conservation and Research Advisory Committee Member (08/2013 to 01/2016), Santa Barbara Botanic Garden, Santa Barbara, CA

Served on a committee of researchers, scientists and land managers from local entities to quarterly evaluate the conservation and research strategies and programs, and advise changes in direction, scope, and timing as it related to the Santa Barbara Botanic Garden mission and the current state of conservation and research.

Director (01/2008 to 08/2013), Native Range, Inc., Lompoc, CA

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Conceptualized and co-established Native Range, Inc., a for-profit conservation consulting firm, provide cost-effective ecological services such as: flora and fauna surveys, invasive plant management, management plan development. Developed novel methods to manage invasive plants. Served as the lead contact for all clients and developed project bids, served as lead scientist and project principle, and managed a staff of up to eight biologists. Secured over $600,000 in grant proposals for client projects. Managed an annual budget of $500,000.

Invasive Plant Program Manager (06/2004 to 01/2008), Catalina Island Conservancy, Avalon, CA

Developed the Conservancy's first official invasive plant management program and established program priorities. Developed and implemented the first invasive plant management plan for the island, which was the most ambitious invasive plant eradication program in the world at the time. Co-developed a watershed ranking priority system and served as lead-author in the development of the plan. Secured over $1.4 million dollars in corporate, private foundation, and county, state, and federal grants. Managed a $500,000 annual budget. Forged partnerships with research institutions, non-profit organizations, Federal and State agencies, & youth conservation corps. Developed & delivered presentations at symposia, schools, community groups, and state agencies. Managed an extensive GIS database, identified restoration site, and mapped over 40,000 invasive & rare plant populations. Purchased & maintained equipment and conducted general administrative duties.

Board Service (01/2006 to 01/2016), California Invasive Plant Council, Berkeley, CA

Served as: **Past President** (01/2015 to 12/2016), **President** (1/2012 to 2014), **Vice President** (01/2010 to 12/2011), **Board Secretary** (01/2008 to 12/2009), **Board Director** (01/2006 to12/2007)

Oversaw adherence to the mission and fiduciary responsibilities and lead organizational strategic planning. Served as chair of the Steering, Board Development and Fundraising Committees, and served on the Finance and Symposium Committees. Assisted in hosting ten statewide annual symposia. Organized and hosted Southern California Regional Weed Inventory workshops and provided assistance with invasive species ranking and outreach projects to partners throughout the state. Collaborated in the development of Statewide invasive plant species maps and provided assistance with invasive species inventories.

Board Director (01/2004 to 12/2005), Southern California Botanists, Claremont, CA

Served as Board Director. Contributed to the adherence to mission goals and fiduciary responsibilities, and contributed to the production of an annual symposium, botanical hikes, and journal publication.

Coordinator of Volunteers (02/2001 to 10/2002), Catalina Island Conservancy, Avalon, CA

Recruited, coordinated, & supervised community group volunteers conducting a variety of restoration projects such as: seed collection, cleaning, and processing, outplanting, invasive plant treatment, and wildlife surveys. Managed the world-renowned Volunteer Vacations Program. Maintained a volunteer database tracking volunteer hour, interests, and recognition.

Charter School Teacher (05/99 to 01/2001), Los Angeles Conservation Corps Charter High School, East Los Angeles, CA

Educated under-served young adults (ages 18-24) about environmental science & ecology. Developed curricula for a nationally recognized & awarded environmental education program. Instilled in corps members a strong work ethic & love for nature. Successfully adapted to an ever-changing schedule and teaching environment. Established working partnerships with local

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

community groups. Assisted in corps member training & development. Coordinated recycling presentations & work projects at middle schools. Served as a representative to the National Parks and Conservation Association.

ADDITIONAL EXPERIENCE, SKILLS, AWARDS, PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS, AND SELECT PRESENTATIONS PUBLICATIONS

Computer programs
•Microsoft Office •ESRI Geographic Information System •Trimble, Garmin, and smartphone application global positioning systems

Professional Organizations
•California Invasive Plant Council •California Native Plant Society •California Society for Ecological Restoration •California Weed Science Society •Ecological Society of America •Society of Conservation Biology •Southern California Botanists •Grupo de Ecología y Conservación de Islas

Professional Awards
•2025 California Invasive Plant Council Jake Sigg Award for Vision and Dedicated Service

Select Professional Presentations
Delivered over 50 presentations at professional conferences and symposia, professional societies, universities, and community groups: including: California Invasive Plant Council, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Society of Conservation Biology, Ecological Society of America, Society of Ecological Restoration, Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council, California Weed Science Society, University of California Santa Barbara, California Native Plant Society, Island Invasives Eradication Conferences (New Zealand and Scotland), Southern California Academy of Science, California Islands Symposia, United States Department of Fish and Wildlife, Wild Pig Conference, International Oak Society, Conservation de Islas (Mexico), The Nature Conservancy Science Conference, Global Conservation Consortium: Oaks, California Native Plant Society, city Rotary, and local yacht clubs and K-12 schools.

Select Publications
Boser, C.L., C. Cory, K.R. Faulkner, J.M. Randall, J.J. Knapp, and S.A. Morrison. 2012. Strategies for biosecurity on a nearshore island in California. 8th California Islands Symposium.

Cory, C. and J. J. Knapp. 2012. The Nature Conservancy's Program to eradicate 25 invasive plant species from Santa Cruz Island. Proceedings of the 8th California Island Symposium. Ventura, CA.

Hoyer CA Is. Symposium

Knapp, D.A. and J. J. Knapp. 2005. Ecosystem protection through watershed-level prioritization on Catalina Island. Pp. 39-46 In: G. Skurka, (ed.). Proceedings of the California Invasive Plant Council symposium, Volume 9. Berkeley, CA.

Knapp, D.A., D. Borhes-Flores, P. Dixon, W. Hoyer, J.J. Knapp, L. Luna-Mendoza, K. McEachern, J. Hernandez-Montoya, B. Munson, P. Power, and J.M. Randall. 2017. The future of California Islands conservation in a changing world. J.J. Knapp and M. Kaufmann (eds) In: Special Issue: Islands of the Californias, Fremontia. 45:3, 44-45 p.

Knapp, J. J. 2004. Catalina Invasive Plant Ranking Plan for Santa Catalina Island. Unpublished plan prepared for the Santa Catalina Island Conservancy. Avalon, CA. 160 p.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Knapp, J. 2007. Lessons from Catalina Island: managing invasive plants before and after a fire. Pp. 12-16 In D. Ready (Editor). Watershed Wise- the fires this time: post-fire recovery best practices.

Knapp, J. J, C. Cory, R. Wolstenholme, and S. Chaney. 2007. Santa Cruz Island Weed Management Strategy. Unpublished report prepared for The Nature Conservancy and Channel Islands National Park. Ventura, CA. 120 p.

Knapp, J. J. 2008. Draft Catalina Island Invasive Plant Management Plan. Unpublished report prepared for the Catalina Island Conservancy. Avalon, CA. 150 p.

Knapp, J.J., C. Cory, R. Wolstenholme, K. Walker, and B. Cohen. 2008. Santa Cruz Island Invasive Plant Species Map. In the 7th California Islands Symposium proceedings.

Knapp, J. J. 2010. Catalina Island's invasive plant management program, with an emphasis on invasion and protection of oak ecosystems. In: D. Knapp, (Ed.). Proceedings of the Catalina Island Oak Conference, Volume 1.

Knapp, J. J., P. T. Schuyler, K. N. Walker, N. L Macdonald, and S. A. Morrison. 2010. Benefits of supporting invasive plant and animal eradication projects with helicopters. Pages 188-191. In: Veitch, C.R.; Clout, M.N. and Towns, D.R. (eds.), *Island Invasives: eradication and management.* Proceedings of the International Conference on Island Invasives. Gland, Switzerland. IUCN and Auckland, New Zealand: CBB. Xii +542 pp.

Knapp, J.J., D.J. Knapp, and M. White. 2011. Tejon Ranch Invasive Plant Management Plan. Unpublished report prepared for the Tejon Ranch Conservancy, Frazier Park, CA 80 p.

Knapp, J.J. and M. Kaufmann (eds.). 2017. Special Issue: Islands of the Californias. Fremonita. 45:3, 53 p.

Knapp, J.J. and J.M. Randall. 2017. Introduction to this special issue on the flora and vegetation of the islands of the Californias. J.J. Knapp and M. Kaufmann (eds) In: Special Issue: Islands of the Californias, Fremontia. 45:3, 53 p.

Mazurkiewicz, D., J. Adams, M. Ball, Ryan Carle, P. Dixon, K. Flagg, E. Havstad, E. Howe, Bill Hoyer, J.J. Knapp, K. McEachern, L. Luna-Mendoza, B. Munson, K. Niessen, K. Owen, J. Parish, P. Power, A. Yamagiwa, and A. Little. 2017. Restoration and protection of the archipelago's flora and habitats: a new era. J.J. Knapp and M. Kaufmann (eds) In: Special Issue: Islands of the Californias, Fremontia. 45:3, 37-43 p.

McEachern, K., P. Dixon, E. Havstad, W. Hoyer, D. Knapp, J.J. Knapp, L. Luna-Mendoza, B. Munson, and H. Schneider. 2017. J.J. Knapp and M. Kaufmann (eds) The Struggle for Recovery. In: Special Issue: Islands of the Californias, Fremontia. 45:3, 32-36 p.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

SASHA GANNON

EDUCATION

Clark University, Worcester, MA *May 2025*
M.S. in Geographic Information Science Concentration in
Conservation & Wildlife Biology Overall GPA: 3.93

Clark University, Worcester MA *May 2024*
B.A. in Geography, *summa cum laude*
Concentration in Geographic Information Science & Earth Systems Science
Minors: Global Environmental Studies, International Development and Social Change Overall GPA: 3.83

School for Field Studies, Paro Bhutan *August 2022-December 2022*
Study Abroad Field Work and Research Program Concentration
in Mountain Ecology and Wildlife Monitoring Overall GPA: 3.9

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Ecological Restoration Project Manager June 2025-Current
Catalina Island Conservancy

- Manage all GIS, spatial data, and geodatabase systems for the Conservancy's Conservation Department.
- Lead department-wide data management: data standards, QA/QC, workflows, storage, and documentation.
- Produce clear maps, dashboards, and data summaries for managers, partners, and grant reporting.
- Perform remote sensing analysis using multispectral, LiDAR, and high-resolution imagery to support vegetation mapping, habitat assessments, and restoration planning.
- Build custom GIS tools, mobile data-collection forms, and workflow solutions to streamline field operations and monitoring efforts.
- Join field crews as needed to support surveys, restoration treatments, data collection, and on-the-ground problem solving.
- Write clear technical reports, monitoring protocols, and grant materials that translate complex spatial and ecological data into practical guidance for teams and partners.

Transportation Planning GIS Co-op January 2023-August 2024
Massachusetts Department of Transportation, Office of Spatial Analysis and Research

- Contributed to the development and maintenance of spatial databases and analytical tools, supporting transportation planning and geospatial data management.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- Assisted in overseeing and coordinating multi-year projects, including advanced geospatial analyses and custom applications, in collaboration with external consultants and vendors.
- Produced and updated comprehensive reports and technical documentation, improving the clarity and utility of GIS applications for ongoing transportation planning initiatives.

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Graduate Researcher August 2024- May 2025
Clark University, California State University Long Beach

- Designed and implemented a master's research project assessing River Ridge Ranch as an ecological corridor through resistance modeling and wildlife monitoring.
- Conducted extensive fieldwork, including deploying and maintaining camera traps, to collect data on wildlife presence and movement patterns.
- Integrated remote sensing, spatial modeling, and field observations to analyze habitat connectivity and support evidence-based land management strategies.

Undergraduate Consultant January 2024-May 2024
Earth Insight

- Developed a Google Earth Engine code for Earth Insight to assess the expansion of a nickel mining company in Guatemala beyond its concession area.
- Conducted analysis of land change and deforestation using Landsat data, quantifying yearly and overall forest loss.
- Provided insights on environmental impact and compliance, contributing to the organization's understanding of deforestation trends related to mining activities

Undergraduate Researcher August 2024- December 2024
Clark University, Geography Department

- Worked on a team of undergraduate students supervised by Dr Florencia Sangermano to assess the effectiveness of ecosystem services in mitigating the Urban Heat Island (UHi) effect in Cordoba, Argentina using the InVEST Urban Cooling model
- Integrated socioeconomic data to analyze the relationship between urban heat mitigation and social vulnerability, identifying neighborhoods with the highest susceptibility to extreme heat.
- Applied advanced spatial analysis techniques, including space-time cube and emerging hot spot analysis, to detect and visualize temperature changes and anomalies.

Undergraduate Researcher August 2022-December 2022
School for Field Studies Bhutan

- Directed research on the spatial distribution of large felids across elevational gradients and forest types in the Eastern Himalayas, in collaboration with the Bhutan Department of Forestry and the Bhutan Ecological Society
- Utilized camera trap data and geospatial technology to map distribution patterns and assess wildlife populations in various ecosystems.
- Conducted fieldwork, including camera trapping and biodiversity surveys, to evaluate ecological health and explore conservation strategies oriented toward large felids.

RESEARCH INTERNSHIPS & FELLOWSHIPS

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

NASA DEVELOP Project Lead September 2024- December 2024
NASA DEVELOP, Fort Collins Colorado

- Collaborated with the Pueblo of Santa Ana Department of Natural Resources to support rangeland monitoring and grazing management using NASA Earth Observations.
- Analyzed trends in bare ground cover and herbaceous biomass productivity from 1985 to the present using the Rangeland Analysis Platform.
- Utilized long-term field data to evaluate and interpret satellite-derived products, identifying trends relative to management history and vegetation type.

Graduate Research Assistant May 2024-July 2024
NSF REU: Tracking Land Change, California State University Long Beach

- Supported Dr. Mystyn Mills in investigating the effectiveness of remote monitoring techniques to assess anthropogenic impacts on wildlife in working landscapes, with a focus on the Sierra Nevada Foothills.
- Initiated and contributed to a master's thesis project evaluating River Ridge Ranch as an ecological corridor using remote sensing and camera trap analysis, aimed at understanding wildlife movement and habitat connectivity.
- Managed the deployment and data collection of camera traps for wildlife monitoring

Undergraduate Research AssistantMay 2023-July 2023
NSF REU: Tracking Land Change, California State University Long Beach

- Conducted spatial, behavioral, and dietary analysis of the California Ground Squirrel for the Tracking Land Change (TLC) project at River Ridge Ranch.
- Applied geospatial technologies and biogeographic concepts to study population dynamics, utilizing conservation drones and GPS technology for data collection.
- Analyzed data using geospatial and statistical software, identifying spatial patterns and behavioral trends

Undergraduate Research Assistant June 2022-August 2022
NSF REU: Spatial Models & Electoral Districting, University of Washington Tacoma

- Developed and implemented a population and contiguity-constrained algorithm to redistrict electoral districts based on travel time metrics.
- Worked within a subgroup of 6, specializing in the analysis of electoral districting through travel time, as part of a larger interdisciplinary team of 12.
- Cleaned and analyzed U.S. Census data, using GIS, R, and Python to assess demographic, geographic, and voting patterns, identifying statistical outlier districts based on travel time.

TEACHING AND MENTORING EXPERIENCE

Science Educator January 2025-May 2025
EcoTarium Museum of Science and Nature

- Educated diverse audiences on wildlife conservation, astronomy, and environmental science through interactive overnight programs and hands-on activities.
- Led engaging wildlife tours featuring rescue animals, fostering public awareness of species conservation and care.

GIS Help Desk Assistant September 2024-May 2025

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Clark University Geography Department

- Mentor undergraduate students in GIS by providing guidance on assignments, labs, and projects, enhancing their practical skills and understanding.
- Troubleshoot and resolve technical issues related to vector and raster GIS and remote sensing, ensuring smooth workflow for students.
- Facilitate student comprehension and application of GIS and remote sensing concepts and tools, supporting their academic and research needs.

Graduate Mentor, NSF REU: Tracking Land Change Summer 2024

California State University Long Beach

- Guided undergraduate students in data collection and analysis, ensuring accuracy and adherence to research protocols.
- Provided training and support in research techniques, including the use of software and instruments, to enhance students' technical skills.
- Assisted in the preparation and presentation of research findings, mentoring students in effective communication and presentation strategies.

HONORS AND AWARDS

Szugda-Emani Memorial Environmental Scholarship Award **2024**

- Given to an outstanding senior in Geography who shows passion for the environment in their education and research

Robert Goddard Achievement Scholarship **2020-2024**

- The Clark University Robert Goddard Achievement Scholarship, given for exceptional academic merit upon admission, provides support throughout all four years of study

Gamma Theta Upsilon Member **Inducted 2022**

- Inducted into the Alpha Sigma chapter of the International Geographic Honor Society. Members of GTU have established excellence in their geography coursework and are committed to furthering the cultural and practical status of geography.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

Riley, B., Gannon, S., & Byrne, B. (2024).Using camera trap data to evaluate the impact of anthropogenic presence upon wildlife at River Ridge Ranch. Poster session presented at the Ecological Society of America, Long Beach, California.

Nix, L., Laris, P., Winslow S., Gannon, S. (2024) Mapping Invasive Thistle and Mustard using Multispectral Imagery: A Methodological Study. Poster session presented at the Geo-Resolution Conference, St. Louis, Missouri

UNIVERSITY SERVICE

Office of Study Abroad & Away Program Assistant July 2023 - January 2024

Clark University

- Advised students on study abroad processes and managed their applications.
- Supported administrative tasks, including data management and document processing.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Office of Advancement Services and Research Data Assistant **August 2020 - May 2022**

Clark University

- Organized and digitized paper archives, improving data accessibility.
- Managed and updated Excel databases for alumni donations and transactions.

Lead Editor, Copy Editing and Content **August 2021 - May 2022**

Clark University Scholarly Undergraduate Research Journal

- Edited research articles to enhance clarity and quality, ensuring high editorial standards.
- Directed and trained a team of copy editors, overseeing the editorial process and maintaining quality control.

TECHNICAL SKILLS

- Geospatial Analysis: Geographic Information Systems (GIS), Remote Sensing, ArcGIS Suite, QGIS, Google Earth Engine, GeoDa, Rangeland Analysis Platform (RAP), Conservation Drones and GPS Technology, Spatial Modeling
- Programming Languages: Python, R, Java, SQL
- Field and Sensor Technologies: Camera Trap Analysis and Deployment, Acoustic Analysis and Deployment

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS AND MEMBERSHIPS

- **Member,** Gamma Theta Upsilon (2022-present)
- **Member,** Ecological Society of America (2024-present)
- **Member,** Association of American Geography (2022-present)

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit 3 – Restoration Management Permit application

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

1673 (b1) – Application Fee

No application fee required

1673 (b2) – Project Applicant

Santa Catalina Island Conservancy
Lauren Dennhardt,
Senior Director of Conservation
320 Golden Shore, Suite #220
Long Beach, CA 90802
310-510-2595
ldennhardt@catalinaconservancy.org

1673 (b3) – Project Name and Location

The Catalina Island Restoration Project (Project) encompasses the entirety of Santa Catalina Island, totaling 47,884 acres, with restoration activities occurring primarily on lands owned by the Catalina Island Conservancy (centroid 33.383, -118.433). Limited project activities will also extend into areas near Two Harbors, as well as portions of land owned by the Santa Catalina Island Company, Hamilton Cove, and within the City of Avalon. Land ownership across the Island is depicted in Exhibit 1.

1673 (b4) – Project start and end dates

The Conservancy plans to initiate this Project in January 2026 and is asking for approval of restoration activities through December 2035. The intention of the Conservancy is to continue work on restoration for decades which is referenced in the documents accompanying this permit application. After ten years, the Conservancy will apply for another Restoration Management Permit if needed for continued restoration activities.

1673 (b5) – Detailed description of project activities and desired outcomes

The Project aims to restore ecological integrity on Catalina Island, 88 percent (42,135 acres) of which is owned and managed by the Catalina Island Conservancy (the Conservancy) in Los Angeles County, California. The Project exclusively proposes activities to restore Catalina's unique ecosystem through active native plant restoration, and by reducing threats posed by nonnative ungulates (HRMP 1.3.3) and invasive plant species (HRMP 1.3.4), which have led to biodiversity loss, erosion, decreased water capture, and reduced habitat quality on Catalina Island (HRMP 2.1.2,3,4,6,7, & 8)).

The Project will focus on the restoration of island resources by preserving biodiversity restoring ecosystems. Incidental benefits will include reducing the likelihood of wildfire, improving water capture, reducing erosion, and enhancing recreational opportunities. The Project will accomplish this through four major components: 1) active restoration (across 204.9 acres), 2) biosecurity, 3) monitoring, and 4) outreach. This four-part framework ensures all the necessary components are present for Catalina Island to be resilient to

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

change and to establish the components that exemplify the biodiversity that once thrived on the Island.

Project components include:

1. Landscape level active restoration – This plan outlined in detail in the attached Habitat Restoration and Monitoring Plan (HRMP) is proposed for the next many decades and will continue beyond this permit application and utilizes different approaches for active management including island scrub oak chaparral restoration (HRMP 1.3.5), top-of-watershed habitat restoration (HRMP 1.3.6), and cultural-based native revegetation (HRMP 1.3.7). Details on how the Conservancy will begin active restoration over the first ten years of the Project (2026-2035) are in the attached Restoration Workplan (RW).
2. Biosecurity Measures – Biosecurity is critically important towards restoration of an island (Thomas, 2025) due to the fragility of island ecosystems. Islands are at the center of the biodiversity crisis - more than 50% of species extinctions occur on islands (Fernandez-Palacios, et al., 2021). To prevent extinctions, it is critically important to have a strong biosecurity program (Whitby, Novossiolova, Walther, & Dando, 2015)on Catalina Island. The Conservancy aims to accomplish this through high priority invasive plant removal (HRMP, Appendix A); -Island-wide fox monitoring (RW 3.2), disease surveillance (RW 3.3), and mortality monitoring (RW 3.4); and the removal of invasive Mule deer (RW 3.5).
3. Monitoring and Documentation – The scale of active restoration is high (~100 acres at a time) and many other biosecurity measures will have impacts on the whole Island. Thus, monitoring programs to document the efficacy of interventions are critical for the Conservancy's adapting management practices, in addition to sharing knowledge gained through the restoration process. Monitoring programs are critical for the Project since monitored species will inform Conservancy scientists on adjustments to seeding mixes, high priority invasive plant removal, biosecurity interventions, and any other necessary interventions to advance the Restoration Project. Monitoring programs will include island fox reporting to both state and federal entities (USFWS permit ES - 090990-3) (RW 4.1), highly intensive monitoring in active restoration plots (RW 4.2), annual reports on the overall Catalina Island Restoration Project (RW 4.4), faunal surveying (shrews, small mammals, herpetofauna, birds, and lepidoptera ; RW 4.3, 4.6-4.8), and landscape-scale monitoring across 60 plots (RW 4.5).
4. Outreach, Education, Engagement, and Community Partnership – The Conservancy is committed to working in partnership with the community and a broad network of collaborators on all aspects of restoration. The Conservancy will tap into its supporters, volunteers and conservation partners (RW 5.1), while creating opportunities for workforce development in the Project (RW 5.2). Engagement efforts include public meetings, restoration site tours, and briefings with local officials and media (RW 5.3). Ongoing communication will continue through bilingual updates, newsletters, social media, and clear, accessible content online.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

The Conservancy's Education Department has over 20 years of experience educating locals schools and the community. Their expertise will be instrumental to communicating milestones of the Project (RW 5.4).

Active restoration locations are identified in Section 3 of the HRMP. Each location is identified as either top-of-watershed, oak enhancement, or cultural resource enhancement (projects such replanting plants that are culturally important to the Gabrieleno-Tongva). These activities will be accomplished through large-scale invasive plant treatment (physical removal, mowing, herbicide treatment) paired with annual monitoring. After three years of treatment, depending on the site, it will be left as-is if sufficient native species are present, reseeded with a low diversity cover seed mix, followed by a diverse seed mix, and/or enhanced with outplantings.

Seeds and planting for site enhancements will all come from locally (Catalina Island) sourced seeds, to maintain unique island genetics, but some will be bulked off-Island (HRMP 1.3.8). Plants will be collected in the wild through cuttings, seed collection, or air layering. Once collected, they may be grown at the Ackerman Native Plan Nursery (located on the Island), bulked at the Conservancy's future seed farm on-Island, or bulked off-Island. Bulking off-Island will be necessary since a general seeding rate requires 50-100 pounds per restoration acre and there is not enough flat land on the Island to fulfill the demand for seeds needed for landscape scale restoration. On-Island bulking will be reserved for the species most at risk for genetic contamination off-island.

Biosecurity is another important component of the Project. A good example of how a novel disease can disrupt a population on Catalina comes from the Catalina Island Fox. In 1999, the fox population declined dramatically due to the introduction of a novel strain of canine distemper virus (HRMP 2.2.2). The Conservancy in partnership with the Institute for Wildlife Studies recovered the fox population, and the Conservancy continues to maintain it with its biosecurity program that analyzes deceased foxes for diseases, and conducts at least 864 trap nights annually to catch, measure, vaccinate, and exam the fox. The other major biosecurity program is the Catalina Invasive Plant Program (CIPP), which is found in HRMP Appendix A. This program identifies invasive species that threaten Catalina's unique ecosystems. It also involves identifying new invasive plants early on, eradicating them before they are able to spread. The Project's final major biosecurity measure is the removal of invasive Mule deer, which has prevented restoration efforts for decades (HRMP 1.3.1, 1.3.3, 2.1.7, 2.2.1, 2.2.4, and Appendix C).

Success monitoring is the lynchpin for the whole Project as it helps direct which methodology to use and where. Monitoring is essential for restoration since it guides adaptive management to ensure the long term success of the restoration effort. There are many established monitoring and reporting programs that will be used for this project. The details of these monitoring programs can be found in the workplan (RW 4.1-4.9) and HRMP (5.2 & 5.3), which allow for adaptive management (HRMP 5.4). A brief synopsis is described below.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Annually, the Conservancy completes a fox report on all data it collects on the Catalina Island fox (RW 3.2-3.4, 4.1). This includes a population estimate, survival estimate, quasi extinction risk estimate, number of vaccinations, ectoparasite summaries, infectious disease prevalence study, radio collar monitoring, and injured foxes from the Conservancy fox hotline.

The 10-acre fenced exclosure outlined in Exhibit 1 will serve as a pilot site for intensive invasive species control and passive restoration which will be expanded to 105 acres after three years and the Haypress site after six years (Exhibit 2 & 3). The 10-acre pilot site may be located anywhere within the 105 acre restoration area. Monitoring in the fenced area will guide adaptive herbicide use and determine readiness for native seeding. Once native seeding begins, the Conservancy will use a belt transect method throughout to measure effectiveness of native seeding.

Other surveys completed will include: lepidoptera (RW 4.3), landscape level monitoring of vegetation (RW 4.5), bird acoustics (RW 4.6), and Santa Catalina ornate shrew (RW 4.7).

Butterflies and moths serve as indicators of climate response, habitat integrity, and ecosystem productivity. The Conservancy will conduct Lepidoptera surveys across watersheds of the Island, replicating the Island-wide lepidoptera survey methodology originally used by Dr. Jerry Powell to develop a database of species occurrence that builds on previous Island-wide checklists (Powell, Lepidoptera recorded on Santa Catalina Island., 2012).Land use changes on Catalina over the past 200 years, particularly the introduction of feral ungulates, have led to severe alterations in vegetation and, likely, the associated Lepidoptera species composition. Around 530 species of moths and butterflies are currently known to inhabit Catalina Island, and at least six species are island endemics (Powell 1994). With ongoing ungulate removal, there is promise that a more natural state can be reached, and native insect populations and species that depend on them can rebound and expand from the pockets of remaining native vegetation that act as refugia. As the last ungulates are removed, these Lepidoptera surveys can provide important information about how vegetation recovery is impacting insect biodiversity and thus food availability for birds, mammals, and herpetofauna. Information from these surveys can inform land managers to increase presence of certain plant species and ecosystem types to support greater lepidoptera diversity in the future.

As part of the Project, the Conservancy has developed a long-term monitoring strategy for measuring the response of bird species to restoration activities (HRMP 5.3.4). Ground- and mid-story nesting species are expected to show the most rapid population response to invasive Mule deer removal and restoration activities, since invasive Mule deer browsing disproportionately affects understory vegetation, which is essential for many breeding bird species during the nesting season (Chollet, Bergman, Gaston, & Martin, 2014). Acoustic monitoring provides a non-invasive, scalable method to document changes in bird community composition and relative abundance over time, enabling the Conservancy to link restoration interventions to breeding bird responses. This monitoring will assist the Conservancy in determining which rare or threatened birds are utilizing certain ecosystems

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

and find potential plant species that will increase biodiversity. Those plant species can be prioritized for adaptive management and future restoration.

The Conservancy will also monitor herpetofauna on the Island. There are many native herpetofauna on Catalina, more so than any of the other Channel Islands. Threats to their populations include disease, worsening drought conditions from climate change, and impacts from the invasive bullfrogs. Monitoring efforts would aim to address these threats, track population trends and document the impacts of island restoration efforts on these sensitive species

To capture long-term ecological trends, the Conservancy will revisit 60 legacy vegetation monitoring plots first established nearly 20 years ago (HRMP 5.3.2). These plots were previously assessed under historic vegetation mapping and habitat condition assessments and represent a range of elevations, aspects, and habitat types across the Island. This data will establish a quantitative baseline to compare with historical data, inform ecosystem change analyses, and prioritize restoration needs.

Island restoration on Catalina Island is a collaborative effort that engages diverse communities through education, workforce development, public outreach, and volunteerism. The Conservancy has scaled these initiatives to meet restoration needs and public interest while fostering stewardship and connection to the Island's biodiversity. Weekly volunteer events at the Ackerman Native Plant Nursery and "Restore and Explore" programs provide hands-on opportunities for conservation work, now including seed collection and invasive plant removal.

1673 (b6) – A detailed description of where the project will be carried out

Santa Catalina Island is located approximately 22 miles offshore from Southern California, with the most frequently used mainland access points being Long Beach, San Pedro, Dana Point, and Newport Beach. Monitoring and invasive plant and animal work will be completed across the entirety of the Island. Active Restoration work will be started in two locations within the next two years which is near the Airport and Haypress (Exhibit 2). Additional future active restoration sites beyond the first 200 acres are provided in HRMP in Figure 3-5.

1673 (b7) – Department Authorizations Sought

Under the Restoration Management Permit Act, the Conservancy is seeking authorization for take under 1672 b and e.

1673 (b8) – Baseline Conditions for all areas of project

A full description of the current conditions on the Island are found in the attached Habitat Restoration and Monitoring Plan (HRMP) pages 28-144 including geology (section 2.1.1), topography (2.1.2), climate (2.1.3), soil (2.1.4), plant diversity (2.3.1), vegetation communities (2.3.2), vegetation alliances and associations (2.3.3.), endemic taxa (2.4), and special-status plant and wildlife taxa (2.5). We have provided a recent analysis of landscape type in the below text. Dozens of plant and wildlife taxa (species, subspecies,

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

varieties) are endemic to the Channel Islands, meaning that they are found on one or more of the eight islands that make up the archipelago but not on the mainland, and some species are found only on Catalina Island. The project will positively influence all 60+ endemic species across the entirety of Catalina Island. The full list of all special-status species and listed species is found in section 2.5 of the HRMP.

The baseline condition of Catalina Island is strongly influenced by the long history of introduced ungulates. Catalina Island has been severely degraded by these introduced ungulates, of which the goats, sheep, cattle, and pigs have been removed (HRMP 2.2.1). This history remains today with a heavily degraded landscape of which much of the historical Island chaparral is reduced and less biodiverse largely due to damage caused by ungulates, including the remaining Mule deer.

Endemic species are often rare on the Island, which is the case with Catalina Island Mountain mahogany, Catalina Island Ironwoods, and the Catalina Island shrew. In many areas of the Island, invasive annual grasses and other invasive plant species such as flax leaved broom (*Genista linifolia*) dominate the landscape. The full description of the current Island conditions can be found in the HRMP section 2. Presently, all restoration activities occur exclusively in exclosures or in cages (~0.5% of Island). The continued presence of Mule deer prevents the full recovery ecosystems in other locations on the Island (HRMP 2.2.3., 2.2.4). There has been some limited recovery post pig and goat removal, but when fire occurs, drought and deer continue inhibit the growth of diverse ecosystems (HRMP Appendix C).

Many endemic island plants are preferentially consumed by invasive mule deer, thereby restricting their distribution from their natural habitat to difficult-to-access locations, such as sea bluffs, cliff faces in the interior of the island, and within thorny cactus patches (Junak, et al., 2012). This selective browsing decreases island biodiversity and increases the frequency of nonnative plants and other native plants that retained their herbivore defenses, such as lemonadeberry (*Rhus integrifolia*), toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*), white sage (*Salvia apiana*), black sage (*Salvia mellifera*), and prickly pear cactus (*Opuntia littoralis*). Many of these browse resistant plants are now more frequent in many areas of the island. Coastal Bluff Scrub, because of its inaccessibility to invasive ungulates is one of the best-preserved native vegetation communities on Catalina Island (Thorne, 1967).

Island vegetation lifeform (e.g., tree, shrub, herb) is responsive to long-term climatic trends (i.e., wetter, or drier periods of time) and impacts from invasive ungulate browsing, and to a lesser extent grazing and trampling from a small herd of bison. The introduced bison population is currently managed by the Conservancy through an immunocontraception program, with less than 80 individuals currently living on Catalina. Browsing pressure from invasive mule deer is magnified during periods of drought, as the animals are driven to consume less nutritious forage to survive, which impacts the limited island vegetation resources that grow below the browse line (e.g., green leaves and small stems within reach of mule deer to a height of about 4 to 5 feet).

Recent large fires, coupled with the impacts of drought and mule deer browsing, have significantly altered the vegetation structure on Catalina Island (HRMP - Appendix C). The

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

human-caused Empire Fire in 2006 and the Island Fire in 2007 collectively burned 12% of the island, with the latter being the largest recorded fire since 1915 (Exhibit 4). The Island Fire alone scorched 4,723 acres, surpassing the previous record set by the Goat Fire, which burned 285 acres. From 1985 to 2022, unburned watersheds saw a 5.2% decrease in barren soil cover and an 8.1% increase in shrub cover, which coincides with successful removal of feral goats and pigs between 1990 and 2005 (Exhibit 5). Tree cover increased from 40.2% to 48.7% in 1998 but then declined to 40.1% in 2022 following successive drought years from 2011 to 2016 and 2020 to 2022. While in watersheds that burned in the 2006 and 2007 fires, tree cover had increased from 52.0% in 1985 to 63.2% in 2005 (before the Empire Fire). However, 15 years after the fires tree cover has not recovered and is at 54% in 2022, 9.2% below pre-fire levels. Following fire, newly germinated plants from the native soil seed bank and basal resprouting shrubs and trees are subject to intense browsing pressure from mule deer (e.g., see Exhibit 6), even for plants that deer would not find palatable after they have grown to a mature size (e.g., chamise, *Adenostoma fasciculatum*) (Minnich, 1982; Ramirez, Pratt, Jacobsen, & Davis, 2012). The browsing pressure from mule deer on the Island is intensified during drought when forage is limited.

Impacts of introduced Flora

Invasive annual grasses and forbs have become a significant component of Catalina Island's flora, constituting approximately one-third of its species (see HRMP Table 2-4 and Appendix B). These nonnative plants compete with native vegetation for resources, often hindering the recruitment and growth of native species. For instance, a study by Knapp (2007a) documented a 30% reduction in island scrub oak cover between 1943 and 2005, potentially linked to the aggressive spread of invasive annual grasses. Research suggests that the presence of nonnative annual grasses can impede oak recruitment by outcompeting oak seedlings for water resources (Griffin, 1973; Bernhardt & Swiecky, 1991; Danielson & Halvorson, 1991).This competition may have contributed to inadequate regeneration of valley oaks in California during the 20th century. Given these findings, managing and controlling invasive plant species on Catalina Island is essential for preserving native plant communities and fostering the successful recruitment of key species such as island scrub oak.

Other common invasive plants on the island that impact ecosystem health include Italian thistle (*Carduus pycnocephalus*), sweet fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*), Harding grass (*Phalaris aquatica*), and Mediterranean broom (*Genista linifolia*). Mediterranean broom is particularly aggressive and has the potential to establish on most of the island (see Appendix D). First introduced in 1920 as a horticultural landscaping plant at the Saint Catherine Hotel at Descanso Beach that replaced the Banning home burned down in the 1915 Avalon Fire, Mediterranean broom has naturalized in the Avalon watershed, and as of 2015, has infested at least 9 percent of the island (Dion, 2018).

The Project is a voluntary restoration project undertaken by the Conservancy. No more than four acres out of nearly 205 acres of active restoration and 48,000 acres of passive

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

restoration will be used for mitigation in upcoming years. Currently, 0.72 acres of mitigation is being considered in the location depicted in Exhibit 2.

1673 (b9) – Description of how project satisfies the definition of qualifying restoration project

The Catalina Island Restoration Project is a "qualifying restoration project" because it is both a "Management" and a "Propagation" project with the exclusive purpose of restoring habitat for native fish, wildlife, plants, and their habitat. The Project will also have substantial net benefits for marine fish, wildlife, plants, and habitat.

The Project's activities qualify as both "Management" and "Propagation":

1. The fox monitoring and vaccination program is management because it helps aid the conservation and assists recovery of Island foxes through vaccinations and selective treatment of foxes with anti-parasite cream and antibiotics when needed. This program is also propagation because it aids in increasing fox population for conservation, scientific, and management purposes through vaccinations and selective treatment of foxes with anti-parasite cream and antibiotics when needed.
2. Invasive species control through the Invasive Plant Program qualifies as management because it is a restoration activity that will aid in the conservation and recovery of native plant species by reducing competition of invasives plants, and improves habitat of wildlife which aids in recovery of wildlife species. This work is also propagation because it is an activity that helps sustain or increases wildlife and plant populations by reducing competition of invasive plants for native plant species, which in turn improves habitat.
3. Growing native plants in a nursery followed by outplanting qualifies as management because it is a restoration activity in which native plants are put back on the landscape to aid in the recovery of native plants directly and native wildlife indirectly. This work is also propagation because it is an activity that helps both sustain and increase native plants directly and wildlife indirectly through improved habitat for scientific, conservation, and management purposes.
4. Bulking of seed and seeding on the landscape qualifies as management because it is a restoration activity in which native plants are put back on the landscape to aid in the recovery of native plants directly and native wildlife indirectly. This work is also propagation because it is an activity that helps both sustain and increase native plants directly and wildlife indirectly through improved habitat for scientific, conservation, and management purposes.
5. Monitoring of birds, lepidoptera, and small mammals qualifies as management because it is an activity that informs future adaptive management decisions around habitat restoration to continually improve the conservation and assist in the recovery of all listed wildlife species monitored. This work is also propagation because it is an activity that informs future management decisions around habitat

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

that helps sustain and increase all native wildlife for scientific, conservation, and educational purposes.

6. Removal of mule deer qualifies as management because it is an activity that removes a key invasive species that damages native plants and wildlife habitat which will improve the conservation and assist in recovery of native wildlife and plant species. This work is also propagation because it is an activity that helps sustain or increase native wildlife and plant populations for scientific, conservation, and management purposes by eliminating the threat of ecosystem transition from Chaparral to invasive grasslands.

Outlined below are the substantial net benefits above baseline conditions for each category.

Native Fish

Catalina Island only has 80.5 acres of freshwater and no native freshwater fish. However, its surrounding marine environment is exceptionally rich with nine of California's 124 Marine Protected Areas along its coast. Restoration on Catalina will reduce erosion and subsequent sedimentation entering nearshore waters, thereby improving habitat quality for native marine fish. Erosion is reduced and reversed through the recovery of vegetation cover on the landscape. Vegetation recovery and root stabilization bind roots to the soil, intercept rainfall, and slows ground cover runoff. Similar ecological responses have been seen on other islands that have removed nonnative ungulates. For example, after deer were removed from Santa Rosa Island, passive restoration resulted in 42.1 km2 of scrub, chaparral, and woodland vegetation recovery and a 31.2 km2 decrease in invasive grasslands and a 12.0 km2 of bare ground (Summers, Masukawa, & Hartman, 2018). Decreasing bareground and annual grasses, which lack stabilizing roots and canopy cover, help reduce erosion. Likewise, research on San Clemente Island, found that exotic herbivores dramatically altered the island's topography, increasing sediment yield, reducing infiltration, and heightening wind erosion (Longcore, MacDonald, & Wilson, 2020). Sedimentation from erosion directly affects kelp forests, reducing quality habitat of fish species (Foster & Schiel, 2010). Catalina's extensive kelp forests support the garibaldi (California's state marine fish), the critically endangered giant sea bass, and the California sheephead. By reducing erosion and sedimentation through island-wide restoration, Catalina's land and marine ecosystems will both benefit, fostering greater resilience and biodiversity across terrestrial and coastal habitats.

Native Wildlife

The Project will enhance native wildlife populations across Catalina Island through comprehensive restoration actions, including invasive plant and animal removal, active revegetation, and long-term ecological monitoring. These efforts will create and expand diverse native plant communities that provide critical refuge, foraging, and breeding habitat for wildlife. By restoring a more complex and resilient network of habitats, the

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Project will support a broader range of species and promote overall ecosystem biodiversity. Similar restoration initiatives on other islands have demonstrated measurable increases in wildlife diversity—particularly among invertebrates and birds—following the removal of non-native ungulates, underscoring the ecological benefits expected on Catalina .The Project will enhance bird abundance on the Island through expansion of critical habitat for certain species (Martin, Arcese, & Scheerder, 2011). Restoration efforts will aid the recovery of bird species through more abundance of critical plant species such as the Island scrub oak which is the exclusive nesting tree for the Catalina Hutton's vireo. Additionally, management recommendations for two of Catalinas endemic birds, the Catalina California quail (*Callipepla californica catalinensis*) and the Catalina Hutton's vireo (*Vireo huttoni unitti*), recognize the invasive mule deer as an ongoing threat to these species due to the habitat destruction they cause and suggest removing the deer from the Island (Shuford & Gardali, 2008).

It is well known, that plant biodiversity and abundance positively effects insect species (Southwood, 1978). Active restoration efforts and invasive plant removal will improve plant biodiversity and thus improve insect populations, which is critical on Catalina Island. Catalina is home to over 45 endemic insect species and thousands of other native species that will positively benefit from restoration. Mammals are also affected by insect abundance. An example is the very rare Catalina Island Shrew, which relies on diverse insect populations for food. Reduced food resources and habitat will further threaten this cryptic species. Deer removal will benefit insect abundance as well. For example, invasive deer also reduced species density and abundance of insects on Haida Gwaii (British Columbia, Canada) through changing the quality of leaf litter from less plant diversity over time (Allombert, Stockton, & Martin, 2005).

The Catalina Island Fox will benefit from the Project. Recent research on the Santa Rosa Island Fox, which is closely related to the Catalina Island Fox, indicated they select for Island Chapparal over grasslands. The Project reduces invasive grasses through herbicide treatments and seeding with native plants. In addition, the Catalina Island Fox will benefit through the removal of deer since Island Chapparal will slowly be replaced by grasslands unless deer are removed (Jacobsen, Pratt, Alleman, & Davis, 2018; Ramirez, Pratt, Jacobsen, & Davis, 2012; Summers, Masukawa, & Hartman, 2018). Notably, after all of the invasive introduced mammals were removed from Santa Cruz Island, the endemic and endangered Santa Cruz Island fox (*Urocyon littoralis santacruzae*) experienced the fastest recovery and delisting of any mammal in the history of the Endangered Species Act (Morrison, 2023).

Native Plants and Habitat

The Project will aid in further improving habitat and populations of native plant species. Seeding efforts include the following species which will improve their instance across the island while also improving wildlife habitat: Channel Island silver lotus, wild onion, Catalina manzanita, mugwort, island morning glory, Catalina mariposa lily, feltleaf ceanothus, Island bigpod ceanothus, Catalina mountain mahogany, summer holly, Catalina silverlace, island rush-rose, California rockflower, island bush poppy, blue dick,

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

southern monkeyflower, giant wild rye, California fuchsia, Trask's yerba santa, Saint Catherine's lace, island buckwheat, golden yarrow, cliff spurge, Catalina bedstraw, island snapdragon, toyon, heartleaf penstemon, fragrant pitcher sage, giant coreopsis, southern honeysuckle, lupine, California boxthorn, Catalina Island bushmallow, laurel sumac, southern islands mallow, bladderpod, Lyon's pygmydaisy, island cherry, Engelmann oak, island scrub oak, island oak, Macdonald oak, island redberry, lemonade berry, Catalina currant, white sage, black sage, Catalina figwort, purple needle grass, Catalina nightshade, and mission manzanita.

Invasive plant control will have a direct impact across the Island using the CIPP and additional invasive plant treatments at restoration sites. Reducing invasive grasses in restoration sites improves native chapparal recovery (Phillips & Allen, 2023). There is plenty of documentation that invasive plant species negatively affect native plant recruitment and increase type conversion (Dicknes & Allen, 2013; Weidlich, Florido, Sorrini, & Brancalion, 2020). The reduction of invasive plant species will allow for native habitat and plants to thrive. In our active restoration site, reducing invasive plant species (primarily invasive grasses) will improve overall restoration outcomes and improve native seed recruitment.

The removal of invasive mule deer will directly improve the Island's habitat and rare plant populations. A study on Catalina of post-fire regeneration for three woody resprouting plants (*Heteromeles arbutifolia, Rhus integrifolia,* and *Rhamnus pirifolia*) found that exposing these plants to mule deer resulted in an eight-fold increase in plant mortality. In plots protected by fencing only 11% of resprouts died, but in deer-exposed plots the die-off rose sharply to 88%. Deer browse also resulted in a greater than 93% reduction in canopy coverage among dominant shrub species, allowing for invasion by exotic species and vegetation type conversion (Ramirez, Pratt, Jacobsen, & Davis, 2012). Avalon Canyon, an area burned during the 2007 Island Fire, clearly displays how deer browse can alter landscapes post-fire. Areas outside of exclosures in the burned area are currently dominated by flax-leaved broom (*Genista linifolia*), a highly invasive Mediterranean plant that mule deer do not consume. In contrast, areas protected from deer browse with exclosurs after the fire supported native plants four times the size of those outside the exclosures (Jacobsen, Pratt, Alleman, & Davis, 2018). Island scrub oak recruitment is also hampered by deer. Island scrub oak (*Quercus pacific*) is thought to have covered a third of the Catalina as recently as the 1940s. In the intervening decades oak habitat has declined by 31%. This dieback is driven by several factors, but ongoing acorn predation by mule deer, is likely among the more significant impacts (Manuwal & Sweitzer, 2007).

The ecological damage that the mule deer cause to native plant populations on Catalina has been thoroughly documented (Manuwal & Sweitzer, 2007; Jacobsen, Pratt, Alleman, & Davis, 2018; Salladay & Ramirez, 2018; Stapp, Hamblen, Duncan, & King, 2022; Knapp, 2010; Dvorak & Catalano, 2016; Knapp, 2005; Ramirez, Pratt, Jacobsen, & Davis, 2012). The removal of livestock and feral animals from Catalina in the past has helped put the Island on a trajectory of recovery (Knapp, 2014) and the Conservancy has documented passive revegetation of the Island, but the species growing are deer-resistant species common across southern California, not the Catalina and Channel Islands endemic

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

species that are necessary for the full biodiversity of Catalina to be represented. Native plants on Catalina have less chemical and physical defenses than closely related mainland taxa and are therefore more susceptible to deer browse (Orians & Ward, 2010). This is because island varieties of plants have evolved without the presence of herbivores such as deer and therefore have evolved to deter browse. In a forage palatability trial comparing plants from ten matched taxonomic groups comprising samples from the mainland and Catalina, ungulates decisively favored island plants (Salladay & Ramirez, 2018).

Mule deer directly threaten endemic and rare plant species on Catalina for this reason. The flora of Catalina contains sixty-nine species or subspecies included in the California Native Plant Society's California Rare Plant Ranking system. There are nine Catalina endemic plants and thirty-seven Channel Islands endemic plants (including the Catalina endemics). Four species (*Cercocarpus traskiae*, *Pentachaeta lyonii*, *Sibara filifolia,* and *Crocanthemum greenei*) are federally listed endangered or threatened species. Two of these species (*Cercocarpus traskiae* and *Pentachaeta lyonii)* are listed as endangered by the state of California.

The island rush-rose (*Crocanthemum greenei*) is a federally threatened species found only on the Channel Islands. Following the 2007 Island Fire, growth and reproductive success of the island rush-rose was measured across the Island, within and outside protective exclosures. Populations exposed to deer browse showed markedly lower reproductive success, with 58% of those populations failing to produce any seeds. However, populations protected by exclosures contained plants of significantly larger size, and 100% of plants in exclosed populations successfully fruited, regenerating the soil seed bank (Dvorak & Catalano, 2016).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

In addition to achieving the Project's restoration objective, the Project is expected to yield important inadvertant benefits described below. These benefits are also detailed in HRMP Table 1-1.

Reducing the likelihood of wildfires: The restoration of native perennial vegetation is crucial in mitigating the risk of wildfires, particularly those fueled by "flashy" dry fuels from nonnative annual grasses and other plants. By replacing these highly flammable plants with less ignition prone native species, the Project can help reduce the likelihood of fire ignition and also slow the spread of wildfires if they do occur. This is particularly important for protecting both the community of Avalon and the Island's unique flora and fauna. By promoting a more fire-resilient ecosystem through reducing the chance of ignition from invasive grasslands, the Project can help create a safer and more sustainable future for Catalina Island, reducing the likelihood of catastrophic wildfires and their devastating impacts. Mitigating wildfire risk to native plant communities also enhances the Island's overall resilience to increasingly frequent drought events driven by climate change.

Enhancing habitat connectivity: By improving the quality and connectivity of habitats across the Island, the Project will help species adapt to climate change by providing them with the resources they need to move and survive in a changing environment.

Conserving soil: Reducing topsoil erosion is crucial for improving soil health, restoring native habitats, and protecting downstream sensitive species and cultural resources. To achieve this, the Project will implement erosion control measures and restore native vegetation in highly degraded areas. Researchers have shown that deeper soils can be held intact under shrublands when they would fail under grasslands. This will help stabilize slopes, increase water infiltration, and reduce sedimentation in waterways, ultimately protecting local water supplies and enhancing the resilience and sustainability of the Island's ecosystem.

Increasing carbon sequestration: The Project's focus on revegetation of native perennial vegetation communities, such as CSS, chaparral, and native bunch grasses, can help increase carbon sequestration, thereby mitigating the effects of climate change and improving the Island's resilience to its impacts. Increased carbon sequestration on the Island helps reduction of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

Increasing water retention and stormwater quality: Restoring native perennial vegetation can significantly improve the Island's water retention and infiltration capacity. This will help reduce stormwater runoff, decrease erosion, and increase groundwater recharge, ultimately benefiting the Island's freshwater supply. The restoration of deep-rooted native plants can also help capture and store more water in the soil, making it available for use by plants and animals during dry periods. In addition, increased water retention can help mitigate the impacts of drought and climate change on the Island's ecosystem, supporting Island ecosystem resilience and sustainability. Native vegetation will reduce the amount of nitrogen and suspended sediments in stormwater runoff.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Monitoring and adaptive management: By monitoring the success of the restoration efforts and adapting management strategies as needed, the Project can help ensure that the Island's ecosystem remains resilient to climate change and other stressors over the long term.

1673 (b10) – Department Authorizations Sought

Common name/Scientific Name	Proposed Authorized Take or Possession Limit	Proposed Authorized forms of Take or Possession	Method	Procedure
Catalina Island Fox (*Urocyon littoralis catalinae)*	Whole Island Population for vaccination/ monitoring; kill only in cases of humane euthanasia	Capture; Possess; Procedure; Release; Kill; Salvage	Trap; Baited; Chemical euthanasia; Net; Hand	Measure and Weigh; Non-invasive swabs; Sample, Blood; Vaccination; Tag, Passive Integrated Transponder (PIT), GPS collar, VHF collar, basic wound care; Chemical euthanasia
California Kingsnake (*Lampropeltis californiae)*	Whole Island Population	Capture; Procedure; Release; Salvage	Hand; Lasso; Cover Boards; Pitfall; Funnel trap; Net	Measure and Weigh; Non-invasive swabs; Tag, External Color Mark (Temporary)
California mountain kingsnake (*Lampropeltis zonata)*	Whole Island Population	Capture; Procedure; Release; Salvage	Hand; Lasso; Cover Boards; Pitfall; Funnel trap; Net	Measure and Weigh; Non-invasive swabs; Tag, External Color Mark (Temporary)

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Western skink (*Plestiodon skiltonianus)*	Whole Island Population	Capture; Procedure; Release; Salvage	Hand; Lasso; Cover Boards; Pitfall; Funnel trap; Net	Measure and Weigh; Non-invasive swabs; Tag, External Color Mark (Temporary); Toe clipping; Tail tissue samples
San Bernardino ring-necked snake (*Diadophis punctatus modestus)*	Whole Island Population	Capture; Procedure; Release; Salvage	Hand; Lasso; Cover Boards; Pitfall; Funnel trap; Net	Measure and Weigh; Non-invasive swabs; Tag, External Color Mark (Temporary)
San Diego alligator lizard (*Elgaria multicarinata webbii)*	Whole Island Population	Capture; Procedure; Release; Salvage	Hand; Lasso; Cover Boards; Pitfall; Funnel trap; Net	Measure and Weigh; Non-invasive swabs; Tag, External Color Mark (Temporary); Toe clipping; Tail tissue samples
Two-striped gartersnake (*Thamnophis hammondii)*	Whole Island Population	Capture; Procedure; Release; Salvage	Hand; Lasso; Cover Boards; Pitfall; Funnel trap; Net	Measure and Weigh; Non-invasive swabs; Tag, External Color Mark (Temporary)
Southern pacific rattlesnake (*Crotalus oreganus helleri)*	Whole Island Population	Capture; Procedure; Release; Salvage	Hand; Lasso; Cover Boards; Pitfall; Funnel trap; Net	Measure and Weigh; Non-invasive swabs; Tag, External Color Mark (Temporary)
Western side-blotched lizard (*Uta stansburiana)*	Whole Island Population	Capture; Procedure; Release; Salvage	Hand; Lasso; Cover Boards; Pitfall; Funnel trap; Net	Measure and Weigh; Non-invasive swabs; Tag, External Color Mark (Temporary); Toe clipping; Tail tissue samples
Baja California treefrog (*Pseudacris hypochondriaca)*	Whole Island Population	Capture; Procedure; Release; Salvage	Hand; Lasso; Cover Boards; Pitfall;	Measure and Weigh; Non-invasive swabs; Tag, External Color Mark (Temporary)

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

			Funnel trap; Net	
Garden slender salamander (*Batrachoseps major)*	Whole Island Population	Capture; Procedure; Release; Salvage	Hand; Lasso; Cover Boards; Pitfall; Funnel trap; Net	Measure and Weigh; Non-invasive swabs; Tag, External Color Mark (Temporary)
Arboreal salamander	Whole Island Population	Capture; Procedure; Release; Salvage	Hand; Lasso; Cover Boards; Pitfall; Funnel trap; Net	Measure and Weigh; Non-invasive swabs; Tag, External Color Mark (Temporary)
Catalina Island ground squirrel (*Otospermophilus beecheyi nesioticus)*	Whole Island Population; Kill only in case of inadvertent take	Capture; Possess; Procedure; Release; Kill; Salvage	Cover Boards; Trap, Pitfall; Trap, Box, or Cage (e.g. Sherman or Tomahawk); Baited	Measure and Weigh; Tag, External Color Mark (Temporary), PIT, fur clipping, metal ear tagging; Sample collection, fur, whisker, feces; Non-invasive swabs
Santa Catalina Island shrew (*Sorex ornatus willetti)*	Whole Island Population; Kill only in case of inadvertent take	Capture; Possess; Procedure; Release; Kill; Salvage	Cover Boards; Trap, Pitfall; Trap, Box, or Cage (e.g. Sherman or Tomahawk); Baited	Measure and Weigh; Tag, External Color Mark (Temporary), PIT, fur clipping, metal ear tagging; Sample collection, fur, whisker, feces; Non-invasive swabs
Santa Catalina Island deer mouse (*Peromyscus maniculatus catalinae)*	Whole Island Population; Kill only in case of inadvertent take	Capture; Possess; Procedure; Release; Kill; Salvage	Cover Boards; Trap, Pitfall; Trap, Box, or Cage (e.g. Sherman or Tomahawk); Baited	Measure and Weigh; Tag, External Color Mark (Temporary), PIT, fur clipping, metal ear tagging; Sample collection, fur, whisker, feces; Non-invasive swabs

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Santa Catalina harvest mouse (*Reithrodontomys megalotis catalinae)*	Whole Island Population; Kill only in case of inadvertent take	Capture; Possess; Procedure; Release; Kill; Salvage	Cover Boards; Trap, Pitfall; Trap, Box, or Cage (e.g. Sherman or Tomahawk); Baited	Measure and Weigh; Tag, External Color Mark (Temporary), PIT, fur clipping, metal ear tagging; Sample collection, fur, whisker, feces; Non-invasive swabs
Mojave dotted-blue butterfly (*Euphilotes mojave)*	No more than 5 per year	Capture; Possess; Release; Kill; Salvage	Spotlight; Night lights; Nets	Measure and Weight; Sample collection
Crotch bumble bee (*Bombus crotchii)*	No more than 5 per year	Capture; Possess; Release; Kill; Salvage	Spotlight; Night lights; Nets	Measure and Weight; Sample collection
Monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus)*	No more than 5 per year	Capture; Possess; Release; Kill; Salvage	Spotlight; Night lights; Nets	Measure and Weight; Sample collection
Catalina mountainsnail (*Radiocentrum avalonense)*	No more than 5 per year	Capture; Possess; Release; Kill; Salvage	Spotlight; Night lights; Nets	Measure and Weight; Sample collection
Santa Catalina lancetooth snail (*Haplotrema catalinense)*	No more than 5 per year	Capture; Possess; Release; Kill; Salvage	Spotlight; Night lights; Nets	Measure and Weight; Sample collection
Mule Deer (*Odocoileus hemionus)*	Whole Island Population	Capture; Procedure; Possess; Release; Kill	Bait; Firearm (e.g. Centerfire Rifle/Shotgun); Gun, Airgun (e.g. Rifle, Pistol); Drop Net; Spot-Lighting/Night-Lighting,	Anesthetize/Chemical Immobilization; Humanely Euthanize; Medical/Surgical Procedure; Sample, Blood; Tag, Ear; Tag, GPS Collar

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

			Detection dogs; Trap	
Catalina mountain-mahogany (*Cercocarpus traskiae)*	< 5% of each plant	Take (seed, air layering, and vegetative collection), Possession (micropropagation, grow, hydroponics/ aeroponics, and seed storage)	Hand	N/A
Lyon's pentachaeta (*Pentachaeta lyonii)*	< 5% of each plant	Take (seed, and vegetative collection), Possession (micropropagation, grow, hydroponics/ aeroponics, and seed storage)	Hand	N/A
Beach Spectacle-pod (*Dithyrea maritima*)	< 5% of each plant	Take (seed, and vegetative collection), Possession (micropropagation, grow, hydroponics/ aeroponics, and seed storage)	Hand	N/A
San Clemente Island Lotus (*Acmispon dendroideus var. traskiae*)	< 5% of each plant	Take (seed, and vegetative collection), Possession (micropropag	Hand	N/A

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

		ation, grow, hydroponics/ aeroponics, and seed storage)		

Catalina Island Fox (RW 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and 4.1) - Covered activities surrounding the Catalina Island fox allow for the Conservancy's annual fox vaccination and monitoring program. Capture is completed using modified Tomahawk #106 single-door live traps baited with dry and canned cat food and loganberry lure. When foxes are captured they are handled by a wildlife biologist (approved by Director of Conservation) who may perform the following procedures: draw blood, vaccinate, weigh/measure, tag, collar, apply topical anti-parasitic treatment, administer subcutaneous fluids, clean eyes and apply optic ointment, and address mild injuries in the field including the application of topical and injectable antibiotics. All deceased foxes are collected and assessed for the cause of death. Foxes that are in good condition with unknown cause of death will be sent in for necropsy analysis by scientists at UC Davis. In some cases, when foxes are injured, an injectable agent may be used to humanely euthanize and reduce pain/suffering. Euthanized foxes will be sent to UC Davis for necropsy.

Herpetofauna (RW 4.9) - Covered activities for herpetofauna on the Island include monitoring. Throughout the Island, cover boards and other techniques are used to estimate populations of herpetofauna. Once found, herpetofauna are weighed and measured by hand. In some cases, herpetofauna who are deceased are salvaged. These are sent to the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles for biobanking, used for genetic analysis or kept on site and sent in for research/analysis.

Small Mammals (RW 4.8) - Small mammals will be captured using pit fall traps, Sherman traps, and Tomahawk cage traps. Cage/box traps will use bait alone, and pitfall traps will use bait and drift fences to attract small mammals to traps. The only mortality will be inadvertant, and all traps will be checked frequently. Any inadvertant mortality will be sent to the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles for biobanking. All small mammals will be measured and released afterward. See the workplan for details on all handling procedures and techniques. The goal of any trapping will be to document and measure Catalina's unique small mammal inhabitants.

Invasive Mule Deer (RW 3.5)- Mule deer will be dispatched via shooting on foot or from a land vehicle, by net capture with aerial and ground teams, thermal detection, surgical sterilization, baiting, and both daytime and nighttime dispatch. Deer will be located using thermal imagery, detection dogs who will locate and bay, and aerial detection. No deer will be dispatched using aerial firearms. Deer will be captured using nets from air and ground in order to reach deer in remote locations and for the purpose of surgical sterilization during the sentinel phase. In remote locations, deer will be captured by aerial nets followed by euthanasia. In Avalon, deer will primarily be chemically demobilized, followed

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

by euthanasia along with dispatching with an air rifle. Meat may be recovered and used for the California Condor recovery program, depending on funding. Locals and tribal partners may harvest meat separately from this permit through the ongoing Private Lands Management Program if there is a desire.

The methods will follow the American Veterinary Medical (AVMA) Guidelines for the Depopulation of Animals (AVMA, 2020). No snares or poison would be used for the project.

During deer removal operations there will be continuous open communication between the Conservancy, local law enforcement, and the contractor to keep necessary people well informed regarding field activities to avoid conflicts. Proper topography or elevation will always be used to provide a safe earthen backdrop. In urban environments, elevated positions will be utilized to provide an earthen backdrop. In human populated areas, deer will primarily be taken using chemical immobilization. Dispatch operations will cease immediately if unsafe conditions exist (e.g., unauthorized personnel in operational areas). Operations will not be resumed until conditions are deemed safe. Detection dogs will be with a handler and trained to be deer specific to avoid any inadvertant take of the Catalina Island fox.

Plants (RW 2.9) - This authorization covers the collection of propagation material from the four federally and state-listed species Catalina Island mountain mahogany (*Cercocarpus traskiae*), Lyon's pentachaeta (*Pentachaeta lyonii*), Beach Spectacle-pod (*Dithyrea maritima*), and San Clemente Island Lotus (*Acmispon dendroideus var. traskiae*) occurring on Santa Catalina Island, Los Angeles County, California.

While researchers are exploring the benefits of sourcing seeds from bioclimatic regions that match future climate scenarios for habitat restoration (Ramalho, Byrne, & Yates, 2017; Vitt, et al., 2022), the Conservancy will only use the wild collection of seeds from Catalina Island itself (Garrambone & Saroa, 2020). This approach maintains local genetic integrity and ensures the use of plants adapted to the island's unique conditions, which is crucial given the Channel Islands' relative climatic stability and high rate of endemism. The only exception is the Catalina Mountain Mahogany in which a tree exists at the Blake Estate in Berkeley and another at the California Botanic Garden. Both these tree were sourced from Catalina Island and could be another source of genetic diversity.

During wild seed collection, best practices will be followed, such as collecting at the appropriate time for each species, limiting collection to a maximum of 5 to 10% of individual plants' seed production, and collecting from no more than 5 to 10% of individuals in a population. To ensure genetic diversity, seeds will be collected from a variety of plants within each population. The genetic integrity of plant populations will be preserved by bulk-producing seeds for restoration efforts from Santa Catalina Island populations, and potentially other Channel Islands populations if necessary. This approach will protect the unique genetics of Catalina Island populations and prevent the introduction of mainland genetics that could outcompete or overshadow the native genetics.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

For all plant materials grown in nursery, the Conservancy will review and implement restoration design considerations and best management practices (BMPs) to help prevent pathogen contamination, as published by the "Working Group for Phytophthoras in Native Habitats" (www.calphytos.org), when there is a risk of introduction and spread of plant pathogens in site plantings.

The Conservancy will review and implement decontamination protocols to prevent the spread of pathogens among amphibians or other aquatic animals when working in aquatic habitats that may support native amphibians. Gear and equipment that may contact water will be cleaned and decontaminated to prevent the spread of chytrid fungus, following protocols in Aquatic Invasive Species Disinfection/Decontamination Protocols, CDFW.

For Catalina Mountain Mahogany, non-hybrid vegetative plant tissue will be collected from up to the last seven remaining individuals. Material collection will occur in the fall and will not exceed five percent of the material from any single plant, nor five percent of the total remaining population. Each cutting will be accessioned by source plant and replicate. Pruners and razor blades will be flame-sterilized and treated with 95 percent isopropyl alcohol before each cutting. Micropropagation trials will be conducted on wild cuttings to determine the most effective sterilization chemicals, concentrations, and exposure times to produce clean propagules free of microbial contamination with minimal tissue damage. Propagules will be multiplied to create a library of individual clones, and nutrient formulation trials will be conducted to optimize macro- and micronutrients, vitamins, and growth regulator concentrations. Clean propagules will be inoculated into sterilized culture vessels containing pre-formulated nutrient agar. Data will be collected on new leaf and shoot production, percent chlorosis, vitrification, and callus formation. Rhizogenesis trials will follow, testing different phytohormone mixtures and concentrations to promote root initiation. Rooting trials will be monitored for rooting percentage, chlorosis, vitrification, and callus formation. Plants may be grown by the Conservancy through pottings, hydroponics, micropropagation, or aeroponics.

For Lyon's pentachaeta, mature seed will be collected directly from wild individuals prior to natural dispersal, without clipping the flower heads, by gently extracting seeds by hand. No more than five percent of the seed produced by any individual plant will be collected in a given year, with collections spread evenly across available population(s) whenever feasible to maintain genetic representation. Gloves will be worn and changed between populations to prevent the spread of pathogens or invasive species. All seeds will be labeled with source population identifiers, GPS coordinates, collection date, collector name, and relevant site conditions. A portion of the seed will be used for germination trials to determine optimal propagation methods, including potential pre-treatments such as cold stratification or alternating temperature regimes. The remainder will be cleaned, dried, and stored in a climate-controlled seed bank, with duplicate samples placed in accredited conservation seed repositories. Germination trials will record germination percentage,

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

time to germination, seedling vigor, and survival rates under nursery conditions. Newly discovered populations will be vouchered if there are more than 10 individuals.

For beach spectacle pod and San Clemente Island Lotus, both species have not been seen on the Island for decades, but if found seed will be collected on the Island. No more than 5% of seed will be collected for either species.

All data collected for species will be stored in the Catalina Island Conservancy's central data repository and made available to agency partners or collaborators upon request. Five year summary reports will be submitted to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, detailing collection activities, propagation trial results, and the disposition of all plant material. These records will serve both as compliance documentation and as a resource for advancing best practices in rare plant conservation.

All other plants that are not state listed will follow similar protocols (RW 2.4, 2.5; HRMP 4.5.2, 4.5.3). For any plant considered rare, no more than 5% will be collected from an individual/population. Although for common species, up to 10% may be collected. Collections can include seed, cuttings, and air layering. Plants will be grown on-Island, stored in a climate-controlled environment and bulked off-Island by a certified grower with proper biosecurity measures in place to eliminate the risk of genetic contamination. Plants on-Island can be farmed for seed, planted in pots, or grown using micropropagation, hydroponics, or aeroponics. Once plant seed is bulked it will be reseeded on the landscape, which is outlined in the workplan.

1673 (b12) – Copy of any other federal, state, or local permit for project

Take of Santa Catalina Island fox is authorized in accordance with the most current amendment of federal permit ES-090990.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Bibliography

Allombert, S., Stockton, S., & Martin, J.-L. (2005). A Natural Experiment on the Impact of Overabundant Deer on Forest Invertebrates. *Conservation Biology, 19*(6), 1917-1929.

Bernhardt, E., & Swiecky, T. (1991). Minimum input techniques for valley oak restocking. *U.S. Forest Service General Technical Report*, 2-8.

Chollet, S., Bergman, C., Gaston, A., & Martin, J. (2014). Long-term consequences of invasive deer on songbird communities: Going from bad to worse? *Biological Invasions*, 17:777-790.

Danielson, K., & Halvorson, W. (1991). Valley oak seedling growth associated with selected grass species. *U.S. Forest Service General Technical Report*, 126.

Dicknes, S., & Allen, E. (2013). Exotic plant invasion alters chaparral ecosystem resistance and resilience pre- and post-wildfire. *Biological Invasions*, 16 pgs. 1119-1130.

Dion, B. (2018). Flax-leaf broom on Catalina Island. *Dispatch CAL-IPC*, 26(2).

Dvorak, T. M., & Catalano, A. E. (2016). Exclusion of introduced deer increases size and seed production success in an island-endemic plant species. *Ecology and Evolution, 6*(2), 544-551.

Fernandez-Palacios, J. M., Kreft, H., Irl, S. D., Norder, S., Ah-Peng, C., Borges, P. A., . . . Drake, D. R. (2021). Scientists' warning - The outstanding biodiversity of islands is in peril. *Global Ecology and Conservation*, Volume 31.

Foster, M. S., & Schiel, D. R. (2010). Loss of predators and the collapse of southern California kelp forests (?): Alternatives, explanations, and generalizations. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 59-70.

Garrambone, M., & Saroa, S. (2020). Seed-based Restoration: Scaling up for the Future. *Fremontia*, 48:1.

Griffin, J. (1973). Valley oaks: the end of an era? *Fremontia*, 1:5-9.

Jacobsen, A. L., Pratt, R. B., Alleman, D., & Davis, S. D. (2018). Post-fire ecophysiology of endemic chaparral shrub seedlings from Santa Catalina Island, Southern California. *Madrono*, 106-116.

Junak, S., Knapp, D., Haller, J., Philbrick, R., Schoenherr, A., & Keeler-Wolf., T. (2012). The California Channel Islands. *Terrestrial Vegetation of California 3rd Edition*.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Knapp, D. A. (2005). Rare Plants in the Goat Harbor Burn Area. *Proceedings of the Sixth California Islands Symposium* (pp. 205-211). Ventura: Institute for Wildlife Studies and National Park Service.

Knapp, D. A. (2010). Changes in oak distribution and density by decade on Santa Catalina Island, 1943.

Knapp, D. A. (2014). Ecosystem Restoration on Santa Catalina Island: A Review of Potential Approaches and the Promise of Bottom-Up Invader Management. *Monographs of the Western North American Naturalist, 7*(1), 421-434.

Longcore, T., MacDonald, B., & Wilson, J. P. (2020). *Reconstruction of Historical Topography to Estimate Erosion and Model Historical Vegetation Distribution on San Clemente Island, California*. UCLA Institute of the Environment and Sustainability.

Manuwal, T., & Sweitzer, R. (2007). *Browse Impacts of Introduced Mule Deer to Island Scrub Oak Habitats on Santa Catalina Island, California*. Avalon: Catalina Island Conservancy.

Martin, T. G., Arcese, P., & Scheerder, N. (2011). Browsing down our natural heritage: Deer impacts on vegetation structure and songbird populations across an island archipelago. *Biological Conservation, 144*(1), 459-469.

Minnich, R. (1982). Grazing, fire, and management of vegetation on Santa Catalina Island, California. *Proceedings of the symposium on the dynamics and management of Mediterranean-type ecosystems*, 444-449.

Morrison, S. (2023, October 17). Letter of Support for the Catalina Island Conservancy's Catalina Island Restoration Project.

Orians, C., & Ward, D. (2010). Evolution of plant defenses in nonindigenous environments. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 55:439-459.

Phillips, M. L., & Allen, E. B. (2023). Invasive grass density negatively impacts chaparral seedling establishment. *Restoration Ecology*, 32(3).

Powell, J. (1994). Biogeography of Lepidoptera on the California Channel Islands. *The Fourth California Islands Symposium: Update on the Status of Resources*, 449-464.

Powell, J. (2001). Lepidoptera recorded on Santa Catalina Island. In C. Schwemm, & T. Coonan, *Status and ecology of deer mice (Peromyscus maniculatus subsp.) on Anacapa, Santa Barbara and San Miguel Islands, California: Summary of monitoring 1992-2000.* National Park Service.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Powell, J. (2012). *Lepidoptera recorded on Santa Catalina Island*.

Ramalho, C., Byrne, M., & Yates, C. (2017). A climate-oriented approach to support decision-making for seed provenance in ecological restoration. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, Vol5, Article 95.

Ramirez, A. R., Pratt, R. B., Jacobsen, A. L., & Davis, S. D. (2012). Exotic deer diminish post-fire resilience of native shrub communities on Santa Catalina Island, southern California. *Plant Ecology, 213*, 1037-1047.

Salladay, R. A., & Ramirez, A. R. (2018). Reduced Defenses and Increased Herbivore Preference of Island Chaparral Shrubs Compared to Mainland Relatives. *Western North American Naturalist, 78*(4), 768-776.

Shuford, W. D., & Gardali, T. (Eds.). (2008). *California Bird Species of Special Concern Book*. Western Field Ornithologists, California Department of Fish and Game.

Southwood, T. (1978). *Ecological methods: with particular reference to the study of insect populations*. New York: Wiley.

Stapp, P., Hamblen, E., Duncan, C. L., & King, J. L. (2022). Status of the Introduced Mule Deer Population on Catalina Island, California, Based on Annual Spotlight Counts. *Proceedings of the Vertebrate Pest Conference*, *30*.

Summers, R., Masukawa, J., & Hartman, B. D. (2018). The Influence of Slope on Vegetation Recovery Following Nonnative Grazer Removal on Santa Rosa Island, California. *Western North American Naturalist*, 78(4):787-798.

Thorne, R. (1967). A Flora of Santa Catalina Island, California. *Aliso: A Journal of Systematic and Floristic Botany*, 6:3(2).

Vitt, P., Finch, J., Barak, R., Braum, A., Frischie, S., & Redlinski., I. (2022). Under the guise of science: how the US Forest Service deployed settler. *Environmental Sociology*, 8(2), 134-148.

Weidlich, E. W., Florido, F. G., Sorrini, T. B., & Brancalion, P. H. (2020). Controlling invasive plant species in ecological restoration: A global review. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 1806-1817.

Whitby, S., Novossiolova, T., Walther, G., & Dando, M. (2015). *Preventing Biological Threats: What You Can Do*. West Yorkshire, UK: Bradford Disarmament Research Center.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit 1

Map depicting Catalina Island and various ownership




Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit 2

First and second location of most intensive restoration work.





Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit 3 – Exclosed herbicide testing site






Exhibit 4 - Vegetation Cover in 1985, 2007 after two large fires, and 2022.



Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Tree Cover Increased and Barren Cover Decreased Between 1985 and 2022 Following Feral Goat and Pig Removal beginning in the 1990s. However, Tree Cover Has Not Fully Recovered in the 15 Years Since the 2006 and 2007 Due to Drought and Mule Deer Browsing Impacts. See HRMP Appendix C for more detail.

Exhibit 5 - Tree Cover has not recovered in Watersheds that Burned in the 2006 Empire and 2007 Island Fires, see HRMP Appendix C for more details.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Exhibit 6 - An Island Scrub Oak plant is unable to recover after the 2003 Airport Fire because of mule deer browsing basal resprouts (May 19, 2003 after Airport fire).



Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit 4 – Catalina Island Restoration Project 10-Year Workplan (2026-2035)

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Catalina Island Restoration Project
10-Year Workplan (2026-2035)



Prepared by the Catalina Island Conservancy Conservation Department

Principal Investigator: Lauren Dennhardt, Ph.D., Senior Director of Conservation

Updated: December 2025

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Contents

1. Introduction....4
2. Landscape-Level Active Restoration....4
2.1. Introduction....4
2.2. Fence building....5
2.3. Initial Herbicide Application....5
2.4. Collect Seeds for Application and Growing Plants for Outplantings....8
2.5 Bulk Low Diversity Cover Crop Plants....11
2.6. Apply Low Diversity Cover Crop Plant Palette Natives to Landscape....12
2.7. High Diversity Seed Mix Bulk and Application....13
2.8. Expand Invasive Plant Treatment Beyond Exclosures....15
2.9 Rare Plant Propagation Recovery and Monitoring....16
3. Biosecurity Measures in Place to Reduce Threats to Ecosystem....19
3.1. High Priority Invasive Plant Removal....19
3.2. Annual Island-Wide Fox Monitoring 2026-2035....21
3.3. Infectious Fox Disease Surveillance....22
3.4. Fox Mortality Monitoring and Threat Reduction....23
3.5. Invasive Mule Deer....24
4. Monitoring and Documentation....34
4.1. Fox annual reporting....35
4.2. Measure changes to active restoration sites....35
4.3. Island-Wide Lepidoptera Survey....36
4.4. Report on Key Findings on Restoration Project....37
4.5. Landscape level monitoring across 60 plots....38
4.6. Bird Acoustic Surveys....39
4.7. Shrew Surveys....41
4.8. Small Mammal Surveys....43
4.9. Herpetofauna Surveys....44
5. Outreach, Education, Engagement, and Workforce Development....45

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

5.1. Volunteer Events 45
5.2. Workforce Development 46
5.3. Public Outreach 46
5.4. Education 46
6. Exhibits 47
Exhibit 1: 10-acre Restoration Testing Site 47
Exhibit 2: 105 acre Restoration Location 48
Exhibit 3: Second Major Location for Restoration 49
Exhibit 4: 2024 Fox Traplines and Trap Locations 50
Exhibit 5: 60 Legacy Long-Term Vegetation Monitoring Plots 51
Exhibit 6: Song Bird Acoustic Monitoring Sites 52
Literature Cited 53

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

1. Introduction

The Catalina Island Restoration Project (Project) aims to restore ecological integrity on Santa Catalina Island, 88 percent (42,135 acres) of which is owned and managed by the Catalina Island Conservancy (Conservancy) in Los Angeles County, California. The Project focuses on mitigating ecological threats posed by invasive plant species, human-caused fire ignition, nonnative ungulates, and a changing climate, which have collectively led to biodiversity loss, erosion, decreased water capture, and reduced habitat quality. The Conservancy plans to begin the Project in 2026 and is committed to continuing it through 2035. This document covers the first ten years of the Project which will extend beyond the first 10 years. The Conservancy will submit a new permit application at the end of the 10 years if necessary.

The first 10 years of the Project aim to refine broad invasive plant treatments followed by seeding native species within an enclosed 10-acre site. That site will be broadened to 105 acres before starting a second major restoration location. Critically, to reduce detrimental impacts from the high rate of dispersal of invasive species, active restoration will be paired with extensive biosecurity measures, such as invasive plant treatments and mortality tracking and a vaccination program for the Catalina Island fox. The Project is built on a foundation of adaptive management with two scales of monitoring occurring: 1) Island-wide and 2) active restoration focused. Finally, invasive mule deer will be removed from the landscape to allow for Island-wide passive restoration and active habitat restoration to occur. Together, all aspects of the Project will ensure a safer and more biodiverse Catalina Island for all – ultimately removing cages and fencing from the landscape and expanding rich biodiversity to all of the Island. This Project is one of the greatest gifts the Conservancy can bestow on future generations.

2. Landscape-Level Active Restoration

2.1. Introduction

Starting in 2026, the Conservancy plans to prepare for landscape-level restoration by beginning with its top-of-watershed approach (Habitat Restoration Management Plan (HRMP), section 1.3.6). Restoring the upper reaches of a watershed allows for natural processes such as gravity and water and wind flow to disperse seed downhill. For any species recovery or habitat restoration work that begins while invasive mule deer (deer) are still present, an exclosure will be necessary. The Conservancy will begin testing the application of herbicides at a landscape scale to test the efficacy of invasive seed bank reduction on the landscape (HRMP 4.8). The Conservancy will then collect and begin bulking of native seeds for a low diversity cover crop plant palette (HRMP 4.5), develop

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

protocols for rare plant propagation, and continue invasive plant management (HRMP Appendix A).

2.2. Fence building

Since deer will remain on the landscape in the early stages of the Project, it will be necessary to install fencing to exclude them from active restoration areas—particularly in areas where native seeds are expected to germinate following invasive plant treatment. This is especially important for rare endemic species that have lost their natural defenses against herbivory. If a fence is not constructed, the native seed bank could begin to germinate and could inadvertently deplete many native plants above ground as well as in the soil seed bank. As part of the site preparation phase for long-term native habitat restoration, a targeted herbicide application strategy will be implemented across the fenced 10-acre site identified in Exhibit 1. This site has been selected because it is within 105 acres (identified in Exhibit 2) of high priority top of a watershed location identified in the HRMP (section 3.4) that would positively impact restoration efforts both downstream and Island-wide. The 10-acre site could be located anywhere within the 105 acres identified in Exhibit 2 as needed.

The aim is to complete the construction of the fence within the first quarter of 2026 so herbicide applications can begin afterward.

2.3. Initial Herbicide Application

The 10-acre active restoration location has a high density of invasive annual grasses, which severely limits native species recruitment and contributes to elevated wildfire risk, erosion, and degraded ecological function. Many of the planned active restoration sites have a high cover of invasive annual grasses which makes these locations ideal to refine the Project's invasive plant treatment methodology. The initial herbicide treatment will consist of broadcast applications of Poast® (active ingredient: Sethoxydim), a monocot selective, post-emergent herbicide registered for use on wildland and restoration sites to control weedy C4 and C3 annual grasses, including *Brachypodium* spp., *Bromus* spp., *Avena* spp., and *Schismus* spp. All of these species have benefited from the presence of deer on the Island. Applicators may shift herbicide use to a similar monocot specific herbicide such as Fusilade II or utilize a broad-spectrum herbicide if needed. Poast® herbicide specifically targets grass species without significantly impacting broadleaf plants or native forbs. These monocot selective herbicides, do not contain a surfactant and will be mixed with a crop oil concentrate such as Agridex® (active ingredient: Paraffinic oil, ethoxylated sorbitan fatty acid ester, sorbitan fatty acid ester) or a methylated/modified seed oil such as Glacier-EA® (active ingredient: Methylated seed oil, Polyoxyethylene polyol fatty acid ester and Butyl lactate) as necessary based on the herbicide label instructions.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- Application Method: Herbicide will be applied using a UTV-mounted boom sprayer for efficiency and even coverage over large areas. Spray rigs are calibrated to ensure application rates are consistent with the label rates. All herbicides will be applied by trained applicators and in accordance with all California Department of Pesticide Regulation and County of Los Angeles Agricultural Commissioner regulations.
- Frequency: two or three applications per growing season, depending on precipitation timing and target species phenology, will be implemented for three consecutive years. Variable precipitation could result in fewer or greater applications if necessary. Intervals will follow best practices to align with invasive grass emergence and seed set stages. Application will not occur during conditions that are not conducive to application (high winds, high temperatures, etc.)
- Timing: Treatments are expected to occur between February and May, depending on seasonal rainfall and grass growth stages.

To address the possible post-treatment issue of secondary invasion by non-native forbs, a randomized experimental plot design will be implemented within the 10-acre site. In plots where invasive forbs establish dominance following grass suppression (e.g., *Brassica nigra*, *Hirschfeldia incana*, *Erodium* spp., etc.), a broad-spectrum herbicide, such as Glyphosate, or a broadleaf specific herbicide, such as triclopyr, may be used in accordance with label guidelines and under appropriate environmental conditions.

To evaluate the effectiveness of different herbicide treatments in controlling invasive plant species within a 10-acre exclosure, the Conservancy will use a randomized block design with replication. The experiment will compare a monocot-specific herbicide, a broad-spectrum herbicide, and a no-treatment control over three years to determine the most effective approach for site preparation in large-scale restoration.

Design Overview

1. Design Type: Randomized Block Design
2. Location: 10-acre exclosure
3. Number of Treatments: Three
    - Treatment A – Monocot-specific herbicide (e.g. Poast, active ingredient Sethoxydim)
    - Treatment B – Broad-spectrum herbicide (e.g. Rodeo, active ingredient Glyphosate)

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- Treatment C – No-treatment control

4. Number of Blocks: 20
5. Replication: Each treatment will be applied once per block, resulting in 20 replicates per treatment.

The 10-acre site will be divided into 20 equal-sized blocks arranged in a grid pattern, with each block measuring approximately 0.5 acres. Each block will contain three treatment plots, randomly assigned to Treatments A, B, or C. This layout ensures that environmental variation (e.g., soil type, slope, moisture) is accounted for by distributing treatments evenly across the site. The treatments are listed below.

1. Treatment A – Monocot-specific herbicide
    - Product: Sethoxydim (Poast)
    - Application Rate: 1%–1.5% in solution
    - Adjuvant: Crop oil concentrate or methylated seed oil at 1%
    - Potential for two separate application rates (1% and 1.5%) if differences are expected to be meaningful.
2. Treatment B – Broad-spectrum herbicide
    - Product: Glyphosate (Rodeo or AquaMaster)
    - Application Rate: 2% solution
    - Adjuvant: Approved surfactant at label rate.
3. Treatment C – Control
    - No herbicide application.
    - Standard monitoring for natural changes in vegetation cover.

Herbicide will be applied via UTV-mounted spray rig to ensure consistent coverage. Applications will follow label instructions and be conducted under suitable weather conditions to minimize drift. All applicators will hold a Qualified Applicator License (QAL) or have been trained by a Conservancy QAL holder.

Example of treatment rotation within blocks:

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Block	Plot 1	Plot 2	Plot 3
1	A	B	C
2	B	C	A
3	C	A	B
…	…	…	…
20	A	C	B

All herbicide applications will be monitored annually and will rely on the monitoring plan outlined in the monitoring section of this document. The herbicide program will be monitored annually for efficacy, plant community response, and soil disturbance. Data collected will inform adaptive adjustments to:

- Application frequency and rates
- Need for subsequent herbicide treatments
- Timing of native seed introduction

All applications will comply with label requirements, pesticide handler safety standards, and reporting obligations to the LA County Agricultural Commissioner.

2.4. Collect Seeds for Application and Growing Plants for Outplantings

Native seed collection and bulking will be implemented to support the re-establishment of native vegetation following invasive species removal and to provide a genetically appropriate, island-adapted seed source for restoration seeding (HRMP 4.5).

The first set of wild seeds collected during this phase will be used to implement native seeding at the fenced 10-acre site identified in Exhibit 1. Following invasive species treatment, this site will serve as the first application area for early colonizer native species selected for their ability to rapidly establish on degraded soils, suppress invasive annual grasses, and initiate early-stage recovery processes (HRMP 4.5.6). These species function as short-term native cover while longer-term successional dynamics reestablish. However, some late successional species, such as endemic buckwheats, colonize sites early after ungulates are no longer a threat, as observed in past exclosures.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Seeds will be sourced from native plant populations across Santa Catalina Island to preserve the genetic diversity and ecological specificity of the Island's flora (HRMP 4.5.2). Collected material will be used for both direct broadcast seeding and propagation. Seedlings will be grown at the Conservancy's Ackerman Native Plant Nursery to support container-based outplantings (HRMP 4.11). To meet volume needs for restoration seeding, wild-collected seed may be bulked through professional seed bulking contracted off-Island (HRMP, 4.5.5). Seeds will be collected according to phenology. Table 1 highlights the anticipated periods when seeds of various species will be ripe for collection.

Low Diversity Cover Crop Plant Palette Seed Collection Calendar												
								=Species bloom period				
								=Seed collection period				
								=Bloom and collection				
Species	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
Achillea millefolium												
Acmispon argophyllus var. argenteus												
Acmispon dendroideus var. dendroideus												
Artemisia californica												
Baccharis pilularis ssp. consanguinea												
Encelia californica												
Eriogonum giganteum var. giganteum												
Isocoma menziesii												
Stipa pulchra												

Table 1. *Seed collection phenology calendar.*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Seed collection will follow established permitting and access requirements. The Conservancy will follow ethical collection protocols aligned with guidance from the Center for Plant Conservation and California Botanic Garden (CPC, 2019).

Seed Mix Composition: The restoration mix will include a standardized blend of disturbance-adapted species (HRMP Table 3-3). All taxa are native or endemic to Catalina Island and selected based on functional traits such as rapid establishment, regenerative ability, and ecological compatibility with early post-treatment environments.

- *Achillea millefolium* – yarrow
- *Acmispon argophyllus* var. *argenteus* – Channel Islands silver lotus
- *Acmispon dendroideus* var. *dendroideus* – island broom
- *Artemisia californica* – coastal sagebrush
- *Baccharis pilularis* ssp. *consanguinea* – coyote brush
- *Deinandra fasciculata*
- *Diplacus puniceus*
- *Encelia californica*
- *Eriogonum giganteum* var. *giganteum* – Saint Catherine's lace
- *Eriogonum granda* var. *grande*
- *Isocoma menziesii* – Coast goldenbush
- *Stipa* spp. – Needlegrass

Seed Phenology Tracking: Collection timing will be based on species-specific bloom and seed maturation periods using Calflora records and Conservancy staff observations. A working phenology calendar is maintained by the Conservancy team and used to guide seasonal scouting and harvest planning (Table 1).

Collection Methodology: Seeds will be collected from wild populations across Catalina Island, prioritizing healthy, phenologically ready stands with sufficient seed yield (HRMP 4.5.2). A maximum of 10% of available seed will be collected per population. Cut tests will be used to assess viability prior to collection, and maternal lines will be tracked using field forms and ArcGIS Field Maps.

Labor and Training: Seed collection efforts will draw on a combination of Conservancy staff, contractors, volunteers, and workforce development partners. All labor sources will support field planning, wild collection, and transport of materials to the nursery or off-Island facilities. Training will be scaled to experience level and will include field safety, collection ethics, plant identification, phenology, seed handling and transport, and species-specific collection methods. Safety instruction will cover radio use, wildlife

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

awareness, equipment handling, PPE, and working in heat. Ethical training will emphasize low-impact practices—limiting the percentage of seed collected, avoiding trampling, and protecting plant populations. Pre-field instruction may include educational workshops, naturalist training, and review of standard procedures. In-field learning will be supported by ID guides, herbarium specimen collection, and staff supervision. Teams will practice manual and mechanical collection techniques, data recording, and follow protocols for safe handling of species that require collection at height. The Conservancy is also in discussion with Native Seed Group to provide additional field services and expertise. Their team is experienced in wildland seed collection and can bulk material off-Island to support large-scale application and supply the on-Island seed farm.

In locations close to roads, outplantings will be used when seeding proves ineffective. A range of propagation and cultivation methods will support this stage, including seed propagation, cuttings, tissue culture, hydroponics, and air layering. Detailed descriptions of these methodologies are provided in Section 2.9. Species such as Catalina mountain mahogany and Catalina ironwood will be prioritized for tissue-culture protocol development and refinement.

Outplantings will be implemented using the high-diversity seed mix once each location has been further evaluated and prepared. All plants used for outplanting will be grown on-Island at the Ackermann Native Plant Nursery, where only sterilized soils are used. For each planting, a hole wider than the root ball will be dug, the plant will be carefully removed from its container, and placed into the hole. Roots will be inspected during backfilling to ensure full coverage and proper orientation. Plants will be watered for two years after installation and monitored for mortality.

2.5 Bulk Low Diversity Cover Crop Plants

Processing and Storage: Most target species produce orthodox seeds suitable for mid-term storage in dry, shaded environments (HRMP Appendix F 4.1.2). Collected seed will be air-dried and processed using species-appropriate methods (e.g., sieving, air-blowing, rubber mat separation). *Baccharis pilularis* will be used immediately due to limited viability in storage.

Cleaning the seed of inert material reduces the chances of rotting or molding of the seed. The amount of seed cleaning that is needed will depend on the harvesting method for the seed, how much inert material is present, the desired purity of the seed, and the seeding method to be used with some methods requiring a higher degree of cleaned seed. For optimal cleaning, a seed cleaning machine should be used.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Threshing to dethatch the seed from any flower stalks or seed heads will be conducted. Many different tools can be used for this process such as mechanical threshers or hammer mills, or threshing can also be done by hand methods for smaller quantities of seeds using creatively produced, handheld implements that can remove the seed from stalks. The second step is winnowing or sieving the seed through a series of screens to remove chaff, other plant material, weed seed, and empty seed hulls.

Seed processing equipment includes a Clipper Office Tester, an Oregon seed blower, a brush deawner, a dissecting scope, a Mettler scale, storage space for seed being processed, and miscellaneous equipment for seed processing, tracking, and propagation including vacuum desiccators, silica, sieves, mesh screens, and plant tags. Other equipment includes precision hand tools (I.e. scalpels, brushes, tweezers, scribers), a rock tumbler to prep seeds for sowing, a blender, a dough roller to break down tough shells, and wooden blocks with rubber attached to remove fleshy portions of the fruit. A dehumidifier to reduce relative humidity down to ~20% assists with desiccation of seeds being processed.

Seed Bulking Strategy: Collected seed will be used for both direct application and propagation. Container plants will be grown at the Conservancy's Ackerman Native Plant Nursery and will be used for both on-Island seed bulking and for landscape installations of taxa that do not reproduce as effectively from seed. Off-Island contractors will lead bulk seed increase over multiple years starting from small wild collections that will follow California Native Plant Society standards (no more than 10% of seed from a given population collected in a given season and <5% for rare plants), as the implementation of Conservancy seed bulking operations will occur on a separate timeline form the initiation of the 10 acre exclosure in Exhibit 1. Partners will be critical to building the volume needed for restoration-scale application, including future seeding phases beyond Exhibit 1.

Seed bulking will be completed in conjunction with the implementation of adaptive invasive plant management. Once weed management thresholds have been assessed through monitoring and determined to meet the criteria for seed application, the low diversity cover crop plant palette in Table 1 will be applied to the landscape.

2.6. Apply Low Diversity Cover Crop Plant Palette Natives to Landscape

Seeding Rates and Quantities: The average target seeding rate is 35 lbs/acre, yielding approximately 100 seeds/sq ft. All final application rates will be adjusted using pure live seed (PLS) calculations based on lab testing. PLS metrics will be matched to individual species and composition of the low diversity cover crop plant palette seed mix can be varied to best achieve desired germination and landscape representation.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Seed installation can be achieved by several methods, including drill seeding, imprint seeding, broadcast seeding, hydroseeding, and seed ball technique (HRMP Appendix F 6). The determination of seeding method will be dependent upon site conditions and accessibility. Larger sites that are accessible by equipment can be efficiently seeded mechanically with a drill seeder, imprint seeder, hydroseeder, or broadcast seeder. Smaller sites, sites with a high density of native species, or with unavoidable populations of sensitive species can be seeded (optimally during the fall season) by hand broadcast (either by hand or with a hand operated seed disperser) or the seed ball technique. During application every effort will be made to not impact invertebrates, although there is a chance of inadvertent take of Catalina mountain snail and Santa Catalina lancetooth snail.

The application will be done in conjunction with precipitation cycles to best facilitate the germination of applied low diversity cover crop plant palette seed mixes (HRMP Appendix F 6.7). Germination on the site will be monitored for desired species and composition. Application methodology will be varied if initial results are not desirable for appropriate vegetation community progression.

2.7. High Diversity Seed Mix Bulk and Application

In 2032, within the 10-acre exclosure, a high-diversity seed mix will be added to the area. To prepare for this application, the high diversity seed mix will be collected and bulked in 2029 using the same methodology outlined in the low diversity seed mix above. The seed mix may contain any of the plants in Table 2. Some plants which prove to be too difficult to bulk can instead be planted in strategic nodes that are easily accessible for watering. Seeds that may be susceptible to genetic admixture off-Island will be bulked on-Island at the Conservancy's seed farm, but for other species with low risk of genetic admixture, the Conservancy will bulk off Island.

Plant Identification	
Scientific Name	**Common Name**
Acmispon argophyllus var. argenteus	Channel Island silver lotus
Allium praecox	wild onion
*Arctostaphylos catalinae**	Catalina manzanita
Artemisia douglasii	mugwort
Calochortus catalinae	Catalina mariposa lily
Calystegia macrostegia	island morning glory
*Ceanothus arboreus**	feltleaf ceanothus
*Ceanothus megacarpus var. insularis**	Island bigpod ceanothus
Cercocarpus traskiae	Catalina mountain mahogany

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

*Comarostaphylis diversifolia ssp. planifolia**	summer holly
Constancea nevinii	Catalina silverlace
*Crocanthemum greenei**	island rush-rose
*Crossosoma californicum**	California rockflower
*Dendromecon harfordii**	island bush poppy
Dichelostemma capitatum	blue dick
Diplacus puniceus	southern monkeyflower
Elymus condensantus	giant wild rye
Epilobium canum	California fuchsia
*Eriodictyon traskiae**	Trask's yerba santa
*Eriogonum giganteum var. giganteum**	Saint Catherine's lace
Eriogonum grande var. grande	island buckwheat
Eriophyllum confertiflorum	golden yarrow
Euphorbia misera	cliff spurge
*Galium catalinense**	Catalina bedstraw
*Gambelia speciosa**	island snapdragon
*Heteromeles arbutifolia**	toyon
Keckeillia cordifolia	heartleaf penstemon
*Lepechinia fragrans**	fragrant pitcher sage
*Leptosyne gigantea**	giant coreopsis
Lonicera subspicata var. subspicata	southern honeysuckle
Lupinus spp. (albifrons, bicolor etc.)	lupine
Lycium californicum	California boxthorn
*Malacothamnus fasciculatus var. catalinensis**	Catalina island bushmallow
*Malosma laurina**	laurel sumac
Malva assurgentiflora ssp. glabra	southern islands mallow
Cleomella arborea	bladderpod
Pentachaeta lyonii	Lyon's pygmydaisy
*Prunus ilicifolia ssp. lyonii**	island cherry
Quercus engelmannii	Engelmann oak
*Quercus pacifica**	island scrub oak
*Quercus tomentella**	island oak
Quercus x macdonaldii	Macdonald oak
*Rhamnus pirifolia**	island redberry
*Rhus integrifolia**	lemonade berry
*Ribes viburnifolium**	Catalina current
Salvia apiana	white sage
*Salvia mellifera**	black sage
*Scrophularia villosa**	Catalina figwort
Stipa pulchra	purple needle grass

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

*Solanum wallacei**	Catalina nightshade
*Xylococcus bicolor**	mission manzanita

Table 2. *High diversity seed mix.*

Application will also follow the same methodologies outlined in the low-diversity section. The only difference being that nodes of plants too difficult to seed will be added to the landscape in nodes. These nodes will be watered for the first two years after planting when rain isn't present. Plantings will be monitored for survivorship within these nodes.

2.8. Expand Invasive Plant Treatment Beyond Exclosures

The 10-acre exclosure serves as a strategically located and accessible core treatment node for the initiation of large-scale invasive plant management on Catalina. This location is currently dominated by invasive grasses but is modeled and has sparse Island Chapparal species. Its location allows for concentrated, controlled trials of various management techniques, ensuring that methods are both ecologically effective and operationally feasible before scaling up. This site will serve as a testing ground to refine herbicide application strategies, evaluate the efficacy of treatments, and develop best management practices that can be applied across more complex or sensitive landscapes.

Once management approaches have been tested, optimized, and demonstrated to produce reliable results, the Project will expand outward to encompass the remaining 105 acres identified within the planned Top of Watershed Program (Exhibit 2). This phased approach will allow us to reduce uncertainty, manage resources efficiently, and minimize potential risks associated with scaling up too quickly. Once the 105-acre program has been started successfully, attention will turn to the 100-acre restoration site in Haypress (Exhibit 3). Each location on the Island will be chosen in three-year increments which follow the three years of herbicide, three years of low-diversity native cover crops, and finally the high diversity seed mix.

To maximize efficiency and minimize environmental disturbance, helicopter-based herbicide applications will be utilized for broader landscape treatment when appropriate. All aerial applications will be conducted in consultation with the Los Angeles County Agricultural Commissioner to ensure compliance with local regulations and best practices. Licensed applicators holding both a Qualified Applicator License (QAL) and a Pest Control Aircraft Pilot certification will perform the work, ensuring the highest standards of safety, precision, and regulatory compliance. Helicopter application will allow targeting of invasive plant populations across rugged, otherwise inaccessible terrain, applying herbicide with accuracy and speed while reducing the need for ground-based mechanical disturbance.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2.9 Rare Plant Propagation Recovery and Monitoring

The Conservancy will monitor the status of rare plants on the island by surveying remaining individuals, tracking environmental pressures, and collecting GPS coordinates of source plants which will go into our long-term GIS database.

Rare plants that will be used for restoration and collection such as the Catalina Island mountain mahogany, Catalina Island ironwood, Channel Islands tree poppy, and Lyon's Pentachaeta. These plants will be used in our active Restoration sites to increase rare plants and reduce rate of extinction on the landscape (Exhibit 1, 2, and 3). We will also include beach spectacle-pod and San Clemente Island lotus, both CESA listed species that have not been seen on Catalina Island for decades, but which could come back after deer removal. The main focus will be on the protocol development for the Catalina Island mountain mahogany due to its rarity and critical need for management, although many of the same techniques will be used on the Catalina Island ironwood as well.

Vegetative tissue collection all rare plants will occur on the Island. The only expection is for Catalina Island mountain mahogany, where collection of cuttings and seed for propagation activities may also occur from pure Catalina Island mountain mahogany individuals at the University of California Berkeley Blake Garden (37.91333, −122.28527) and at the California Botanic Garden (34.11076, −117.71511) living collections. Propagation activities will be conducted at the Catalina Island Conservancy's Micropropagation Lab and at the Ackerman Native Plant Nursery on Santa Catalina Island located at 200 Middle Ranch Road, Avalon, CA. Propagated Catalina Island mountain-mahogany (*Cercocarpus traskiae*) plants will be used in restoration areas during the high diversity planting/seeding. Catalina Island mountain-mahogany plants may also be sent to botanic gardens in California to be maintained in their living collections if the botanic gardens are permitted by CDFW to receive the plants.

For any woody plant collected for propagation, trials will be conducted to identify the appropriate sterilization chemical, concentration, and exposure time to secure clean explants free of microbial contaminants, but with minimal tissue damage (necrosis). The treatment with the greatest number of surviving, sterile explants will be selected as the most appropriate treatment for this stage. The optimum nutrient formulation for propagules will be identified through trials using different macro and micronutrients, vitamin, and growth regulator concentrations. The best formulation will be selected on the basis of plant health and growth. Micro cuttings of new shoots will be isolated from the best explants, producing a library of individual plant clones. Explants will be transferred to new culture vessels, with the goal of promoting root initiation (rhizogenesis). The mix and concentration of phytohormones producing the highest number of roots will be

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

determined, and corresponding plant health assessed. Propagation activities will be conducted at the Catalina Island Conservancy's Micropropagation Lab and at the Ackerman Native Plant Nursery on Santa Catalina Island located at 200 Middle Ranch Road, Avalon, CA.

After the development of a micropropagation protocol, all explants will be transferred to the Catalina Island Conservancy's Ackerman Native Plant Nursery on Santa Catalina Island. These plants will be used in ongoing restoration projects outlined in this permit application and monitored for a period of at least five years. For rare plants, there will be ex-situ conservation in living collections on the mainland, and in cryogenic germplasm storage. One of the most notable rare plants of focus is the Catalina Island mountain mahogany (*Cercocarpus traskiae* Eastwood 1898), which is an endangered tree species in the Rosaceae family that is endemic to Catalina Island At the time of its discovery, fewer than 50 were observed (Thorne 1967); in the intervening years, that number has dropped to just six confirmed plants and one unconfirmed individual—all of them occurring in Wild Boar Gully, on the southeastern side of the island. The population is threatened by introduced herbivores, inbreeding depression, environmental change and asymmetric hybridization (USFWS 2007, Knapp 2006, Coblentz 1980, Thorne 1967). Removal of the mule deer will eliminate one of the major threats preventing the restoration of this unique species. This species readily hybridizes with a more common related taxon, *Cercocarpus betuloides* var. *blancheae*, resulting in genetic dilution and low seedling viability (Knapp 2006, Primack 2006, Barrett and Kohn 1991, Riesberg et al. 1989). The Conservancy will use plant tissue culture to generate non-hybrid vegetative propagules from the remaining individuals. The resultant axenic plants will be used in island-wide restoration efforts and shared with collaborating botanic gardens on the mainland for germplasm storage and ex-situ conservation in living collections.

Traditional propagation methods proved inadequate for the Catalina Island mountain mahogany, with low germination rates from seed and poor rooting efficiency from cuttings (Riesberg et al. 1989, CDFW 2017). Furthermore, the threat of hybridization with common species can lead to sterile seeds and outbreeding depression (Templeton 1986, Ellstrand and Elam 1993). The Catalina Island Conservancy therefore seeks to develop novel techniques to ensure that this species continues to exist. Plant tissue culture is a clonal propagation technology capable of producing high-quality propagules for planting or cryogenic preservation (Towill 2000). This method has proved revolutionary for conservation of critically endangered plant taxa (Center for Plant Conservation 1999). In Hawaii, the Lyon Arboretum Rare Hawaiian Plant Program (RHPP) has saved over 130 species of federally listed species from extinction using this tissue culture (Sugii and Lamourex 2004). Our project will apply similar techniques to develop a protocol for use by

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

the Catalina Island Conservancy, to produce viable non-hybrid propagules for restoration, ex situ conservation and cryogenic preservation.

We plan to collect vegetative tissue for isolation of apical and axillary meristems. No more than 5% of plant material will be collected from any individual plant, and no more than 5% from the entirety of the population. In total, approximately two hundred small cuttings (5-10 cm each) will be needed to establish living tissue in axenic culture in vitro, representing all remaining individuals of the Catalina Island mountain mahogany. This level of collection will be of negligible impact—and far less than 5% of the existing plant material. Only vegetative material will be collected and maintained throughout the duration of our work. This material will be established as contained sterile cultures in vitro within a laboratory environment, keeping the material in an early ontogenetic state. This method precludes any possibility of recombination and removes the risk of genetic contamination. The material collected will be accessioned by source plant and replicated.

Vegetative cuttings were collected in the fall of 2022 as authorized by an SCP (No. 2018 (a)-22-005-RP) from the six wild, non-hybrid Catalina Island mountain mahogany plants in Wild Boar Gully on Santa Catalina Island. Six individuals have been confirmed to be pure genotypes. One individual has morphological characteristics of the pure genotype but needs to be tested. In total, approximately 50 small cuttings (5-10 centimeters each) were collected. Collection did not exceed five percent of material from each individual plant and five percent total of the population. Micropropagation trials of wild cuttings were conducted in 2022 and 2023 to identify the appropriate sterilization chemical, concentration, and exposure time to secure clean propagules free of microbial contaminants with minimal tissue damage. Ongoing trials are conducted at the Micropropagation Lab and at the Ackerman Native Plant Nursery to refine a Catalina Island mountain-mahogany micropropagation protocol for bulking activities. Data collection for this activity includes percentage of propagule survival, degree of contamination, and degree of necrosis. Any surviving propagules are expected to be multiplied through additional micropropagation cuttings to produce a library of individual clones. Initial trials investigated the optimal nutrient formulation by testing different macro and micronutrients, vitamins, and growth regulation concentrations. Clean propagules are inoculated into sterilized culture vessels with pre-formulated nutrient agar. Data collected includes the number of new leaves and shoots, percent chlorosis, vitrification, and callus formation. Initial project activities also included a trial to determine the optimal phytohormone mix and concentration to promote root initiation (rhizogenesis). After the agar nutrient treatment, propagules are transferred to new culture vessels to undergo phytohormone treatment. Data collected includes percent rooting, chlorosis, vitrification, and callus formation.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Hydroponics are another propagative methodology that has proven successful with the Catalina mountain mahogany. For this technique, a total of thirty-six vegetative cuttings 10 to 15 centimeters in length will be collected from the six wild Catalina Island mountain mahogany trees in the winter/spring. Each tree will be carefully assessed prior to collection and only one to two year old vegetative growth will be selected. Cuttings will be returned to the Ackerman Native Plant Nursery where they will be dipped in rooting hormone and placed in a 36-cell hydroponic cloner to encourage root development. The cloner is a plastic vessel with a reservoir and motorized sprinkler for delivery of water and nutrients to the basal portion of the cuttings. The reservoir will be filled with six liters of water without nutrients until the roots begin to form. Once roots have formed, nutrient solution will be added to fertilize. establishing roots. Successfully rooted cuttings will be transferred to nursery pots with potting media for further development.

Propagated Catalina Island mountain-mahogany (*Cercocarpus traskiae*) plants will be maintained at the Ackerman Native Plant Nursery to serve as stock material for conservation outplantings on Santa Catalina Island. They will be used in restoration areas during the high diversity planting/seeding. Catalina Island mountain mahogany plants may also be sent to botanic gardens in California to be maintained in their living collections if the botanic gardens are permitted by CDFW to receive the plants.

For the Catalina Island Ironwood, micropropagation techniques are especially helpful since seed germination rates are extremely low in wild collected seeds. If other plants prove to be challenging, we may employ these same techniques to create more viable plants. Catalina Mountain Mahogany will be a part of high diversity seeding/outplantings and incorporated into the overall restoration plan. Material generated from the Project is also proposed for distribution to the following institutions located in California: Santa Barbara Botanic Garden, The Huntington Library & Gardens, California Botanic Garden, San Diego Botanic Garden, and San Diego Zoo Wildlife Alliance for living collection and cryogenic germplasm storage purposes. Coordination of material transfer is in development and will be provided to CDFW for written approval once finalized.

3. Biosecurity Measures in Place to Reduce Threats to Ecosystem

3.1. *High Priority Invasive Plant Removal*

Through the Catalina Invasive Plant Program (CIPP), a twenty-plus year-old program that has supported intensive high priority invasive plant management across Catalina, the Conservancy will continue to manage, mitigate, and work to prevent introductions of invasive plants. The details of the CIPP plan are found in the HRMP Appendix A. The goals of the CIPP are as follows (Knapp, 2007):

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

1. Prevent the reduction or loss of native Catalina flora and fauna, due to the direct or indirect impact(s) caused by invasive plants, by actively managing invasives with the safest, most effective and economical methods available.
2. Increase the Conservancy's and partner agencies' knowledge regarding invasive plant distribution, impacts and management strategies.
3. Stop invasive plant introductions, establishment and spread on Catalina by increasing invasive plant awareness in staff, contractors, residents, and visitors through education programs, and improving cultural practices and partnerships.

Effectively managing well-established invasive species populations through long-term programs requires substantial financial investment and resource allocation, underscoring the importance of strategic prioritization in selecting which species to target for control efforts. To allocate limited resources effectively, the Conservancy focuses on species that pose the most significant threats to native ecosystems and have the greatest potential for successful management (Mullin et al., 2000).

Efficient management of invasive plants relies on accurately predicting susceptible species and locations, while employing robust control tools. This strategic prioritization requires understanding each species' ecological impact, distribution, and control potential. By focusing on high-impact, rapidly expanding species, land managers can effectively allocate resources to protect native habitats. A well-informed, data-driven prioritization process ensures efficient use of limited conservation resources, enabling professionals to make targeted decisions that preserve native ecosystems and promote long-term environmental health (APRS Implementation Team, 2000).

The goal of active invasive plant management species is currently achieved through four objectives:

1. Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) to detect, monitor, and eradicate new invasive plant introductions before it can spread.
2. Eradication of all known populations on the Island, or from natural areas, of species that have significant ecological impacts and are feasible to eliminate.
3. Control of widespread invasive species too common to be eradicated will be reduced in high priority watersheds, restoration areas, and high use areas.
4. Control of widespread species too common to be eradicated that occur along dispersal corridors, such as roadways and trails that have the potential to spread invasive plant propagules.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.2. Annual Island-Wide Fox Monitoring 2026-2035

Trapping Schedule and Design: Each year from 2026 to 2035, the Conservancy will conduct a six-week systematic Island-wide fox trapping survey. The survey is conducted across 216 road-accessible trap locations spanning both the East End and West End of the Island, arranged into six traplines with between 32 and 41 traps per line (Exhibit 3). Each trapline is active for four consecutive nights before being closed and sterilized *(totaling approx. 864 trap nights per year)*. Trapping design accounts for spatial representation, logistical access, and is in accordance with historical annual trapping efforts that have been conducted on the Island since 1999. Occasional target trapping will also take place in other locations across the Island.

Foxes are captured using modified Tomahawk #106 single-door live traps baited with dry and canned cat food and loganberry lure. Traps are outfitted with bite bars, shade cloth, and fine mesh to reduce injury, and are sterilized between deployments with chlorhexidine. The Conservancy will only conduct monitoring if federal permits through USFWS and CDFW are active.

Captured foxes are processed in under 20 minutes without sedation and released at the capture site. Each individual is permanently marked (if untagged) with a 12.5 mm passive integrated transponder (PIT) tag and evaluated for:

- Age class (based on tooth wear)
- Sex
- Body weight and condition
    - Administer subcutaneous fluids if necessary
- Reproductive status
- Eye status
    - Clean and open any infected eyes and apply optic ointment
- Ectoparasite load (fleas, ticks, lice)
    - Provide topical frontline if the infection is severe enough
- Ear mite severity, canal condition, and presence of tumor nodules (otoscopic exam) Visible injury, infection, or trauma (address what can be addressed in the field or bring the animal to the Veterinarian for more serious issues)
    - Application of topical or injectable antibiotics

A subset of foxes also receives blood draws (≤9 mL) for disease surveillance and collaborative research projects which may include but not limited to the collection of swabs, blood, ectoparasite, and/or fur samples.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Vaccination: All eligible foxes receive vaccinations using protocols developed by the Island Fox Working Group and previously validated through titer persistence studies. Vaccines are administered as follows:

- CDV: 1 mL intramuscular Purevax® Ferret CDV vaccine (left thigh)
- Rabies: 1 mL subcutaneous Imrab® 3 TF vaccine (right thigh)

All captured foxes also receive topical treatment for ear mites with ivermectin (0.05 mL per ear). Ear canal condition and mite severity are scored during an otoscopic exam and recorded (Moriarty et al. 2015; Vickers et al. 2015).

Sentinel Collaring: A critical subset of the Catalina Island fox population is not vaccinated during trapping but instead fitted with radio collars and monitored biweekly. These individuals serve as sentinels for early detection of disease emergence. Selection criteria for collaring include:

  - Adult foxes weighing ≥2.0 kg
  - No vaccine administered during current or prior year's trapping
  - Preference for younger individuals with naïve immune systems when possible

Foxes selected for collaring are fitted with Holohil Systems Ltd. VHF radio collars (39 g, <2% of body weight) equipped with:

  - 12-hour mortality sensors
  - Reflective tape for enhanced nighttime visibility
  - Unique tape banding combinations for individual field identification

When a mortality signal is detected, field personnel recover the collar and carcass as quickly as possible to assess cause of death. If the fox is not too decomposed, fresh remains are submitted to the California Animal Health and Food Safety Laboratory (CAHFS) at UC Davis for necropsy.

3.3. Infectious Fox Disease Surveillance

Infectious disease remains one of the greatest threats to the long-term viability of the Catalina Island fox (fox) population, as demonstrated by the catastrophic 1999 Canine Distemper Virus outbreak. Surveillance is conducted annually during Island-wide trapping using serological sampling, targeted radio-collar monitoring (biweekly), and collaboration with external research partners.

Sample Collection and Laboratory Analysis: Blood samples (≤9 mL) are collected from a subset of captured foxes during annual trapping efforts, with selection stratified by age,

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

location, and vaccination status. Serum samples are sent to the New York State Animal Health Diagnostic Laboratory at Cornell University, where they are tested for antibodies against five key canine pathogens:

- Canine Distemper Virus (CDV)
- Canine Adenovirus (CAV)
- Canine Parvovirus (CPV)
- Canine Coronavirus (CCV)
- Canine Herpesvirus (CHV)

Serological assays include:

- Serum Neutralization (SN) tests for CDV, CAV, CCV, CHV
- Hemagglutination Inhibition (HI) for CPV

Titer thresholds for past exposures are considered:

- SN ≥ 1:16 for CDV, CAV, CCV, CHV
- HI ≥ 1:80 for CPV

3.4. Fox Mortality Monitoring and Threat Reduction

Tracking known mortality is essential to understanding the ongoing threats facing the fox and informing targeted management actions. Mortality monitoring is conducted through a combination of radio telemetry, public reporting, carcass recovery, and necropsy. Data are reviewed annually to identify trends in cause of death, assess the effectiveness of mitigation efforts, and determine whether thresholds for adaptive response have been exceeded

Mortality Detection and Investigation: Mortality events are detected through VHF radio telemetry and public reporting. All sentinel foxes fitted with Holohil collars are monitored on a biweekly basis using both vehicle and aerial surveys. Collars emit a mortality signal if no movement is detected for ≥12 hours. Upon receiving a mortality signal or report from the public, Conservancy staff recover the carcass and conduct a preliminary field assessment, including documentation of condition, location, and probable cause of death.

When cause of death cannot be confirmed in the field carcasses are submitted to the California Animal Health and Food Safety Laboratory (CAHFS) at UC Davis for full necropsy. Necropsy findings are used to track emergent threats (e.g., toxicants, predation) and guide future biosecurity or enforcement actions.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Public Reporting and the Fox Hotline: To improve mortality detection and public response, the Conservancy launched a dedicated Fox Hotline in 2024. The hotline received 41 reports during the year:

- 53.7% reported injured foxes
- 36.6% reported mortalities
- 9.8% reported behavioral concerns

Of these, 7.3% resulted in humane euthanasia following evaluation at the Animal Clinic of Catalina.

Public outreach, including informational flyers and information about the fox hotline, is also an important part of the Conservancy's threat mitigation.

3.5. Invasive Mule Deer

Invasive mule deer (deer) removal on Catalina will happen over multiple years. Management will be carried out by ground-based specialists using rifles in controlled operations under strict safety protocols (described below). In early stages of the Project, crews may test the use of approved deer food to guide deer to predictable sites to safely be dispatched. This improves safety for people and wildlife to complete work efficiently and humanely. Deer carcasses near roads, trails or public areas will be removed, and meat will be provided to the California Condor Recovery Program and potentially tribal partners. The California Condor Recovery program will use deer to help these endangered birds gain a natural food source (pending funding). Deer will be gathered and stored in a freezer and shipped off Island to the US Fish and Wildlife Center. Before deer carcasses leave the Island, the Conservancy will work with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to test for Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD).

During the pre-implementation phase (2026), the Conservancy will continue to use the Private Lands Management recreational hunting program for local residents and tribal members, for interested parties in those groups. A tribal hunt will be advertised to the Gabrieleno-Tongva partners outlined in the Conservancy's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). If any of our designated MOU tribes are interested, each group (max of four people at a time) will sign up for 72 hours of transportation and lodging. This will occur over a two-week period, currently slated for November 2026.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Once the deer population is reduced, there will be a strong natural response by the deer to repopulate quickly (Bartmann et al. 1992). For example, the deer population started with two individuals in 1928 and eight more in 1930. By 1947, the deer population was estimated at 2,000. The key to removing the population is a sustained approach to rapidly depopulate the deer.

A range of tools and strategies will be employed to ensure complete population removal. These include baiting, day and night shooting by specialists, surgical sterilization, net capture (aerial and ground-based), and detection dogs. Helicopters will be used as a support tool for detection and net capture, although no deer will be dispatched from a helicopter or any other aerial platform. Aerial tools will be used primarily in remote, hard-to-reach areas for detection. This will be followed by euthanasia performed by trained professionals on the ground. For sentinel deer, after tranquilization, aerial or ground-based relocation will also be employed to capture and relocate sentinel deer, which will help locate remaining non-sentinel deer across the Island. Sentinel deer are collared, sterilized deer that help specialists detect other deer in the final stages of the removal effort. A proposed timeline for the removal effort can be found in Table 3. This timeline may shift due to weather and success of the removal.

Year	Dates	Primary Activities	Avalon (Y/N)	Interior (Y/N)
Pre-Removal Assessment	Sept-Oct 2026	Baiting sites and mobile shooting	N	Y
Year 1	Jun–Oct 2027	Professional shooting with bait/water sites	N	Y
Year 1	Nov 2027–April 2028	Nocturnal ground shooting with drone support	N	Y
Year 2	Sept/Oct 2028	Aerial net-capture	N	Y
Year 2	Nov 2028–March 2029	Ground shooting with detection dogs – Helicopter support	N	Y
Year 3	April/May 2029	Capture, sterilization, and release of sentinel deer	Y	Y
Year 3	Jul–Aug 2029	Initial sentinel tracking	N	Y
Year 3	Sept 2029–Jan 2030	Continued sentinel tracking breeding season	N	Y
Year 3	Dec 2029–April 2030	Avalon depopulation	Y	N

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Year 4	Aug 2030–Jan 2031	Continued sentinel tracking	N	Y
Year 5	Aug 2031–Jan 2032	Continued sentinel tracking	N	Y

Table 3. *Proposed timeline of deer removal operations including where operations would occur*.

Removal will be accomplished by first attracting deer to easily accessible locations in the interior and shooting from a vehicle. Attracting the deer to safe sites will be accomplished with baiting and/or watering stations. Bait will likely consist of cracked corn which does not pose a biosecurity risk of spreading corn in the Interior of the Island. There are roughly 165 miles of roads and trails in the Interior of the Island that can be employed for this strategy. This stage of the deer removal process will be the most rapid depopulation and will largely occur in 2027 with a testing round in 2026, although timelines may shift.

The next stage will include nocturnal shooting with thermal sensing technology and drone assistance to locate deer (Fig. 1). Specialists will be working in the interior of the Island at night, when deer are most active, to further reduce the population. This stage relies on state-of-the-art thermal drone technology to help detect every deer on the Island. In 2023, the Conservancy tested thermal capable drones to see how well they could detect deer and found them to be a very efficient tool to find deer in thick vegetation at night as seen below (Fig. 1). In remote locations, deer will be netted via helicopter and then dispatched from the ground.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 1. *The number one rule in any shooting accident is the failure to properly identify the target and what is beyond it. To overcome these challenges at night, positive deer identification will be mandatory, and specialists will utilize thermal and night vision optics. UAVs can also be equipped with these devices (such as the thermal optic used to identify deer in the image above) to assist specialists in successfully identifying the correct target.*

The next stage relies on detection dogs to locate the last few dozen deer, currently projected to begin in November 2028, although timelines may shift. They will always remain under the control of the handler by voice command to ensure safety and avoid disturbance to wildlife. All dogs will be trained in advance to target only deer, so that there is no risk of incidental take of Island foxes or other wildlife. Dogs will only detect deer, they will not chase animals. They will indicate deer location either through barking or “pointing”. Aerial transport will be used to return dog teams to basecamp efficiently, preventing fatigue and heat stress, and allowing for rapid redeployment when needed.

Each detection dog will be vaccinated for canine distemper virus, rabies, kennel cough, and treated for parasites prior to coming to the Island. They will be inspected for any plant seed in their coat as a biosecurity measure. They will be housed each individually in a kennel in a quiet, secure, and safe location on Conservancy property. The kennels will be fenced off from island foxes that may harass kenneled dogs as observed on other Channel Islands where detection dogs have been utilized in invasive vertebrate removal programs. The kennel will be cleaned once per day.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

The dogs will be cared for by trained professionals and fed two times a day. The dogs' health will be assessed by their trained specialist handler daily. If a detection dog sustains an injury, it will be pulled out of detection rotation until it has been evaluated, treated, and healed. Injured dogs will be exercised in accordance with their injury to ensure the physical and mental well-being of the animal. Detection dogs that show any signs of deviation from their non-target avoidance training will be assessed and given further training until they are capable of avoiding non-target species or will not be utilized. The dogs' health, safety, and well-being are not only important for their humane care, but vital to successfully detecting deer.

By the time sentinel deer are deployed, only a small percentage of invasive mule deer are likely to remain in the interior of the Island which will be around 2029. The purpose of sentinel deer is to help specialists find the last remaining deer in the interior. Sentinel deer will be surgically sterilized by a licensed veterinarian, and GPS collared. Deer will then be relocated across all parts of the Island. In total, there will be fewer than 30 sentinel deer deployed. These deer will help specialists detect the final remaining invasive mule deer on the Island, as any individuals still present are likely to be exceptionally wary of humans and difficult to locate. Sentinel deer will be marked with distinctive ear tags to help specialists identify them.

Deer removal work in Avalon is scheduled for December 2029, although it could start later. Trained specialists will use tranquilizers followed by humane euthanasia or sterilization. Some mule deer valued by Avalon residents may be sterilized and tagged, and left in Avalon to live out their lives; these will not be the same as the sentinel deer. If deer are present on anyone's property, those will not be removed via tranquilizers without permission from the property owner in advance.

The Conservancy is open to either off-site euthanasia or sterilization of deer within Avalon, depending on what is agreed upon by the City after receiving community input. If the permit is approved, the Conservancy will partner with the City of Avalon to create a transparent protocol that explains how decisions will be made for the deer in town.

The Community may desire to have their local veterinarian join Conservancy crews for sterilization and/or euthanasia of City deer. The Conservancy will allow for him/her or another representative of the veterinary clinic to join for the purpose of transparency.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Sterilization will be a minor part of the deer removal effort, but important, nonetheless. The surgical operations will be performed exclusively by a licensed veterinarian and will be limited to both mule deer the public wishes to retain and no more than 30 sentinel animals.

For operations in the interior, helicopters will be used as a support tool only - not as a way to dispatch deer from the air. Trained specialists and detection dogs will be transported via helicopter to:

- access remote locations
- decrease travel time to ensure contractors and detection dogs can maximize cooler daytime temperatures to reduce heat stress and fatigue
- maximize daylight hours when there are fewer people on the landscape as a safety measure
- detect if people are on-site
- survey for invasive mule deer
- track sentinel deer

No animals will be dispatched from helicopters.

The methods for lethal deer removal will follow the American Veterinary Medical Association's (AVMA) Guidelines for the Depopulation of Animals. No snares or poison would be used for the Project, relying on the most humane removal methods possible and every effort would be made to dispatch animals with a single shot. Any deer wounded during shooting would be followed and immediately dispatched.

Throughout the Project, data on deer removed will be collected to assess effectiveness of each removal strategy. Data will be collected by specialists every time a deer is dispatched using a Field Maps application. This will include time, sex, method, date, and approximate age. Dispatch data will be used to estimate the percentage of the population taken.

A variety of methodologies may be employed to estimate deer populations and assess success throughout the Project. For example, spotlight surveys can be used along established roads on the Island. Spotlighting vehicles would drive at slow speeds, with observers using eight million candle power spotlights to search for deer and range finders to determine the distance from the road to the observed animals. Demographic information and associated habitat information may be collected as well. These data can be analyzed to estimate population density or can be used to represent indices of the total population (total deer seen per night or per mile) (Stapp et al. 2022). Another methodology would use drones equipped with thermal sensors to assess the deer population status. A thermal camera will be positioned on the drone, directly perpendicular to the ground. Drones may be hand controlled or driven by autopilot along specified flight routes. The

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

altitude of the drone will always be at least 60m above ground during surveys (Larson et al. 2023). The drones will also be able to collect GPS positions of the animals detected during manually driven flights to allow for easy spatial analysis and habitat associations.

Thermal imagery will be processed using a standardized workflow tailored to mule deer detection and the environmental conditions on Catalina Island. Raw frames will be screened for motion, blur, glare, fog, and terrain shadowing, and any compromised images will be excluded. Remaining frames will be reviewed systematically by trained staff using hotspot-extraction tools that highlight thermal anomalies. Each hotspot will be visually verified to distinguish deer from non-target heat sources such as sun-warmed rocks or dense vegetation. The GPS coordinate associated with each verified detection will be extracted and stored as a georeferenced point. Overlapping imagery will be used to identify duplicate detection which will be removed through spatial clustering. The final detection dataset will then be integrated into GIS.

Data from both the spotlight surveys and the drone flights will be used to assess the progress of the depopulation efforts, the efficacy of bait stations, demographic changes to the population, as well as the distribution of deer on the island

Safety Protocols

The intent of this safety plan is to present methods and systems that will be deployed to mitigate safety risks during night and diurnal shooting operations. All trained specialists engaged in shooting activities will have certification as a Level 3-Urban Sharpshooter per standards set forth by the National Wildlife Control Operators Association (NWCOA).

<u>General Safety Protocols</u>

1. All specialists will possess proof of firearms safety certification such as the National Rifle Association certification.
2. Specialists will complete all Conservancy-required training necessary for the Project, including wildlife safety (rattlesnakes, bison, yellow jackets), poison oak identification, VHF radio use, heat illness prevention, four-wheel-drive training, and incident reporting.
3. Specialists will coordinate with the Conservancy and local law enforcement when operating near Avalon to identify safe, discreet removal locations and appropriate start times.
4. Specialists will utilize the four primary rules of firearm safety – 1) always keep firearm pointed in a safe direction, 2) treat all guns as if they are loaded, 3) keep

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

your finger off the trigger until you are ready to shoot, and 4) always be sure of your target and what's beyond.

5. Specialists will only engage a deer when there is a safe earthen backdrop, an area without humans, and no dogs, cats, or bison are detected.
6. Specialists will use high-quality, fully functional equipment that is inspected and maintained daily. Required equipment includes firearms, scopes, night-vision optics, thermal devices, lights, communication devices, and GPS units.
7. Specialists will follow strict target-identification procedures, engaging animals only after positive identification in clear visibility. Specialists will be trained to identify all potential non-targets (humans, domestic dogs, bison, island foxes, and feral cats). If any non-target species is present, no shot will be taken.
8. Specialists will enhance safety through teamwork, maintaining clear communication regarding target identification, including a standardized system of signals indicating when a shot is about to occur.
9. Specialists will maintain a safety-first mindset at all times, including calm and deliberate decision-making under pressure.
10. Specialists will live on-site and develop strong environmental awareness, scouting areas during daylight hours to familiarize themselves with terrain, vegetation, hiding spots, and human infrastructure. Specialists will identify landmarks visible in low light to ensure safe navigation during operations.
11. Specialists will wear reflective vests or clothing to ensure visibility to team members and will wear proper footwear with good traction to prevent falls.
12. Specialists will carry first-aid kits, maintain a clearly defined emergency response plan, and keep all essential first-responder radio channels and telephone numbers on their person.
13. Shooting will never be aimed toward a road during any stage of the plan.
14. Notices of night shooting will be posted at all site access points, including trailheads and roads.

<u>City of Avalon Safety Protocols</u>

1. Within Avalon city limits, the use of firearms, center-fire rifles, and rimfire rifles are **prohibited.** "Firearm" is defined as any weapon that uses an explosive (gunpowder) to propel a projectile. "Center-fire rifle" is defined as a firearm that uses centerfire ammunition. "Rimfire rifle" is defined as a rifle using rimfire cartridges in which they ignite when the fire firing pin strikes the rime (outer edge) of the cartridge base rather than a primer in the center.
2. All Avalon operations will be closely coordinated with local law enforcement and designated city officials (e.g., the City Manager). Weekly operational plans will be

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

communicated to a designated Conservancy contact to address implementation challenges. The Conservancy will work collaboratively with the City to adjust operations based on community concerns.

3. Specialists will not enter nor conduct operations on private or city property without permission.

Safety Protocols for Night Shooting in the Interior

1. All personnel will be trained specialists with Level 3 Urban Sharpshooter certification per NWCOA standards and a minimum of four years of depopulation experience.
2. Specialists will work exclusively in teams to ensure mutual safety and oversight.
3. A pre-operation safety briefing covering the operational plan and all safety protocols will be required each day.
4. All firearm use during night operations will incorporate thermal or night-vision optics.
5. Positive species identification will be required before any animal is engaged.
6. No shots will be taken at movement, heat signatures, silhouettes, or sounds alone.
7. Pre-mapped shooting zones will be developed and shared weekly with Conservancy leadership, and if relevant, the City of Avalon staff.
8. Shots will only be taken when a known, safe backstop exists and area is deemed safe to shoot with no people present between shooter and target.
9. A minimum buffer of 150 yards will be maintained from residences and occupied areas, and all shots will be taken away from buildings.
10. Teams will use radios on designated channels to maintain communication throughout operations.
11. Regular check-ins will occur between all teams daily.
12. In the event of an emergency, first responders (911) will be contacted immediately, followed by the field lead, who will notify Conservancy leadership.
13. Clear and visible signage will be placed around the Island to alert the public to ongoing operations.
14. Deer will only be engaged when the specialist is certain a safe and humane kill can be achieved.
15. All personnel will wear identifiable reflective gear.
16. Real-time GPS tracking will be used to monitor the location of specialists in the field.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

These safety protocols are from national standards for safely and humanely dispatching animals (USDA Wildlife Services, 2023; USDA Wildlife Services, 2018; California Department Fish and Wildlife, 2021)

Specific Shooting Procedures

1. Prior to initiating any field activities, the target area(s) and surrounding properties are thoroughly surveyed using digital aerial imagery and active aerial drones followed by field confirmation. By knowing the location of every occupied structure and areas of human use the specialists are better able to work safely, discreetly, and efficiently.
2. Field operations will occur during hours of lowest human activity. In addition, during culling operations the specialists will search intensively for people and non-target animals to avoid unsafe conditions. Areas surrounding operations will be continuously surveyed using handheld thermal optics to search for humans and non-target animals.
3. During deer removal operations there will be continuous open communication between the Conservancy, local law enforcement, and the specialists to keep people well informed regarding field activities to avoid conflicts.
4. Once the decision to engage a deer is made, the shooter will take the firearm out of safe state (safety OFF, bolt/action engaged) and engage select animals at their discretion, while ensuring maximum safety, in a manner that conforms with the goal of efficiently reducing the herd without educating remaining individual deer. Once firing has ceased, the firearm will be returned to a safe state (safety ON, action open).
5. Proper topography or elevation will always be used to provide a safe earthen backdrop.
6. Shooting operations will cease immediately if unsafe conditions are encountered and will not be resumed until conditions are deemed safe.

To maintain deer naïveté as the population declines, the management team must possess superior technical ability (e.g., to shoot with precision), field intuition (e.g., to determine whether deer encountered should be engaged), and discipline (e.g., to refrain from engaging if conditions are not conducive to removal). This approach maximizes the Conservancy's ability to remove a high percentage of the population and sustain removal operations over the years necessary to complete the deer removal.

Project Success and Outcomes

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Catalina has a long history of introduced and feral ungulate removals. Approximately 30,000 sheep, including feral sheep, were removed by 1949 using only ground-based methods. Feral cattle were rounded up during the mid 1950's, with the last few removed in the early 1980's. The Conservancy successfully completed both a feral goat and pig removal on the Island in the 1990s and early 2000s.

This project will not use helicopters as a shooting platform, as was done on neighboring Santa Rosa Island. Although aerial shooting is considered the industry standard for humane and effective removal, ground-based removal with helicopter support will provide a key advantage for this project. Helicopters will rapidly transport the trained specialists, detection dogs, and equipment to remote sites, significantly reducing travel time and increasing safety for the operating team.

This deer removal effort will succeed due to the experience of the Conservancy, technological advances, and the experience of the hired specialist. Although the Conservancy used a helicopter for a portion of the goat removal in the 1990s, it was not the primary platform utilized. For the pig removal on Catalina, no helicopter was used, instead it relied on trapping and detection dogs. The Conservancy has a few technological advances that were not available during other animal removal projects, such as advanced thermal imagery, drones, and advancements in detection dog training. The Conservancy is hiring specialists that have accomplished six animal removal projects on other islands and with over 100 deer specific management projects throughout the world.

As deer are reduced, native vegetation will have reduced pressure. Although full recovery of the Island will take decades, the most immediate response to deer removal will be growth of perennially browsed plants that are currently in a state of stunted development. These mini versions of shrubs will quickly rebound. Native plants will germinate from the existing native seed bank and establish after a few higher precipitation seasons. Active restoration will not be limited to cages or small areas fenced off from deer but can reach its full potential with the Conservancy's helping hand.

4. Monitoring and Documentation

Monitoring is a cornerstone of the Conservancy's Project. It allows the Conservancy to evaluate progress, adapt management actions to real-time ecological responses, and ensure long-term ecosystem resilience. This plan outlines four key monitoring initiatives: Island-wide vegetation and wildlife monitoring (HRMP 5.3.2 & 5.3.4), a targeted lepidoptera biodiversity survey (HRMP 5.3.5), and site-specific restoration monitoring at the 10-acre Exhibit 1 restoration site (HRMP 5.2).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4.1. Fox annual reporting

Each year, all data collected through Island-wide monitoring, telemetry, mortality investigations, and disease surveillance are synthesized into an integrated review. This process includes:

- Annual data analysis of demographic trends, spatial use, and health indicators
- Comparison to historical baselines
- Identification of anomalies or emergent concerns (e.g., clustering of mortalities, parasite burdens)

Annual trends, emergent research, and management best practices are shared across the six islands with island foxes at the annual Fox Working Group Meeting. This synthesis forms the basis for determining whether current monitoring protocols remain appropriate or if adaptive changes are required.

As part of the Catalina Island Fox Conservation Agreement and associated regulatory frameworks, the Conservancy provides annual reporting to relevant agencies and collaborators, including:

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- Island Fox Conservation Working Group
- Funding entities and nonprofit partners

Deliverables include a detailed Annual Island Fox Report and species-specific updates within broader restoration technical reports.

All reports are archived in the Conservancy's central data repository and made available to agency partners upon request.

4.2. Measure changes to active restoration sites

The 10-acre fenced exclosure outlined in Exhibit 1 will serve as a pilot site for intensive invasive species control and passive restoration which will be expanded to 105 acres after three years and the Haypress site after six years (Exhibit 2 & 3). Monitoring here will guide adaptive herbicide use and determine readiness for native seeding. Once native seeding begins, the Conservancy will use this methodology throughout to measure effectiveness of native seeding.

Monitoring will use line-belt transects (typically 10 m x 1 m) placed systematically throughout sites. The sites will be monitored before and after treatments to establish a

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

baseline. Within each transect, the percent cover of native vs. non-native species will be recorded, alongside species richness and dominance.

Data will be linked to specific treatment areas (e.g., selective vs. broad-spectrum herbicide plots) in a randomized block design, allowing for evaluation of treatment efficacy over time. Permanent photo points and drone imagery will be used to document visible changes in vegetation structure and bare ground cover over time.

Soil Conditions: Optional assessments may include soil compaction, organic matter, or erosion metrics if funding and staffing allow.

4.3. Island-Wide Lepidoptera Survey

Land use changes on Catalina over the past 200 years, particularly the introduction of nonnative ungulates, have led to severe alterations in vegetation and, likely, the associated Lepidoptera species composition. Around 530 species of moths and butterflies are currently known to inhabit Catalina Island, of which many have not been identified to the species-level, and at least six species are island endemics (Powell 1994). With ongoing ungulate removal, there is promise that a more natural state can be reached, and native insect populations and species that depend on them can rebound and expand from the pockets of remaining native vegetation that act as refugia.

The Conservancy will conduct Lepidoptera surveys across watersheds of the Island, replicating the Island-wide lepidoptera survey methodology originally used by Dr. Jerry Powell to develop a database of species occurrence that builds on previous Island-wide checklists (Powell 2012). As the last ungulates are removed, these Lepidoptera surveys can provide important information about how vegetation recovery is impacting the flow of energy through the ecosystem. Butterflies and moths serve as indicators of climate response, habitat integrity, and ecosystem productivity.

Timing: One survey in spring (March–May) and one in fall (September–November) in 2026 and every three years after depending on funding.

Surveys: Surveyors will conduct both daytime butterfly transects and nocturnal UV-light trapping for moths at 20 locations across major vegetation type (Powell, 1994 2012). Surveyors will also survey vegetation for caterpillars to cover as many species as possible and establish host-plant relationships. Caterpillars will be photographed alive, and a selection will be stored in 95% ethanol for DNA analysis. Surveys will also be conducted at night with UV light traps to collect most moth species. Moths collected in the traps will be frozen until returned to the lab, where they will be pinned and spread. A selection of morphotypes will be photographed, and tissue (leg or abdomen) will be dissected for DNA extraction. Specimens will be identified to species-level where possible based on

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

morphology and existing identification keys. During these stages it is possible to have some inadvertent take of CESA listed and rare insects including Crotch bumble bee (*Bombus crotchii*) and Monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*). DNA barcoding of up to five monarch butterflies may occur. Any Crotch bumble bee will quickly be released if caught in any traps to minimize impact.

DNA Barcoding: DNA barcodes by first extracting DNA from tissue samples using a liquid handling robot available in the Conservancy's lab for optimal time and cost efficiency. The COI Barcode region will be amplified with PCR and universal primers for Lepidoptera and sequenced cost-efficiently using the Pacific Biosciences Revio platform. The Conservancy's lab routinely applies this method, which efficiently yields large batches of high-quality sequences. These sequences will be used to confirm species identification, identify any cryptic species found in Catalina Island, and provide a DNA reference database for future ecological studies.

Analysis will be completed using species index counts with both richness and evenness across the Island which can be compared to Powell's previous surveys. DNA analysis will aid in species identification.

Sampling Protocol: Each trap night will follow Powell's standardized protocol (e.g., trap start at dusk, 4–5 hours per site, fixed wattage UV light in protected mesh containers) (Powell 2012).

Deliverable: A comprehensive species list, photographic sampling, and habitat notes.

4.4. Report on Key Findings on Restoration Project

All monitoring data collected through this Project will be integrated into a robust adaptive management cycle to ensure restoration strategies remain effective, efficient, and scientifically defensible. This cycle will include annual data review, adjustments to restoration methodology, public and agency reporting, and curation of all monitoring records.

Every five years, data from vegetation surveys, wildlife monitoring, and site assessments will be analyzed in detail to evaluate progress toward restoration targets. This review will compare results against baseline conditions and identify any emerging trends or challenges.

Based on the findings, restoration practices will be refined as needed. This may include modifying herbicide application rates or timing, shifting seeding schedules earlier or later in the season, integrating erosion-control measures, or introducing supplemental plantings. In cases where restoration targets are exceeded, certain management activities may be scaled back to avoid over-intervention.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Results and management changes will be communicated to key stakeholders, including the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), funding partners, and the public. Reporting tools will include detailed technical memos, GIS-based dashboards for spatial visualization of results, and annual summary presentations tailored to different audiences.

All monitoring records—raw data, processed datasets, spatial files, and interpretive reports—will be archived in the Conservancy's central data repository. This secure and well-organized archive will ensure that information is readily accessible to agency partners, collaborators, and researchers upon request.

A centralized annual summary document will synthesize the year's monitoring results, highlight conclusions, outline adaptive management adjustments, and capture key lessons learned. Over time, this record will serve as both a scientific resource and a practical guide, allowing the Conservancy to share insights and strategies with the wider conservation community, supporting restoration efforts beyond Catalina Island.

4.5. Landscape level monitoring across 60 plots

To capture long-term ecological trends, the Conservancy will revisit 60 legacy vegetation monitoring plots (Exhibit 5) first established nearly 20 years ago (HRMP 5.3.2). These plots were previously assessed under historic vegetation mapping and habitat condition assessments and represent a range of elevations, aspects, and habitat types across the Island.

Methodology: Each plot will be sampled using the point-intercept method on permanent transects, recording vegetation hits at fixed intervals (e.g., every 50 cm) to generate estimates of species cover, richness, and composition. The point-line intercept method consists of a transect with two points (A and B) thirty meters apart. Two pieces of rebar will be hammered into the ground and covered in white PVC pipes delineating the two points. A measuring tape will then be stretched thirty meters from the A point to the B point. The vegetation will be recorded every thirty centimeters across the thirty-meter tape for a total of a hundred measuring points. A hiking pole is marked as a centimeter ruler and then placed vertically across the measuring tape, and every plant touching the pole is identified to the specific epithet level. The canopy (the highest plant at that point) height is measured. At each point, monitors will identify each plant that touches the measuring rod, and for woody vegetation, the height and age class. The substrate of each transect will be recorded.

Recorded Data: In addition to the point-intercept data, a list of all plant species observed within a one-meter buffer on the uphill slope of the 30-meter tapeline and any additional species within a five-meter buffer on either side will be recorded. For all rooted shrubs

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

within one meter of the tapeline on the uphill side, the number of individuals will be recorded with notes on their various life stages. The same notes will be taken for rooted trees within five- meters on either side of the tapeline while also measuring the diameter-at breast- height (DBH) of the largest size class trees in the established boundary. From this combined data, the Conservancy can accurately calculate and assess changes in the percent coverage of species, native and non-native plant species richness, plant community structure and composition, diversity, etc.

Stratification: The selected sampling sites will be stratified by slope, elevation, vegetation type, distance from roads, and distance from other points. Samples will be divided between low elevation areas in drainages as well as ridge lines and hillsides. Additional sample points may be added as needed in areas with active restoration or if a particular habitat is underrepresented. It is recommended that each of the key vegetation habitat types is represented in the sample points, which include island chaparral, island scrub oak chaparral, coastal sage scrub, maritime cactus scrub and grassland.

Monitoring Schedule: Monitoring will be conducted in late winter to early summer depending on weather variables and plant phenology to capture the vegetation characteristics at the height of the growing season.

Methodology Alignment and Collaboration: The vegetation transect sampling techniques will align with the transect monitoring protocol used by the Channel Islands National Park to allow for a larger comparison among California Pacific Islands. Where appropriate, vegetation rapid assessments will be conducted in addition to transects and will follow the current California Native Plant Society – California Department of Fish and Wildlife Protocol for Combined Vegetation Rapid Assessment and Relevé, which was last updated April 2016.

Purpose: This data will establish a quantitative 2026 baseline to compare with historical data, inform ecosystem change analyses, and prioritize restoration needs.

Deliverable: A GIS-linked dataset and map layer of vegetation composition, disturbance, and presence of special-status plant species.

4.6. Bird Acoustic Surveys

As part of the Project, the Conservancy has developed a long-term monitoring strategy for measuring the response of bird species to restoration activities (HRMP 5.3.4).

Ground- and mid-story nesting species are expected to show the most rapid population response to deer removal and restoration activities, since deer browsing disproportionately affects understory vegetation, which is essential for many breeding bird species during the nesting season (Chollet et al. 2014).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Acoustic monitoring provides a non-invasive, scalable method to document changes in bird community composition and relative abundance over time, enabling the Conservancy to link restoration interventions to breeding bird responses.

The Conservancy will monitor up to 35 core acoustic stations, supplemented by additional stations in areas with current or planned habitat restoration activities (Exhibit 6). Sites were selected using stratified random sampling from a pool of locations with past or planned vegetation monitoring, ensuring coverage of multiple habitat types and restoration stages. Some sites will be located near exclosures to provide direct comparisons of vegetation and avian community structure. To reduce noise interference and potential recorder theft, stations will be placed at least 20 m from secondary roads and 50 m from primary roads, positioned to face the most open habitat available.

Acoustic Recorder Deployment: At each site, a single Audiomoth recorder will be mounted on an expandable pole approximately 1.8 m (6 ft) high. Recorders will be positioned away from trees to avoid leaf rustling and aimed toward the most open area. Recorders will be programmed to run between 0500–0900 hours (peak morning chorus) and 1900–0000 hrs (evening activity), aligning with breeding season vocalization peaks while optimizing battery life. All units will be deployed in early May and remain in the field for a four-week sampling period.

Habitat Data Collection: At each site, the Conservancy will collect vegetation structure and cover data annually during the acoustic deployment period. Metrics will include canopy height, understory density, shrub cover, and ground vegetation cover to link bird responses to habitat structure changes over time.

Target Species and Guilds: The Conservancy will analyze occurrence patterns for 4–6 focal species from each nesting guild:

- Ground nesters – e.g., San Clemente spotted towhee (*Pipilo maculatus clementae*)
- Mid-story nesters – e.g., Chipping sparrow (*Spizella passerina*)
- Canopy nesters – e.g., Catalina Hutton's vireo (*Vireo huttoni unitti*)
- Guild-level analysis will allow detection of differential responses to restoration and invasive Mule deer removal based on nesting height and habitat reliance.

Data Processing and Analysis: Audio files will be processed using BirdNET (Kahl et al. 2021), a machine-learning platform that identifies species from acoustic recordings. Data outputs will include species richness, species-specific occurrence rates, and guild-level presence/absence.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4.7. Shrew Surveys

The Santa Catalina Ornate shrew (also known as Catalina Island shrew; *Sorex ornatus willetti*) is the rarest endemic mammal on Catalina Island. First identified in 1941, it is an elusive species with only about 40 individuals observed since its discovery over 80 years ago. It is one of several subspecies of the ornate shrew that have a limited distribution. In 1986, the shrew was declared a Species of Special Concern by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife due to its restricted range, rarity, and the paucity of information concerning its life history.

This species serves as an indicator for understanding the health of ground-layer ecosystems. Its survival is linked to moisture-retaining shaded understory and intact leaf litter, conditions most consistently found in riparian corridors and lower elevation drainages. The extreme rarity and habitat sensitivity of the shrew make it especially valuable as a measure of restoration effectiveness in microhabitats—especially as invasive species removal, deer reduction, and native vegetation recovery progress.

Between 2006 and 2020, there were no shrew detections on the Island. In February 2020, the Conservancy placed remote cameras at all known historic shrew observations since 1941 (20 locations) and detected two individuals. Despite searching over 160 locations between 2021-2022, no additional shrews were detected. In 2023, the Conservancy expanded trapping effort to include live trapping with pitfall traps and Sherman traps. During the wet year in 2024, four shrews were detected via camera traps in two separate drainages on the windward side of the Island.

Core Monitoring Method: Camera Trapping: Given the species' small size, nocturnal behavior, and low detectability, remote camera traps serve as the primary long-term detection method for shrews. This method allows for minimally invasive, scalable monitoring that can operate seasonally or year-round in appropriate microhabitats.

Site Selection Criteria: Camera trap deployment is guided by microhabitat features documented in the 2023 shrew trapping report and historical detections. Key site selection attributes include:

- Dense leaf litter or understory vegetation for concealment and movement
- Habitat edges near riparian corridors or transitions between plant communities
- Moist soils that support invertebrate prey and soft substrate
- Shaded overstory conditions (e.g., oak woodland, mature coastal sage scrub)
- Sites are prioritized using fine-scale vegetation mapping and proximity to known or suspected shrew locations, with ongoing updates based on new detection

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Camera Trap Configuration: Camera traps are constructed using 10-gallon buckets with integrated Reconyx Hyperfire2 cameras, with a target focal distance of 40 cm. All components are secured for long-term deployment and baited to increase shrew visitation. Specific setup procedures include:

- Create a vegetation-free ring in the soil using the bucket's outline
- Insert a stake-mounted tea strainer baited with live mealworms and grass
- Place a second stake-mounted plastic cup containing dried mealworms
- Secure both bait components using wire and a ground stake
- Replace the bucket over the site and stabilize using straps and perimeter rocks
- Capture documentation photos.

Cameras are programmed to take a three-photo burst upon motion detection. Camera servicing occurs on a rotating one to four-week schedule depending on weather and activity.

Optional Methodology (Contingent on Funding): If funding allows, the Conservancy may implement expanded detection through Sherman traps and pitfall traplines.

- Sherman Traps. Sherman traps are collapsible aluminum box traps designed for small mammal capture. On Catalina, each unit is:
    - Baited with a mix of dried mealworms, live mealworms, and oats
    - Supplied with poly-fill nesting material to retain body heat
    - Placed 5–25 meters from pitfall lines to target complementary microhabitat
    - Checked at defined intervals depending on environmental conditions and trapline accessibility Closed during daylight hours to prevent overheating or stress
- Pitfall Traplines: If funding allows, pitfall traplines serve as an expanded detection method for the Santa Catalina ornate shrew and are deployed in conjunction with drift fencing to intercept ground-dwelling small mammals. Traplines will consist of two-gallon buckets (depth = 24 cm) sunk flush with the soil surface and linked by drift fencing to direct movement.

Two configurations are used: 3.5-meter and 7-meter fence segments between buckets, all constructed with 1-ft-tall barrier fencing.

- Key trap components and bait setup include:
    - Live and dried mealworms, along with oats, placed within each bucket
    - A 1x1-inch sponge soaked in water for hydration
    - Shelter materials including poly-fill nesting substrate and a 5-inch PVC pipe segment as refuge

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Traps are opened in the evening and checked at defined intervals depending on environmental conditions and trapline accessibility. All captures are processed and released at the point of capture. Trap success for shrews has been low but remains biologically important due to prior detections in similar habitat and methods.

4.8. Small Mammal Surveys

The Santa Catalina Island deer mouse (*Peromyscus maniculatus catalinae*) the Santa Catalina Island Harvest Mouse (*Reithrodontomys megalotis catalinae*), and the Santa Catalina Island ground squirrel (*Otospermophilus beecheyi nesioticus*) subspecies are endemic to Catalina. The monitoring of small rodent populations has occurred consistently on the other Channel Islands over the last 20 years (Schwemm & Coonan, 2001), yet those on Catalina have been understudied. The most recent data collected on native mice was due to incidental captures in 2003-2004 by USGS while using pit-fall arrays to survey reptiles and amphibians (Baklin et al. 2004). There have not been any formal studies of the ground squirrel population on Catalina. The study of these animals will detect trends in endemic small mammal population dynamics especially in response to landscape restoration. Estimating native mouse density and abundance in various habitat types will allow these surveys to inform Island-wide population trends and be directly comparable to surveys conducted by the other Channel Islands and previous trapping efforts on Catalina (Ashley 1983 and Perlmutter 1986).

Monitoring of the Santa Catalina Island deer mouse and the Santa Catalina Island Harvest mouse will employ mark-recapture grids and opportunistically, consistent with current National Park Service, Channel Islands National Park protocols described in Fellers et al. (1988). Mice will be trapped via Sherman aluminum folding live capture traps. Trapping grids will be established Island-wide in various habitat types and be sampled as funding and personnel permit.

Sherman traps will be baited with rolled oats, peanut butter and dried mealworms, and will have bedding material for thermoregulation. Sherman traps will be opened in the late afternoon and checked first thing the following morning; they will remain closed during the day. All mice will be identified to species, aged, weighed, sexed, and tagged. Biological samples including blood, feces, swabs and hair/whisker samples may be taken. Tagging methodologies include non-toxic paint/markers, fur clippings, PIT tags and metal ear tags (National Band & Tag, style 1005-1), All small mammals will be released at the site of capture.

Monitoring of the Santa Catalina Island ground squirrel will employ mark-recapture efforts, similar to the methods from Baldwin et al. (2021) and Person et al (2024). Squirrels will be trapped in Tomahawk cage traps (combination of 13 × 13 × 46 cm and 15 × 15 × 61 cm

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

traps; Tomahawk Live Trap, Hazelhurst, Wisconsin, USA) baited with rolled oats and peanut butter. Trapping grids will be established Island-wide in various habitat types and be sampled as funding and personnel permit.

Tomahawk squirrel traps will be open during the day and closed at night. Traps will only be left open while the weather remains favorable. All squirrels will be weighed, aged, sexed, and tagged. Biological samples including feces, swabs and hair/whisker samples may be taken. Tagging methodologies include non-toxic paint/markers, fur clippings, PIT tags, VHF/GPS collars and metal ear tags (National Band & Tag, style 1005-1), All small mammals will be released at the site of capture.

Summaries of annual trapping efforts will be compiled into an annual report and will be shared with CDFW and maintained on the Catalina Island Conservancy repository. Small mammal population estimates, and trapping will only occur in years with funding on a 3–5-year cycle.

4.9. Herpetofauna Surveys

There are many native herpetofauna on Catalina, more so than any of the other Channel Islands. Threats to their populations include disease, worsening drought conditions from climate change, and impacts from the invasive bullfrog. Monitoring efforts would aim to address these threats, track population trends and document the impacts of island restoration efforts on these sensitive species.

There are nine native reptiles [Side-blotched lizard (*Uta stansburiana*), San Diego Alligator lizard (*Elgaria multicarinata webbi*), Coronado skink (*Plestiodon skiltonianus interparietalis*), California kingsnake (*Lampropeltis californiae*), California mountain kingsnake (*Lampropeltis zonata*), Southern Pacific rattlesnake (*Crotalus oreganus helleri*), San Bernardino ring-necked snake (*Diadophis punctatus modestus*), Two-striped garter snake (*Thamnophis hammondii*), San Diego Gopher snake (*Pituophis catenifer annectens*)], two amphibian species native to this Island [Baja California chorus frog (*Pseudacris hypochondriaca*), Garden slender salamander (*Batrachoseps major*)], one invasive reptile [Red-eared slider (*Trachemys scripta elegans*)], and one invasive amphibian species [Bullfrog (*Rana catesbeiana*)].

Very little is known about the two-striped garter snake and the California mountain king snake population on the Island outside of a handful of observations. Other species such as the garden slender salamander, Pacific treefrog, side-splotched lizard and alligator lizard are frequently seen or heard throughout the Island and are assumed to be at relatively healthy population levels, though no formal assessment of this has taken place. Monitoring of all herp species on the Island will provide information about the health of the

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

populations and the impact of restoration on the microhabitats that these cryptic animals rely on.

Herpetofauna surveys will be conducted via systematic coverboard surveys, pitfall traps, funnel traps (single and double ended), dip nets, opportunistic surveys by moving habitat elements (ex. boulders) and hand catching or lasso catching individuals. Pitfall traps may be accompanied by a drift fence and will have mealworms, a PVC tube for shelter and a wet sponge for osmoregulation and will be checked every 12 hours. Funnel traps may be accompanied by a drift fence and will be checked daily while deployed. Herp funnel traps and pitfall traps will Designated Reptile and Amphibian Biologist(s) be closed during weather events such as heavy rain. During opportunistic surveys and coverboard surveys, any habitat element that is moved will be placed back exactly where it was found.

Captured herpetofauna will be measured, weighed, sexed and released at their capture site. Captured individuals may also be marked with a temporary non-toxic substance and swabbed (buccal for DNA, exterior for Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis). Biological samples such as toe clippings, scale clippings, and lizard tail tissue may also be collected.

Summaries of annual herpetological efforts will be compiled into an annual report and will be shared with CDFW and maintained on the Catalina Island Conservancy repository.

5. Outreach, Education, Engagement, and Workforce Development

The Project is not undertaken in isolation—it thrives through the active involvement of many communities, each contributing through education, workforce development, recreation, and volunteerism. The Conservancy has intentionally scaled these efforts to match the scope of island restoration, creating opportunities for engagement at every level. By connecting people to the Island's beauty and biodiversity, the Project will foster a shared sense of stewardship while building lasting partnerships that strengthen the restoration process.

5.1. Volunteer Events

The Conservancy hosts weekly volunteer events for both local residents and mainland visitors, providing meaningful opportunities to participate in hands-on conservation. Every Thursday, volunteers gather at the Ackerman Native Plant Nursery, where community members assist with transplanting, seeding, and managing native plants for restoration work across the Island. The Conservancy also runs "Restore and Explore" events, which bring volunteers to various locations for activities ranging from trail maintenance to beach cleanups. As part of island restoration, many of these "Restore and Explore" events will now also focus on wild seed collection and processing and invasive plant treatment.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Volunteer groups form a major component of the Conservancy's restoration workforce. In the first three months of 2025 alone, 13% of invasive plant removals on the Island were completed by volunteer groups staying at one of two dedicated camps—Laura Stein Volunteer Camp or Black Jack Volunteer Camp. During the first half of 2025, the Conservancy hosted 18 different groups, including Toyota, Farmers & Merchants Bank, Armanino CPA Group, the American Hiking Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Keene State College, and California State University–Long Beach. These groups receive complimentary camping accommodations and a front-row seat to large-scale conservation in action, gaining a unique and immersive experience in island ecology.

5.2. Workforce Development

The Conservancy's partnership with the conservation corps' has grown substantially in recent years. The Conservancy relies on the corps' for critical restoration work, including wildlife surveys, nursery enhancements, invasive plant removal, and—soon—seed collection.

In 2025 alone, conservation corps removed 32% of all invasive plants cleared from the Island's landscape, making them an essential part of the Conservancy's restoration success. This partnership has also expanded to include on-Island internships.

5.3. Public Outreach

Continued public outreach is a vital part of the Conservancy's mission. Each month, the Conservancy hosts the Catalina Island Speaker Series, a free event available both in person and virtually, featuring scientists who share their expertise and experiences with the public. The Conservancy also holds Community Conversations—an in-person forum where community members can engage directly with Conservancy leadership and ask questions.

In addition, the Conservancy organizes special events such as a recent community event around wildfire resilience, which included a new fox mascot serving as an Island ambassador and posting fire danger levels at the local museum. This free program gave local schoolchildren the opportunity to suggest a name for the fox mascot, interact with Conservancy scientists, and enjoy a documentary about the Island fox. These events create meaningful opportunities for learning, dialogue, and connection between the community and the conservation work happening on Catalina.

5.4. Education


The Conservancy's education team offers multiple pathways for the public to learn about restoration and conservation on Catalina. This includes the free, online Naturalist 1 course, as well as the more advanced Naturalist 2 and California Naturalist (CalNat) courses. In the first quarter of 2025 alone, the Conservancy's team educated more than 400 TK–12

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

students both on- and off-Island through youth and science programs. So far this year, the Conservancy has hosted 41 public programs, engaging over 385 participants. All of these educational offerings will continue, with the Catalina Island Restoration Project featured prominently as part of the Conservancy's broader community engagement efforts.

6. Exhibits

Exhibit 1: 10-acre Restoration Testing Site




Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit 2: 105 acre Restoration Location



Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit 3: Second Major Location for Restoration



Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit 4: 2024 Fox Traplines and Trap Locations



Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit 5: 60 Legacy Long-Term Vegetation Monitoring Plots



Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit 6: Song Bird Acoustic Monitoring Sites



Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Literature Cited

APRS Implementation Team. 2000. Alien Plants Ranking System Version 5.1. Jamestown, ND: Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center Home Page. http://www.npwrc.usgs.gov/resource.2000/aprs.htm

Ashely, M.V. and C. Wills.1987. Analysis of mitochondria DNA polymorphisms among Channel Island deer mice. Evolution 41(4) 854-863.Backlin, A.R., Compton, S.L., Kahancza, Z.B.

Bartman, R.M., White, G.C, Carpenter, L.H. 1992. Compensatory mortality in a Colorado Mule Deer Population. *Wildlife Monographs*. 121 pgs. 3-39.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2021. *Wild Pig Depredation Permit Guidance*. Wildlife Branch, Sacramento, CA.

California Code of Regulations, Title 14. Sections on firearms, safety zones, and wildlife take prohibitions.

Center for Plant Conservation. 2019. CPC Best Plant Conservation Practices to Support Species Survival in the Wild. Center for Plant Conservation, Escondido, CA.

California Botanic Garden's SEED COLLECTION POLICY Amended 31 January 2024 Pp 1-9. 6616feb5053855f29ca12dde_CalBG_Seed Collection Policy_Jan2024-2.pdf

Chollet, S., C. Bergman, A. J. Gaston, and J.-L. Martin. 2014. Long-term consequences of invasive deer on songbird communities: Going from bad to worse? Biological Invasions 17:777–790. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10530-014-0768-0>.

Crystal-Ornelas, R., J. A. Brown, R. E. Valentin, C. Beardsley, and J. L. Lockwood. 2021. Meta-analysis shows that overabundant deer (Cervidae) populations consistently decrease average population abundance and species richness of forest birds. Ornithological Applications 123. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ornithapp/duab040>.

Fellers, G.M., Drost, C.A., and Arnold, B.W. 1988. Terrestrial vertebrates monitoring handbook. National Park Service, Channel Islands National Park. Ventura, CA.

Fisher, R.N. 2004. Baseline biodiversity survey for Santa Catalina Island - Herpetofauna and ants with remarks on small mammals and others: U.S. Geological Survey Final Report prepared for Catalina Island Conservancy, CA.

Kahl, S., C. M. Wood, M. Eibl, and H. Klinck. 2021. BirdNET: A deep learning solution for avian diversity monitoring. Ecological Informatics 61:101236. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoinf.2021.101236>.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Knapp, J.J. 2007. Catalina Island Invasive Plant Management Plan. Unpublished Report submitted to the Catalina Island Conservancy, Avalon, California. 30 Pp.

Drone with Mounted Thermal Infrared Cameras for Monitoring Terrestrial Mammals. Larson et al. 2023

Moriarty, M. E., Vickers, T. W., Clifford, D. L., Garcelon, D. K., Gaffney, P. M., Lee, K. W., King, J. L., Duncan, C. L., and Boyce, W. M. 2015. Ear mite removal in the Santa Catalina Island fox (Urocyon littoralis catalinae): controlling risk factors for cancer development. PLoS One. 10(12):e0144271.

Mullin, B. H., L. W. Anderson, M. DiTomaso, R. E. Eplee, and K. D. Getsinger. 2000. Invasive Plant Species. Issue Paper Number 13. Council for Agricultural Science and Technology. 18 pp.

Perlmutter, G. B. 1986. Preliminary studies on the distribution of Native Mice on Santa Catalina Island, CA. In: F.G. Hochberg (ed). Third California Islands Symposium: recent advances in research on the California islands. Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History. 429-432.

Phillips, G. E., and D. A. Cristol. 2024. Mechanisms of deer (Cervidae) impacts on birds: A comprehensive review. Biological Conservation 290:110454. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2024.110454>.

Powell, J. A. 1994. Biogeography of Lepidoptera on the California Channel Islands. In: Halvorson WL, Maender GJ, editors. The Fourth California Islands Symposium: Update on the Status of Resources. Santa Barbara (CA): Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History. p. 449-464.

Powell, J. A. 2012. Lepidoptera recorded on Santa Catalina Island.

Schwemm, C.A. and Coonan, T.J. 2001. Status and ecology of deer mice (*Peromyscus maniculatus* subsp.) on Anacapa, Santa Barbara, and San Miguel Islands, California: summary of monitoring 1992-2000. National Park Service, Channel Islands National Park. Ventura, CA.

Stapp P, Hamblen E, Duncan CL, King JL. 2022. *Status of the introduced mule deer population on Catalina Island, California, based on annual spotlight counts.* Catalina Island Conservancy.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

USDA Wildlife Services. 2023. *California Wildlife Damage Management Environmental Assessment*. USDA–APHIS–WS, Sacramento, CA.

USDA Wildlife Services. 2018. *WS Firearms Safety Manual*. USDA–APHIS–WS, Washington, D.C.

Vickers, T. W., Clifford, D. L., Garcelon, D. K., King, J. L., Duncan, C. L., Gaffney, P. M., and Boyce, W. M. 2015. Pathology and epidemiology of ceruminous gland tumors among endangered Santa Catalina Island foxes (Urocyon littoralis catalinae) in the Channel Islands, USA. PLoS One. 10(11):e0143211.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit 5 – Habitat Restoration and Monitoring Plan: Landscape-Scale Adaptive Weed Management and Habitat Restoration Plan to Conserve the Biodiversity of Catalina Island

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Habitat Restoration and Monitoring Plan

Landscape-Scale Adaptive Weed Management and Habitat Restoration Plan to Conserve the Biodiversity of Catalina Island

Prepared for



320 Golden Shore, Suite 220
Long Beach, CA 90802

Prepared by



Land IQ
3791 Wade Street
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 Introduction 1

1.1 Project Location 2

1.2 Purpose 2
1.2.1 Expected Project Outcomes 6

1.3 Project Description 8
1.3.1 Background 8
1.3.2 Habitat Restoration Approaches 13
1.3.3 Removal of Invasive Mule Deer 14
1.3.4 High Priority Invasive Plant Control Program 14
1.3.5 Island Scrub Oak Chaparral Restoration Projects 15
1.3.6 Top-of-Watershed Habitat Restoration Projects 15
1.3.7 Infrastructure Maintenance and Cultural-Based Native Revegetation Projects 17
1.3.8 Native Plant Material Collection and Production 17
1.3.9 Biological Monitoring 18

1.4 Conceptual Approach 19

1.5 Island Habitat Restoration Goals, Management Hypotheses, and Principles 22
1.5.1 Habitat Restoration Goals 22
1.5.2 Management Hypotheses 22
1.5.3 Habitat Restoration Principles 24

2 Existing Conditions 27

2.1 Island History and Habitat Degradation 29
2.1.1 Geology 29
2.1.2 Topography 31
2.1.3 Climate 38
2.1.4 Soil 51
2.1.5 Indigenous People and Cultural Land Management 87
2.1.6 Impact of Invasive Species Introductions 89
2.1.7 Invasive Mule Deer Impacts 95
2.1.8 Fire 98

2.2 Catalina Island Conservancy Habitat Restoration Efforts 102
2.2.1 Invasive Ungulate Control 102
2.2.2 Catalina Island Fox Recovery 103
2.2.3 Restoration Plantings 103
2.2.4 Exclosures 105
2.2.5 Invasive Plant Management 106

2.3 Contemporary Island Habitat 113
2.3.1 Plant Diversity 113
2.3.2 Vegetation Communities 115
2.3.3 Vegetation Alliances and Associations 119
2.3.4 Wildlife 123
2.3.5 Climate Change Impacts 123

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2.4 Endemic Taxa 125
2.4.1 Endemic Plants 126
2.4.2 Endemic Invertebrates 126
2.4.3 Endemic Reptiles 129
2.4.4 Endemic Birds 129
2.4.5 Endemic Mammals 129
2.5 Special-Status Plant and Wildlife Taxa 130

3 Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Opportunities and Priorities 145
3.1 Watershed Management Unit Prioritization 146
3.2 Habitat Restoration Targets 148
3.3 Habitat Restoration Plant Palettes 148
3.4 Top-of-Watershed Habitat Restoration Opportunities 156
3.5 Island Scrub Oak Chaparral Restoration Opportunities 156

4 Adaptive Weed Management and Habitat Restoration 159
4.1 Overview 160
4.1.1 Adaptive Management 163
4.1.2 Passive Habitat Restoration 163
4.1.3 Active Habitat Restoration 163
4.2 Invasive Mule Deer Removal 167
4.3 High-Priority Invasive Plant Control 167
4.4 Site-Specific Restoration Project Design 169
4.4.1 Habitat Restoration Approach and Site-Selection 169
4.4.2 Site-Specific Restoration Plan 171
4.4.3 Site-Specific Restoration Project Success Criteria 171
4.5 Native Plant Palette Design 171
4.5.1 Ecological Succession Model 172
4.5.2 Wild Seed Collection and Provenance 172
4.5.3 Seed Bulk In-Place for Rare Plant Populations 173
4.5.4 Native Plant Production Decision Analysis 173
4.5.5 High-Diversity Native Habitat Restoration Seed Mix Design 174
4.5.6 Low-Diversity Native Cover Crop Seed Mix 176
4.6 Initial Dethatch 177
4.7 Erosion Control Measures 177
4.8 Adaptive Weed Management 178
4.8.1 Weed Management Principles 178
4.8.2 Weed Management Guidelines to Avoid Native Vegetation 185
4.9 Seeding Threshold Assessment 186
4.10 Seed Installation Methods 187
4.11 Nursery Grown Container Plants 188

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4.11.1 Biosecurity for Plant Production and Transport 188
4.11.2 Nodes of Nursery Grown Container Plants 188

4.12 Restoration Site Maintenance 189
4.12.1 Weed Management 190

5 Biological Monitoring and Resource Protection 191

5.1 Resource Protection Measures 191
5.1.1 Environmental Awareness Training/Island Fox Protection 191
5.1.2 Pre-Project Nesting Bird Survey 193
5.1.3 Restrictions on the Use of Herbicides 193
5.1.4 Restoration Site Protection Measures 193
5.1.5 Cultural Resource Protection 195

5.2 Site-Specific Restoration Project Biological Monitoring 197
5.2.1 Horticultural Monitoring 197
5.2.2 Plant Establishment Monitoring 198
5.2.3 Project Success Monitoring 199

5.3 Long-Term Monitoring Plan 200
5.3.1 Project Objectives and Target Thresholds 201
5.3.2 Vegetation Structure and Composition Monitoring Methods 205
5.3.3 Photo Monitoring 210
5.3.4 Wildlife Monitoring 211
5.3.5 Insect Monitoring 213
5.3.6 Soil Monitoring 213
5.3.7 Invasive Species Control Monitoring 214
5.3.8 Other Monitoring Methods 215

5.4 Assess and Adapt 215
5.4.1 Passive Restoration Areas 215
5.4.2 Active Restoration Areas 216

5.5 Reporting 216

6 References 217

Appendices ..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A **CATALINA INVASIVE PLANT PROGRAM (CIPP) GUIDE** (HIGH-PRIORITY INVASIVE PLANT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM)
APPENDIX B **CATALINA ISLAND PLANT LIST**
APPENDIX C **LAND COVER CHANGE ANALYSIS: 1985 TO 2022**
APPENDIX D **HABITAT SUITABILITY MODELS FOR CATALINA ISLAND PLANTS**
APPENDIX E **CO-OCCURRENCE MODELS FOR CATALINA ISLAND PLANTS**
APPENDIX F **HABITAT RESTORATION METHODS GUIDELINES**
APPENDIX G **REGULATORY SETTING**
APPENDIX H **NESTING BIRD MANAGEMENT PLAN**

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1 Summary of Legacy Impacts on Catalina Island's Native Habitat Over the Past 200 Years. 9
Table 2-1 Soil Complexes with Primary Geology, Soil Series and Soil Texture (2008 Soil Map). 57
Table 2-2 Soil Type, Taxonomic Family, Parent Material and Typical Vegetation. 68
Table 2-3 Catalina Island Fire History, 1915 to Present. 100
Table 2-4 Summary of the Number of Santa Catalina Island Plants, including all Species, Subspecies, or Varieties, by Taxonomic Group. 114
Table 2-5 Catalina Island 2000 Vegetation Map (Modified from Knapp 2005a). 116
Table 2-6 Special-Status Species on Catalina Island. 133
Table 3-1 Priority Watershed Management Units. 146
Table 3-2 Island Chaparral Plant Palette. 153
Table 3-3 Low Diversity Cover Crop Plant Palette. 155
Table 4-1 Summary of Adaptive Weed Management and Habitat Restoration Activities by Approach. 162
Table 5-1 Project Goals, Objectives, Monitoring Methods, and Management Actions. 202
Table 5-2 Long-Term Vegetation Monitoring—Primary Sites 208
Table 5-3 Long-Term Vegetation Monitoring—Secondary Sites 209

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1 Catalina Island Regional Location. 3
Figure 1-2 Catalina Island Aerial. 4
Figure 1-3 Catalina Island Landownership. 5
Figure 1-4 Island Scrub Oak (Quercus pacifica) Restoration Trial Plantings in Middle Ranch, 2003. .. 11
Figure 1-5 Deer Cages Protecting Endemic Catalina Island Ironwood (Lyonothamnus floribundus subsp. floribundus) Plantings. 11
Figure 1-6 Two Catalina Island Ironwood (Lyonothamnus floribundus subsp. floribundus) groves protected inside White's exclosure. 12
Figure 1-7 Little Harbor Exclosure Constructed in 2022 and Planted with Nursery Grown Plants. 12
Figure 1-8 Damage to White's Exclosure (left) after a series of winter storms with high winds and after repairs (right). 13
Figure 2-1 Generalized Geology Map for Catalina Island. 30
Figure 2-2 Elevation. 32
Figure 2-3 Western End of Santa Catalina T-Sheet 1603, Surveyed 1876 to 1877. 33
Figure 2-4 Western End of Santa Catalina T-Sheet 1603, Surveyed Between 1853 to 1873. 33
Figure 2-5 Eastern End of Santa Catalina T-Sheet 1603, Surveyed in 1878. 34
Figure 2-6 Aerial Photomosaic from 1943. 35
Figure 2-7 Aerial Photomosaic from 1953. 36
Figure 2-8 Aspect of Slope. 37
Figure 2-9 Slope Steepness. 39
Figure 2-10 View of Echo Lake 40
Figure 2-11 Precipitation Record for Catalina Island. 41
Figure 2-12 Island Weather Station Average Precipitation 42
Figure 2-13 Island Weather Station Accumulation of Precipitation in a Water Year. 43
Figure 2-14 Monthly Mean Cloud Albedo (Proxy for Cloudiness) for 1996 to 2018. 45
Figure 2-15 Solar Radiation Received During Equinox. 46
Figure 2-16 Mean Wind Speed in the Southern California Bight. 47
Figure 2-17 Island Weather Station Average Annual Wind Speed and Prevailing Wind Direction. 48
Figure 2-18 Island Weather Station Wind Rose Charts Showing Prevailing Winds from the West. 50
Figure 2-19 Soil Map Units for 2008 NRCS Survey. 56
Figure 2-20 Parent Material. 58
Figure 2-21 Depth to Restrictive Layer. 60
Figure 2-22 Available Water Supply to a Depth of 150 cm. 61
Figure 2-23 Organic Soil Horizon. 62
Figure 2-24 Organic Matter in the Topsoil (0 to 15 cm). 63
Figure 2-25 Soil Texture of the A Soil Horizon. 64
Figure 2-26 Clay Content of the Surface Layer and Average of the Full Soil Profile. 65
Figure 2-27 Topsoil (0 to 15 cm) pH and Cation Exchange Capacity (CEC). 66
Figure 2-28 Taxonomic Relationship of Soil Map Units by Soil Order and Suborder. 67
Figure 2-29 Taxonomic Relationship of Soil Map Units in the Entisols Soil Order. 78
Figure 2-30 Taxonomic Relationship of Soil Map Units in the Inceptisols Soil Order. 79
Figure 2-31 Taxonomy of the Soil Map Unit in the Vertisols Soil Order. 80
Figure 2-32 Taxonomic Relationship of Soil Map Units in the Mollisols Soil Order. 81
Figure 2-33 Taxonomic Relationship of Soil Map Units in the Alfisols Soil Order. 82
Figure 2-34 Water Balance Comparison Between Dewpoint and Coastwise Soils. 84
Figure 2-35 Annual Soil Loss Potential. 86
Figure 2-36 Dry Bare-Soil Index. 88

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 2-37 Timeline of Presence of Invasive Ungulates on Catalina Island. 90
Figure 2-38 Location of Historic Livestock Fences. 91
Figure 2-39 Vegetation Cover in 1985, 2007 after two large fires, and 2022. 93
Figure 2-40 Tree Cover has not recovered in Watersheds that Burned in the 2006 Empire and 2007 Island Fires. 94
Figure 2-41 An Island Scrub Oak plant is unable to recover after the 2003 Airport Fire because of mule deer browsing basal resprouts. 94
Figure 2-42 Exclosure (Outlined in Red) Protecting Island Chaparral Vegetation from the Impacts of Mule Deer Browsing Following the 1999 Goat Fire. 97
Figure 2-43 Catalina Island Fire Perimeter History, 1975 to Present. 101
Figure 2-44 Example of a Felt-Leaf Ceanothus Restoration Planting in an Herbivory Protection Cage. 104
Figure 2-45 Location of Caged Restoration Plantings Since 2008. 105
Figure 2-46 Mule Deer Exclosures. 107
Figure 2-47 Farnsworth Exclosure within 2007 Island Fire Footprint, Protecting Felt-Leaf Ceanothus Regeneration from Mule Deer Herbivory. 108
Figure 2-48 Potential Distribution of Seven Invasive Herbaceous Flowering Plants (excluding Grasses). 109
Figure 2-49 Potential Distribution of Four Invasive Grasses. 110
Figure 2-50 Potential Distribution of Three Invasive Shrubs. 111
Figure 2-51 Invasive Plant Control Survey and Treatment Locations from 2016 to 2023. 112
Figure 2-52 Vegetation Map for Year 2000. 117
Figure 2-53 Historic Records and Future Climate Change Scenario for Catalina Island. 124
Figure 3-1 Priority Watershed Management Units. 147
Figure 3-2 Island Chaparral and CSS Suitability Maps. 149
Figure 3-3 Coastal Bluff Scrub Suitability Maps. 150
Figure 3-4 Potential Natural Vegetation Map for Island Chaparral, CSS, and Coastal Bluff Scrub. ... 151
Figure 3-6 Opportunities for Island Scrub Oak Chaparral/Top-of-Watershed Habitat Restoration…157
Figure 3-7 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Scrub Oak (Quercus pacifica). 158
Figure 4-1 Catalina Island Adaptive Weed Management and Habitat Restoration Plan Overview. . 161
Figure 4-2 Catalina Island Native Plant Material Decision Analysis 175
Figure 4-3 Conceptual Model of Deposits to and Withdrawals from a Soil Seed Bank 180
Figure 5-1 Long-Term Vegetation Monitoring Sites 207
Figure 5-2 Long-Term Photo-Monitoring Sites 212

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was prepared by Land IQ Staff, Travis Brooks and Melissa Riedel-Lehkre, in collaboration with Travis Longcore, PhD, Adjunct Professor, UCLA Institute of the Environment and Sustainability, and geospatial scientist, Nina Noujdina. Robb Hamilton of Hamilton Biological provided essential support in developing the resource protection measures for sensitive and listed species.

We appreciate the dedicated efforts of the Conservancy staff who made this work possible, especially Lauren Dennhardt, PhD, Senior Director of Conservation, Aaron Kreisberg, Invasive Plant Program Manager, Kevin Alison, Plant Conservation Manager, and Makenzie Henk, Wildlife Conservation Manager. Additional thanks to Rachel Boyce, Cayman Lanzone, Becky Rudy, and Christopher Young for their assistance in fieldwork and logistics.

This plan would not have been possible without the support and contributions of all involved.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Catalina Island Restoration Project (Project) aims to restore ecological integrity on Catalina Island, 88 percent of which is owned and managed by the Catalina Island Conservancy in Los Angeles County, California. The Project focuses on mitigating threats posed by nonnative ungulates, invasive plant species, human-caused fire ignition, and a changing climate, which have collectively led to biodiversity loss, erosion, decreased water capture, and reduced habitat quality.

Project components include:

1. Invasive plant management: Continuing existing efforts to control high-priority invasive species.
2. Landscape-scale habitat restoration: Reversing habitat type conversion and enhancing native plant and wildlife populations.
3. Long-term monitoring: Tracking plant and wildlife populations to inform management actions.
4. Nonnative mule deer removal: Addressing overbrowsing, creating opportunities for landscape-scale habitat restoration of endemic native plants and higher quality wildlife habitat.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Four habitat restoration approaches will be implemented using an adaptive management framework:

1. Whole Island passive recovery: Biodiversity recovery through mule deer removal and invasive plant control.
2. Island Scrub Oak Chaparral Restoration: Increasing diversity and native plant recruitment by replacing low-diversity nonnative annual grass understories with higher-diversity native shrubs, herbs, and grasses.
3. Top-of-Watershed Habitat Restoration: Prioritizing habitat restoration from the top down, to improve soil health and increase biodiversity in critical watershed management units with significant cultural and biological resources.
4. Infrastructure Maintenance and Cultural-Based Native Revegetation: Integrating best practices for native revegetation into infrastructure maintenance and promoting opportunities to plant culturally significant native species in consultation with tribal representatives.

A distinctive aspect of the plan is the integration of modeling techniques to (1) characterize the influence of environmental factors on vegetation recovery following drought, fire, and invasive ungulate removal, and (2) identify suitable habitat restoration targets and plant palettes for highly disturbed natural communities. Additionally, the plan incorporates landscape-scale habitat restoration approaches that leverage natural processes to provide feasible and cost-effective methods. Key strategies include:

1. Site preparation and weed management: Employing natural rainfall-driven grow-and-kill events to deplete the weed soil seed bank, reducing competition with native species.
2. Soil health improvement: Implementing erosion control measures in areas with significant topsoil loss, along with the introduction of low-diversity native cover crops, to build soil nutrients and structure over time. This will enable the establishment of island chaparral in areas currently unsuitable due to degraded soil conditions.

By combining modeling techniques with adaptive habitat restoration approaches, the Project strives to address the complex challenges posed by the island's European land use history, endemic flora and fauna, and rugged topography. The Project is vital for preserving the island's unique ecosystems, enhancing climate resilience, and protecting endangered wildlife, such as the Catalina Island Fox. By employing a comprehensive and adaptive approach, the Project will help ensure the long-term conservation of Catalina Island's rich biodiversity.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

1 INTRODUCTION

The Catalina Island Habitat Restoration and Management Plan (HRMP) identifies suitable habitat restoration targets for degraded island vegetation communities, provides restoration principles that leverage natural ecological processes, prioritizes restoration opportunities by watershed management unit, and provides best practice for high quality, cost-effective habitat restoration and enhancement at the landscape scale to support the long-term conservation and restoration of the island's unique ecosystems. The plan is structured as follows:

Section 1: Introduction

- Purpose of the HRMP
- Description and expected outcomes of the Project
- Conceptual approach to the development of the plan
- Goals and management hypotheses of the restoration Project
- Key habitat restoration principles

Section 2: Existing Conditions

- Legacy impacts of human activities on island habitat health and ecosystem function
- Current environmental conditions and their interaction with the island's flora and fauna
- Summary of past and current habitat restoration efforts

Section 3: Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Opportunities and Priorities

- Identification of opportunities for passive and active habitat restoration
- Prioritization of active restoration approaches by watershed management unit

Section 4: Adaptive Weed Management and Habitat Restoration

- Description of the key components of whole island habitat restoration, including mule deer removal, invasive plant control, and native plant production
- Elements of site-specific project design for active habitat restoration approaches, include site-selection, native plant palette design, erosion control measures, adaptive weed management, seeding methods, and site maintenance

Section 5: Biological Monitoring and Sensitive Species Protection

- Presentation of site-specific restoration project biological monitoring methods
- Description of protections for sensitive and protected species
- Presentation of long-term monitoring methods for invasive plants, vegetation change, and wildlife
- Integration of monitoring data to assess and adapt the HRMP to changing conditions

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

The HRMP is designed to provide a flexible and adaptive framework for achieving the goals of the Catalina Island Restoration Project. By integrating scientific knowledge, management expertise, and ongoing monitoring and evaluation, the HRMP aims to support the long-term health and resilience of the island's unique ecosystems.

1.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The Catalina Island Restoration Project (Project) is located on land owned and managed by the Catalina Island Conservancy (Conservancy), a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization, in the County of Los Angeles, California (Figure 1-1). Catalina Island, also known as Santa Catalina Island, is approximately 33 kilometers (km) long and 12.5 km across at its greatest width and is situated about 34 km southwest of Los Angeles and approximately 50 km away from Orange County. The island is part of the Channel Islands archipelago, also referred to as the California Channel Islands, and is accessible by ferry from the mainland. Catalina Island is known for its rugged and hilly terrain, with steep cliffs and deep canyons that create a dramatic and varied landscape (Figure 1-2). The island is also home to a variety of plants and animals, including at least sixty endemic species that are found nowhere else in the world. The Conservancy is dedicated to balancing conservation, education, and recreation, and offers visitors the opportunity to explore the island's natural beauty through a range of activities such as hiking, biking, scuba diving, snorkeling, and kayaking, as part of its mission to be a model steward of the island's resources.

The Project encompasses all the Conservancy land in unincorporated LA County, which is roughly 88% (approximately 17,000 hectares or 42,087 acres) of the island (approximately 19,400 hectares or 47,992 acres total) (Figure 1-3). The City of Avalon has 1,409 land parcels comprised of public and private landowners, totaling approximately 700 hectares, or 1,809 acres. Outside Avalon, in addition to the Conservancy, there are five other private landowners: Santa Catalina Island Company (15 parcels, including El Rancho Escondido and Two Harbors, totaling approximately 1,600 hectares or 3,986 acres); two private landowners (two parcels totaling approximately 30 hectares or 73 acres); Southern California Edison (11 parcels totaling approximately 10 hectares or 21 acres); University of Southern California (USC Wrigley Institute for Environment and Sustainability [WIES] Dornsife Wrigley Marine Science Center, approximately 5.6 hectares or 14 acres).

1.2 PURPOSE

The purpose of the Project is to restore the ecological integrity of Catalina Island by protecting and enhancing the biodiversity of native plants and wildlife habitats. The ecosystem of Catalina Island has been negatively impacted by a history of nonnative ungulates reducing vegetation cover and selectively browsing on rare and endemic plants, as well as the spread of invasive plant species that outcompete native plants in areas degraded by past ranching practices. These factors have led to a loss of biodiversity, extirpation of native species, diminished climate resiliency, increased soil erosion, decreased water capture, and reduced wildlife habitat quality.



Figure 1-1 Catalina Island Regional Location.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 1-2 Catalina Island Aerial.

Aerial Source: LARIAC Aerial Image from 2020.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 1-3 Catalina Island Landownership.

Aerial Source: LARIAC 2020. Parcel data provided by the Conservancy.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

As climate change intensifies and fire regimes change, Catalina faces further risks to its habitat and rare species due in part to the depletion of the native soil seed bank. The Project addresses these issues through the removal of nonnative mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*), continuing and the existing invasive plant management program (Appendix A), implementing landscape-scale habitat restoration to reverse habitat type conversion, and long-term monitoring of plant and wildlife populations to inform management actions.

1.2.1 Expected Project Outcomes

The Project will improve climate resiliency, protect cultural resources, conserve state and federally listed species, and enhance public access and safety in several ways:

1. Increasing biodiversity and native vegetation cover: Removing nonnative mule deer will allow island endemic plants to recover and naturally recruit in the absence of nonnative ungulates that they lack defenses against. This will increase biodiversity and restore the island's native vegetation, promoting a more resilient and diverse ecosystem. Additionally, the recovery of native plants can help improve soil health, stabilize slopes, and provide habitat for native wildlife, further enhancing the resilience and sustainability of the island's ecosystem.
2. Restoring native habitats: By restoring areas that are currently infested with invasive plants, such as coastal sage scrub (CSS), island chaparral, island scrub oak chaparral, maritime cactus scrub, dune mat, riparian, and native grassland, the Project will help improve the resilience of the island's ecosystem to climate change by promoting biodiversity and improving ecosystem function. The resulting higher quality habitat across the island will provide increased opportunities for native wildlife species to thrive, including seeking refuge, breeding, and foraging.
3. Enhancing habitat connectivity: By improving the quality and connectivity of habitats across the island, the Project can help species adapt to climate change by providing them with the resources they need to move and survive in a changing environment.
4. Reducing invasive species: By reducing the population of invasive plants and animals on the island, the Project can help protect native species and habitats, including those of state and federally listed species.
5. Conserving soil: Reducing topsoil erosion is crucial for improving soil health, restoring native habitats, and protecting downstream sensitive species and cultural resources. To achieve this, the Project will implement erosion control measures and restore native vegetation in highly degraded areas. Researchers have shown that deeper soils can be held intact under shrublands when they would fail under grasslands (Gabet and Dunne 2002). This will help stabilize

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

slopes, increase water infiltration, and reduce sedimentation in waterways, ultimately enhancing the resilience and sustainability of the island's ecosystem.

6. Increasing carbon sequestration: The Project's focus on revegetation of native perennial vegetation communities, such as CSS, chaparral, and native bunch grasses, can help increase carbon sequestration, thereby mitigating the effects of climate change and improving the island's resilience to its impacts (e.g., Koteen et al. 2011).
7. Increasing water retention and stormwater quality: Restoring native perennial vegetation can significantly improve the island's water retention and infiltration capacity. This will help reduce stormwater runoff, decrease erosion, and increase groundwater recharge, ultimately benefiting the island's freshwater supply. The restoration of deep-rooted native plants can also help capture and store more water in the soil, making it available for use by plants and animals during dry periods. In addition, increased water retention can help mitigate the impacts of drought and climate change on the island's ecosystem, supporting island ecosystem resilience and sustainability. Native vegetation will reduce the amount of nitrogen and suspended sediments in stormwater runoff.
8. Enhancing public access and recreational opportunities: By restoring the island's habitat and increasing biodiversity, the Project will create new opportunities for the public to appreciate and enjoy the natural beauty of Catalina Island. Visitors will be able to explore restored backcountry areas, observe a greater variety of native wildlife, and admire the vibrant wildflowers that will thrive in the enhanced ecosystem. This will not only provide a more enriching experience for visitors but also increase public awareness and appreciation of the importance of conservation and restoration efforts. The Project will thus not only enhance the island's natural beauty but also promote environmental education and stewardship.
9. Reducing the risk of catastrophic wildfires: The restoration of native perennial vegetation is crucial in mitigating the risk of wildfires, particularly those fueled by “flashy” dry fuels from nonnative annual plants. By replacing these highly flammable plants with less ignition prone native species, the Project can help reduce the likelihood of fire ignition and slow the spread of wildfires if they do occur. This is particularly important in protecting the community of Avalon, as well as the island's unique flora and fauna. By promoting a more fire-resilient ecosystem, the Project can help create a safer and more sustainable future for Catalina Island, reducing the risk of catastrophic wildfires and their devastating impacts.
10. Monitoring and adaptive management: By monitoring the success of the restoration efforts and adapting management strategies as needed, the Project can help ensure that the island's ecosystem remains resilient to climate change and other stressors over the long term.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

1.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1.3.1 BACKGROUND

Catalina Island has been significantly altered since the arrival of European colonists in the early 1800s and was managed in a different way by the indigenous people of the Los Angeles Basin and southern Channel Islands for approximately 9,000 years prior to European settlement. The contemporary landscape of the island retains many of the native plant and animal species that are common to the Channel Islands and coastal California, although their distribution and abundance has been altered due to legacy impacts to the ecosystem and habitat over the last 200 years (Table 1-1). Some of these impacts were of sufficient scale and/or duration to have resulted in the extirpation or near loss of many island endemics.

The primary vision for Conservancy's current 5-Year Strategic Plan (2023 to 2028) is landscape restoration, to complete a "major Catalina Island landscape restoration project, protecting native plants and animals from extinction and enhancing people's engagement with and understanding of the Island." The Conservancy is taking action to implement this vision by planning to remove the invasive mule deer population, which paired with the existing invasive plant control program, Catalina Invasive Plant Program (CIPP), will allow for "passive" recovery of island biodiversity. Mule deer, while important to mainland ecosystems, are invasive to Catalina Island's unique flora. The island is special with over 60 endemic plants—meaning they're found nowhere else on earth. The introduction of nonnative browsers to the island has had significant negative impacts on those endemic plants, and native wildlife habitat. The Conservancy has already seen success with the removal of feral pigs and goats, which resulted in improved biodiversity and native habitat recovery (e.g., Laughrin et al. 1994, Knapp 2009). With the removal of the mule deer, island endemic plants, which did not evolve natural defenses to large ungulates, will have the opportunity to passively recover in parts of the island that have enduring native soil seed banks and in areas that are actively managed as part of active habitat restoration projects.

The planned removal of the mule deer is a game-changing moment, allowing for significant recovery of the island's biodiversity and habitat restoration opportunities at the landscape scale to protect wildlife. With a changing climate, Catalina Island's relatively stable climate (due to its proximity to the ocean) makes it an ideal spot to preserve California's biodiversity. Removing the invasive mule deer will also help revitalize habitat for island wildlife, including habitat for Catalina Island Fox (*Urocyon littoralis catalinae*), a state and federally listed as threatened wildlife species.

The removal of invasive mule deer from Santa Catalina Island has become even more crucial due to the increased threat of large wildfires, such as the 2007 Island Fire that burned almost 5,000 acres, or about 10 percent of the island. This event marked the largest recorded fire on the island in the last 100 years.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 1-1 Summary of Legacy Impacts on Catalina Island's Native Habitat Over the Past 200 Years.

Legacy Impact	Causes
Loss of Island Endemic Plants	Selective browsing pressure by intensive livestock farming (e.g., sheep) and by other invasive ungulates (e.g., feral pigs, feral goats, mule deer) and rooting for bulb plants and roots by feral pigs. The impact of browsing and rooting also extends to plants that are not endemic but preferred food sources.
Topsoil Loss & Excessive Erosion Features	Overgrazing and browsing from intensive livestock farming (e.g., sheep and cattle) and invasive ungulates (e.g., feral pigs, feral goats, mule deer) that are not native to the island ecosystem denuded many watersheds of vegetation cover, increasing bare ground, reduced soil water retention and organic matter. Road construction and maintenance.
Loss of Wetland & Salt Flat Habitat	Development in Avalon, Two Harbors, and smaller impacts in other developed bays, especially on the channel side.
Loss of Floodplain Scrub & Willow Woodland in Large Watersheds	Felling of trees for fuel and construction material. Cultivation of crops. Addition of Harding grass (*Phalaris aquatica*) to help reduce topsoil loss in Middle Canyon from intensive livestock farming. Construction of dams to create reservoirs and livestock ponds.
Reduced Water Infiltration & Water Quality	Type-conversion of native vegetation communities to nonnative annual grassland following clearing or intensive livestock farming combined with the intentional or accidental introduction of Eurasian annual grasses (e.g., ripgut brome, wild oats, soft chess, red brome) and forbs (e.g., fennel, thistle, mustard). Many of these plants are now naturalized and will be impossible to eradicate.
Loss of Scrubland Habitat	Accidental release of highly invasive plants, such as Mediterranean broom (*Genista linifolia*), which was first planted in the early 1900s at Saint Catherine Hotel in Descanso Canyon and subsequently invaded the hills of the Avalon watershed, displacing native scrub to become the dominant shrub in many areas. Control in the interior has been effective, but new populations continue to be found in the backcountry and require treatment to contain the population in Avalon. Type-conversion of upland coastal sage scrub and island chaparral following clearing or intensive browsing and grazing from introduced ungulates combined with the introduction of Eurasian grasses and forbs. The impacts of ungulate browsing on native vegetation are magnified following wildfire when resprouting shrubs and germinating plants are more palatable.
Increase in Size & Frequency of Fire	Human-ignition sources have increased during the dry season, leading to larger and more frequent fires than would have occurred historically, especially in the past 20 years (e.g., 2006 Empire Fire and 2007 Island Fire that combined burned 12% of the island). This trend is also coincident with an increase in vegetation cover following the removal of feral goats and pigs in the early 2000s. From evidence on the mainland, Indigenous island people likely managed the island using fire to increase access to other parts of the island through canyons with dense understories and to manage food sources such as chia and acorns but the fire frequency on Catalina was historically much lower than that on the mainland.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Typically, Catalina's native vegetation can recover successfully from fires if they do not occur too frequently, allowing the plants to naturally recover through seed bank replenishment and basal resprouting. However, the pressure exerted by invasive herbivores, including mule deer, on native plants can lengthen the time it takes for recovery. This extended recovery time leaves the habitat vulnerable to irreversible damage from subsequent fires and periods of extended drought (e.g., see Appendix C). Additionally, browsing from invasive mule deer can even halt the recovery of certain rare species or sensitive habitats altogether. With wildfires becoming more common and more destructive, and the invasive plants and mule deer putting extra pressure on native plants, the island's delicate ecosystem faces a perfect storm of threats. The combination of these factors increases the likelihood of larger and more frequent fires, which further threatens the island's biodiversity and ecological integrity.

Past Conservancy habitat restoration efforts have necessarily been relatively small and focused on caged planting of island shrubs and trees, or fenced exclosures that allow for plantings and natural recruitment by keeping out the invasive ungulates. For example, between 1999 and 2005, the Conservancy planted over 35,000 island scrub oak (*Quercus pacifica*) acorns in experimental trials to evaluate strategies to overcome invasive ungulate browsing pressure on oak regeneration, such as exclosures and tree tubes (e.g., see Figure 1-4, Stratton 2009). The results inform the development of restoration strategies in this HRMP, especially the need to remove invasive mule deer to scale up the recovery of native island habitat.

In 2016, the Catalina Island Conservancy initiated a native tree-planting project near Haypress Recreation Area and Laura Stein Volunteer Camp with the aim of replacing nonnative trees. The Conservancy chose to plant several rare and native species, including the Catalina Island ironwood (*Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus*) and the island oak (*Quercus tomentella*). To protect the newly planted trees from damage by invasive mule deer, the Conservancy installed steel caging around each individual plant. However, despite these protective measures, the planted trees were unable to thrive and grow beyond their cages due to the intense browsing pressure from mule deer (e.g., see Figure 1-5).

Following the 2007 Island Fire, the Conservancy constructed White's Exclosure, a large, fenced area designed to allow native plants to grow and recover without being damaged by invasive mule deer (e.g., see Figure 1-6). Many of Catalina's rarest species, such as island rush-rose (*Crocanthemum greenei*) and island bush poppy (*Dendromecon harfordii*), were able to flourish. In 2022, the Conservancy constructed the Little Harbor Exclosure and installed 100 native plants grown in the Conservancy's Ackerman Native Plant Nursery (Figure 1-7). This is a small exclosure, protecting just 0.03 acres. This exclosure conserves two rare species that have been nearly extirpated from Catalina, malva rosa (*Malva assurgentiflora* subsp. *glabra*) and cliff spurge (*Euphorbia misera*). Malva rosa only exists naturally on Bird and Indian Rock where it is protected from browsing. Most of the cliff spurge populations on the island have been extirpated, with only two remaining isolated populations near Little Harbor remaining (Conservancy data).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 1-4 *Island Scrub Oak (Quercus pacifica) Restoration Trial Plantings in Middle Ranch, 2003.*

Photo taken by the Conservancy in 2003.



Figure 1-5 *Deer Cages Protecting Endemic Catalina Island Ironwood (Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus) Plantings.*

Note the mule deer browse damage outside the protective deer cages, and how the trees are unable to grow past the boundaries of the cages due to extensive browsing. Photo taken by the Conservancy on October 10, 2023.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 1-6 Two Catalina Island Ironwood (Lyonothamnus floribundus subsp. floribundus) groves protected inside White's exclosure.
Photo taken by the Conservancy on March 14, 2013.



Figure 1-7 Little Harbor Exclosure Constructed in 2022 and Planted with Nursery Grown Plants.
Photo taken by the Conservancy on January 30, 2024.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

While deer exclosures have been successful in protecting small areas in the past, it's simply not practical or feasible to expand this approach island-wide. The rugged terrain of the island makes it prohibitively expensive and difficult to construct and maintain large fenced exclosures. Fenced exclosures are regularly breached due to erosion, wind, and animal damage (e.g., see Figure 1-8). Despite regular maintenance and repairs by the Conservancy, the effectiveness of these exclosures is limited to protecting just 0.3% (56.6 hectares or 140 acres) of the island.

To achieve the landscape restoration vision, which is critical to island conservation, education, and recreation, the Conservancy is taking several other actions, including the reorganization of Conservancy staff structure to support the new Strategic Plan, building a residence Hall to support larger restoration crews and collaborators such as Conservation Corps Long Beach, and increasing the amount of key plant seed through seed bulking.



Figure 1-8 *Damage to White's Exclosure (left) after a series of winter storms with high winds and after repairs (right).*
Photos taken by the Conservancy on February 28, 2023.

1.3.2 HABITAT RESTORATION APPROACHES

Passive restoration of island habitat will occur following the removal of the invasive mule deer population, which will allow for natural recruitment and growth of island endemics and other native vegetation that are not deer resistant. However, island habitat recovery will not be complete without additional interventions due to competition from a significant weed soil seedbank (Pearson et al. 2016), native seed limitation due to a depleted soil seed bank (Seabloom et al. 2003), lack of seed dispersing animals (e.g., Catalina lacks scrub jays to help disperse acorns), and other legacy effects (e.g., Magnoli et al. 2013), such as loss of topsoil due to past ranching practices. To recover island habitat and ecosystem function in areas affected by invasive species or other disturbances, active habitat restoration efforts will be necessary (see Section 4).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Four habitat restoration approaches have been developed, which will be implemented in an adaptative management framework:

1. *Whole Island passive recovery of biodiversity through removal of mule deer and high priority invasive plant control using the existing CIPP program*
2. *Island Scrub Oak Chaparral Restoration*
3. *Top-of-Watershed Habitat Restoration*
4. *Infrastructure Maintenance and Cultural-Based Native Revegetation*

1.3.3 Removal of Invasive Mule Deer

Removing mule deer from Catalina is a critical component of achieving the Project's goals, as their continued presence and browsing habits inhibit the restoration of native vegetation and habitat. This removal will be accomplished through ground shooting, as well as sterilization of select "Sentinel" deer to ensure thorough population control. In populated areas, deer will be managed through capture using bait followed by culling, chemical immobilization followed by euthanasia, and sterilization. Deer will be found via detection dogs in remote areas and aerial detection methods. In remote areas, deer will also be captured via aerial net capture. No deer will be dispatch via firearm from a helicopter. The timing of removal efforts will be carefully planned to coincide with the mule deer's reproductive cycle, specifically during the estrus period when they are more social, to maximize efficiency and minimize the need for additional removals. All project activities will be conducted in accordance with the American Veterinary Medical Association's Depopulation guidelines for humane handling of animals, ensuring that the removal process is carried out in a safe, ethical, and responsible manner.

To minimize any potential environmental impacts during removal operations, the Project will use non-lead ammunition and retain carcasses on the landscape. Carcasses will be removed from areas frequented by people, such as populated areas or near trails, paths, and roads, and placed in more remote areas to decompose naturally. This will not only minimize potential health risks to humans and domesticated animals but also provide a valuable source of nutrients for the local ecosystem. The carrion of large animals is rich in nutrients and can benefit plant growth and a diverse range of wildlife, including arthropods, insectivorous birds, small mammals, scavengers such as eagles, and top predators. Overall, the Project is committed to undertaking removal operations in a responsible and environmentally conscious manner (see Section 4.2).

1.3.4 High Priority Invasive Plant Control Program

The Conservancy has an existing invasive plant management program, called the Catalina Invasive Plant Program (CIPP) (see Appendix A), which includes the following features:

1. Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) to detect, monitor, and eradicate new invasive plant introductions before it can spread.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2. Eradication of all known populations on the island, or from natural areas, of species that have significant ecological impacts and are feasible to eliminate.
3. Control of species too widespread to be eradicated by reducing invasive plant populations in high priority watersheds, restoration areas, and high use areas.
4. Corridor Management of species too widespread to be eradicated and commonly found along corridors, such as the roadways, that serve to spread invasive plant propagules.

CIPP will be an important part of achieving the restoration goals of the Project. Passive recovery of native habitat following removal of the invasive mule deer will be significantly enhanced by controlling invasive plants that might otherwise outcompete native vegetation and impair ecosystem functions (e.g., water retention, soil health). CIPP includes annual invasive plant surveys, followed by targeted control of high priority invasive species, which are determined to be the greatest island threats. This invasive plant monitoring program will be integrated into the long-term monitoring plan, as part of the adaptive management scheme of this HRMP (see Section 4.1.1).

1.3.5 Island Scrub Oak Chaparral Restoration Projects

The island scrub oak (*Quercus pacifica*), a dominant species of the scrub oak chaparral community and a common tree across island upland habitats, occupies approximately a quarter of the island area, primarily on north-facing slopes (Knapp 2002). Between 1943 and 2005, Knapp (2007) estimated that there was a 30 percent loss of island scrub oak habitat. Consequently, there is significant concern about the long-term viability of the island scrub oak population and the low diversity and cover of native species in the understory and between canopies of many areas of the vegetation community due to mule deer impacts, and the legacy effects of past ranching practices (e.g., land clearing, intensive livestock production, and overbrowsing), feral pigs (e.g., rooting), and an infestation of invasive Eurasian grasses and forbs (Sratton 2007).

For this restoration approach, island scrub oak chaparral that is dominated by an understory of nonnative annual grasses and forbs will be restored with diverse native island upland scrub, herbs, and grasses. This will help to build healthy soil and recreate regeneration niches for island scrub oak acorns. Potential restoration areas in proximity to accessible roads will be prioritized, which allow timely seasonal weed management for multiple years using natural rainfall-driven “grow-and-kill” cycles to deplete the weed soil seed bank (Section 4.8).

Diverse native seed mixes will be the focus of this restoration approach (Section 4.5.5), including a full range of plant functional groups to replicate the natural disturbance recovery process that island chaparral is adapted to (e.g., early successional forbs, perennial grasses, woody shrubs).

1.3.6 Top-of-Watershed Habitat Restoration Projects

To restore areas with highly eroded topsoil due to historical overgrazing and overbrowsing from past ranching practices and the introduction of invasive ungulates

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

(e.g., feral goats, pigs, and mule deer), which have contributed to the loss of native vegetation cover and increased soil erosion, we propose implementing a targeted active restoration approach. We will restore these areas with a series of strategies:

- Implement erosion control measures to reduce sheet and rill erosion (Section 4.7)
- Reduce the nonnative soil seed bank through a series of rainfall-driven "grow-and-kill" weed management events over multiple years (Section 4.8)
- Strategically plant nodes or small clusters of container plants of key shrub and tree species that are underrepresented in the watershed and do not establish readily from seed (Section 4.11.2)
- Install a low-diversity native cover crop (Section 4.5.6).

The intent of the native cover crop is to establish native perennial vegetation to help rebuild healthy soils, intercept rainfall to reduce topsoil erosion, and establish the conditions for long-term recruitment of diverse native island vegetation communities through natural recruitment. In some cases, it may be appropriate to install a high-diversity native seed mix, when the seed material is available or if there is an immediate need to protect a sensitive species in the short-term through the establishment of higher diversity native cover (Section 4.5.5).

It is essential to conduct most, if not all, weed management prior to seeding to (1) optimize the success of native seed addition and minimize the impact of weed management on native vegetation establishment, (2) reduce the total cost of weed management. Weed management methods will include mechanical (e.g., mowing, line trimming) and chemical (e.g., targeted foliar applications of post-emergent, systemic herbicides) treatments. In highly degraded areas, the use of large, mechanized equipment or broadcast herbicide applications is more cost-efficient, as there are fewer native plants to avoid. Following native seed addition, most mechanized and chemical weed control methods can be detrimental to successful vegetation establishment from seed (Brooks et al. 2019). Hand weeding is often the preferred method for weed management after seeding; however, it is generally not cost-effective or feasible at the landscape scale. Therefore, the goal of this approach is to focus on intensive weed management in the early stages of restoration, leveraging the efficiency of large-scale weed control methods to reduce the weed seedbank and create a more favorable environment for native seedling establishment. This proactive approach can help ensure the successful restoration of native plant communities and enhance the resilience of the restored ecosystem.

The areas targeted for the top-of-watershed approach are identified in Section 3.4 and have the following qualities: significantly impacted by topsoil loss; accessible by a well-maintained road to allow for crew access to consistently conduct timely seasonal weed management and container transplant watering and basin weeding. This habitat restoration approach will be prioritized across watershed management units based on the sensitivity of biological resources (e.g., rare, or protected plant or wildlife

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

populations) down watershed that will be protected and enhanced by this top-of-watershed approach (Section 3.4).

1.3.7 Infrastructure Maintenance and Cultural-Based Native Revegetation Projects

For the maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure, such as roadways, buildings, and equipment, revegetation efforts should prioritize the use of native plant species that are compatible with the adjacent built environment and complement the surrounding native habitat (Section 4.1.3). These restoration activities should align with the methods outlined in this plan for other active habitat restoration methods, but may require modifications to accommodate specific constraints, such as fuel modification zone requirements.

Cultural-based native revegetation projects restore indigenous plants with cultural significance, benefiting both local wildlife and tribal nations. For instance, planting tule (e.g., *Schoenoplectus* spp., *Typha* spp.) near reservoirs offers opportunities for cultural material collection while enhancing bird habitat by providing screening from human activity. This approach fosters biodiversity and supports the overall health of the ecosystem.

1.3.8 Native Plant Material Collection and Production

To ensure a reliable supply of native seeds for landscape-scale habitat restoration projects, both wild seed collecting and bulk production on farmland in Middle Ranch will be employed. Third-party testing by an accredited seed testing laboratory will also be utilized to ensure the quality and viability of the native seeds.

This approach allows for a diversified and robust native seed supply chain, supporting the long-term success of restoration efforts. By incorporating both wild seed collection and bulk production, the Project can leverage the strengths of each approach to produce high-quality native seeds that are well-suited to the specific needs of the restoration sites.

Native seed that is not available in sufficient quantities for collection on Catalina and not feasible or reasonable to bulk in the Middle Ranch seed increase fields, may be bulked on the mainland. A native plant production decision tree is included in this HRMP to help the Conservancy identify which plant species are suitable and more economical to produce on the mainland, while maintaining biosecurity, genetic integrity, and appropriate climatic adaptation for island restoration (Section 4.5.4). As a rule, island

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

endemic plants and natives with high cross-pollination potential will be collected and bulked on the island.

The Conservancy will use their existing nursery infrastructure in Middle Ranch to produce container plants to support outplantings for the top-of-watershed habitat restoration and infrastructure maintenance native revegetation approaches (Section 4.11). For larger planting projects, when appropriate biosecurity measures can be assured, an offsite mainland nursery may be used to propagate native material collected on the island.

Potential seed application methods include but are not limited to sowing by hand, broadcasting by hand and with devices such as seed spreader, seed ball broadcasting, mechanical broadcast seeding with devices such as a push or motorized broadcast spreader, drill seeding manually or with a mechanized drill seeder, hydroseeding, imprint seeding, and remedial seeding. Selection of an appropriate technique for a site will be based primarily on conditions and accessibility (Section 4.10).

1.3.9 Biological Monitoring

To ensure the effectiveness of habitat restoration efforts and achieve island restoration goals, two scales of biological monitoring will be implemented: site-specific restoration project monitoring for active restoration approaches (Section 0) and long-term vegetation and wildlife monitoring (Section 5.3).

Site-specific biological monitoring includes:

- **Protected Species Monitoring**: Measures will be taken to avoid and minimize impacts to sensitive and protected species (Section 5.1).
- **Seasonal Horticultural Monitoring**: This monitoring will determine the optimal timing of weeding and supplemental irrigation events (Section 5.2.1).
- **Seasonal Plant Establishment Monitoring**: This monitoring will track seed and nursery-grown transplant germination and growth (Section 5.2.2).
- **Annual Spring Monitoring**: This monitoring will assess progress towards site-specific habitat restoration goals (Section 5.2.3).

Together, these monitoring efforts provide insights into the effectiveness of restoration activities at each site and help inform the adaptation of HRMP approaches and methods as needed to meet restoration goals.

To gain a comprehensive understanding of island-wide habitat health and assess the success of conservation efforts, long-term monitoring will be conducted in three domains:

- **Invasive Plant Control Program Monitoring**: The success of the high-priority invasive plant control program in mitigating the threats posed by invasive species will be assessed annually through the CIPP program (Section 5.3.7).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- **Vegetation Structure and Composition Change**: To enable detailed monitoring, biodiversity monitoring stations and vegetation transects will be established and monitored every 5 to 10 years across Catalina (Section 5.3.2). These stations will serve as data collection points, providing information on the health of the ecosystem, including the diversity and abundance of plant and animal species, as well as abiotic conditions. And to assess island-wide changes in vegetation structure, land cover change (e.g., tree, shrub, herbaceous vegetation cover classes) will be assessed following the methods in Appendix C and discussed in Section 5.3, Long-Term Monitoring Plan. Large wildfire events, or other significant disturbances to island habitat may necessitate more frequent or additional monitoring events to assess island health and recovery.
- **Sensitive and Protected Wildlife Monitoring**: The status of sensitive and protected species will be regularly monitored to guide adjustments to the plan (Section 5.3.4). Existing wildlife monitoring programs are conducted for the Catalina Island fox, Catalina Island shrew (*Sorex ornatus willetti*), and breeding seabirds.

By integrating these monitoring efforts, the Project can gain a comprehensive understanding of the status of the island's ecosystems and the effectiveness of restoration efforts. This data will enable informed decision-making and continuous improvement of restoration approaches, supporting the long-term sustainability and resilience of Catalina's ecosystems.

Regular assessments of plant and wildlife populations will be conducted to track trends and identify areas where further interventions may be necessary. This information will be used to inform the adjustment of habitat restoration strategies and priorities over time, ensuring that conservation efforts remain aligned with the changing needs of the island's ecosystems.

1.4 CONCEPTUAL APPROACH

The Conservancy has identified landscape island restoration as the primary focus of their current 5-Year Strategic Plan (2023 to 2028). In addition to conserving and restoring high quality habitat for sensitive and protected species, the HRMP must address changing climate, more frequent large fires, existing integrated planning efforts (i.e., invasive plant control programs, infrastructure maintenance, educational programs, public open space for passive recreation), and biosecurity issues that arise for an island that has multiple landowners and is a popular ecotourism destination.

Coordinating and organizing efforts across the landscape scale requires the use of Geographic Information Systems (GIS), which is the preferred method to evaluate opportunities and threats to restoration at the landscape scale (Meinke et al. 2009). The development of this plan and its specifications therefore depend on modern spatial data management and modeling tools that have become more common in conservation planning and landscape management.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

To develop an effective and comprehensive HRMP, this updated plan draws upon the rich experiences of the Conservancy's more than 50 years of stewardship and the insights gained from the scientific and technical literature on restoration ecology.

First, at the scale of hectares, successful habitat restoration is correlated with the environmental niches that define conditions for plant species to survive and thrive (Palik et al. 2000). Data and analysis on the conditions associated with dominant plant species are therefore necessary to establish ecologically appropriate restoration targets across the landscape (Meinke et al. 2009). Successful habitat restoration is correlated with getting appropriate species in a location (site) and then corresponding with annual weather conditions necessary for plant establishment (i.e., the key variables of habitat restoration are site and year). Finding the appropriate locations for different plant communities in the absence of detailed historic vegetation maps will be supported by spatial environmental niche modeling (Appendix D).

Second, even if plant distributions are well-understood at the scale of hectares across the landscape, it is difficult to predict how plant species will respond within a site at the scale of meters. Because data on soils, topography, and disturbance conditions are not available at this scale, a restoration specialist never knows how a vegetation community will develop on a site without experimentation and adaptation to local conditions. Microsites—the variation at the scale of meters—are critically important in determining what species will grow where (Eliason and Allen 1997, Morzaria-Luna et al. 2004, Blumler 2018). This plan therefore presents a set of practices, starting with weed management and leading to seed-based plant material addition that plans for local site variation within a hierarchical system of vegetation niche mapping (Section 4).

Third, even with careful planning, habitat restoration has inherent uncertainty. Historical data to fully understand vegetation distributions may be lacking and require significant effort to locate and synthesize (e.g., Mattoni and Longcore 1997, Stein et al. 2010). Unknown past land uses may impact soil and site conditions at a fine scale. The local watershed may be altered, impacting hydrological conditions. Climatic changes, such as increasing soil aridity earlier in the season (Cooke et al. 2004), require consideration (Choi et al. 2008, Gelviz-Gelvez et al. 2015). Highly variable events, such as rainfall and Santa Ana wind conditions, influence a site from year-to-year, along with associated wildfires and droughts. This plan therefore seeks to manage these uncertainties by utilizing an adaptive management process that is resilient to even these uncertainties, in which site-specific project and longer-term change monitoring (Section 5) inform adjustments to the plan.

Fourth, island habitat has been recovering from a 200-year legacy of ranching and introduced ungulates that preferentially browsed on endemic plants, along with the added challenge of invasive plants. Between 1943 and 2005, a loss of 30 percent cover of island scrub oak chapparal habitat was observed (Knapp 2007a), however, in 2023 there are observations of crown resprouting in some of the impacted areas. Native vegetation cover and diversity has been increasing for over twenty years since the feral goats and pigs were removed by the early 2000s, a process that began in the 1990s. Two

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

large human-ignited wildfires (2006 Empire Fire and 2007 Island Fire) occurred that have resulted in loss of native tree and large shrub cover, as a result of the interaction of mule deer browsing on native resprouts and seedlings during an extended period of drought. Understanding the island-wide trajectory of lifeform change of tree, shrub and herbaceous cover would be useful and should influence the restoration strategy. We therefore analyzed 38 years (1985 to 2022) of US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (USFS) Landscape Change Monitoring System (LCMS) data for the island to characterize how island vegetation cover has responded to the removal of feral goats and pigs, climatic trends, and large fire events (Appendix C).

Fifth, the vegetation communities have been significantly impacted by past ranching practices, selective grazing and browsing pressure on island endemic plants, and recent large fires, resulting in vegetation communities that may not always reflect pre-colonial species assemblages. Therefore, we conducted clustering and network analysis on co-occurring species observations with key diagnostic species in the Consortium of California Herbaria CHH2 database to identify likely groupings of species (Appendix E). These groups were compared to the existing descriptions of island vegetation communities to guide the development of restoration plant palettes for island vegetation communities. Further, the ecological niche models (Appendix D) for the diagnostic species were combined to identify suitable restoration locations for these vegetation community targets (Section 3).

Together, this conceptual approach involves quantifying island-wide vegetation change over the past 38 years (Appendix C), modeling the environmental conditions associated with the potential distribution of key native plants (Appendix D), identifying likely island vegetation assemblages (Appendix E), and synthesizing the ecological niche and species assemblage clustering results to identify suitable habitat restoration targets for island vegetation communities (Section 3).

This conceptual approach has two implications that are necessary compromises to achieve the greatest restoration benefit in the most cost-effective manner. First, the precise location of specific habitat restoration areas might not be planned ahead of time within a larger area under management. For example, to achieve a hectare of coastal sage scrub restoration, several hectares of land might be treated and seeded and the hectare that is ultimately suitable for scrub development would not necessarily be identified at the outset. Second, it is nearly inevitable that intransigent areas may not respond to habitat restoration efforts and will remain as weedy/nonnative grass inclusions (i.e., stuck sites) within a matrix of restored habitats. Rather than invest significantly in converting those sites with finite restoration resources, accepting such inclusions is in the best interest of accomplishing the most extensive restoration at the landscape scale. Such concessions reduce the area supporting native plants—however, nonnative annual grasslands can have wildlife benefits in terms of supporting higher densities of native snakes and raptors compared with native perennial grasslands (Wolf et al. 2017). An example of an exemption to this recommendation would be if the intransigent site is of high value to a target species of conservation, or if the site is a

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

significant source of high priority invasive species that are invading the adjoining native habitat—in which case, more intensive management activity may be warranted.

1.5 Island Habitat Restoration Goals, Management Hypotheses, and Principles

1.5.1 Habitat Restoration Goals

The HRMP is designed to enhance critical ecosystem functions, restore the diversity and life-form of island plant communities, and protect locally rare, threatened, or endangered native species. The plan focuses on the restoration of terrestrial habitats that have been greatly altered since European colonization in the 1800s but does not include the island's marine environment. The HRMP's overarching goal is to improve the island's habitats and biodiversity while also supporting human wellness and recreational opportunities. The plan's specific goals are as follows:

1. **Increase Native Habitat Cover and Quality for Wildlife** - This goal aims to enhance the quality and coverage of native habitats to support a diverse range of wildlife species.
2. **Improve the Health and Vigor of Island Endemic Populations (Plant and Wildlife Species)** - The HRMP seeks to protect and enhance the populations of plant and wildlife species that are endemic to the island, ensuring their long-term survival.
3. **Stabilize Soil in Highly Erosive Areas** - By focusing on soil stabilization, the HRMP aims to reduce erosion and improve the health of the island's soils.
4. **Increase Soil Water Retention** - This goal involves improving the soil's ability to retain water, which is essential for supporting healthy plant growth and ecosystem function.
5. **Control, Reduce, and Eradicate Invasive Species Populations** – Managing the impacts from invasive plant species is a key objective of the HRMP, as these species can pose significant threats to native biodiversity and ecosystem health.

1.5.2 Management Hypotheses

The following management hypotheses have guided the development of this HRMP. Many of these hypotheses assume that the invasive mule deer population has been removed, or substantially reduced, at the time of implementation and will be entirely removed soon thereafter. With landscape-scale habitat restoration, there is a focus on identifying and leveraging natural processes and ecological systems to achieve a desired end state or target in a cost-effective and scalable manner. Data from future monitoring efforts can be used to revise these management hypotheses or generate new ones.

1. Native forb and woody plant cover will increase following the removal of mule deer and the on-going management of the bison herd size, which will be the last introduced ungulate on the island.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2. Restoration and enhancement of shrubland and woodland island plant communities will benefit Santa Catalina Island fox (*Urocyon littoralis catalinae*), which is a habitat generalist, apex predator and keystone island species.
3. Fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*) occurrences, which are high priority for control, will not significantly increase after mule deer removal, because they are not highly palatable to deer and therefore have not been kept in check by browsing since the removal of feral goats (full eradication by 2005) from the island.
4. The removal of the mule deer population will have an insignificant impact on the cover of nonnative annual grass because mule deer are highly selective feeders, with most of their diet comprised of leaf and twig browse of woody shrubs (Collins and Urness 1983), supplemented with forbs in spring and summer (Longhurst et al. 1952), and acorns in fall and early winter when nutritional stress is highest (Cronemiller and Bartholomew 1950, Harlow et. al 1975, Ashcraft 1979, Pine and Mansfield 1980).
5. After removal of mule deer, a one-time prescribed fire event at locations that are both suitable for island chaparral and have an extant island endemic seed bank from long-lived seed species, will increase biodiversity of island chaparral vegetation communities.

   The use of prescribed fire should be considered as a once in 200-year opportunity to reset the biodiversity of island chaparral communities after mule deer removal. However, repeated fire in the same area is not recommended because the natural fire return intervals in maritime chaparral can exceed 100 years. Indigenous residents likely used fire as a management tool on the island, such as for food resources (e.g., chia, acorn) or to thin dense woodland or chaparral understory in steep canyons for improved access, but past cultural use of fire is not well understood, and we do know that frequent or high intensity fire can have negative impacts on many island plants and wildlife.

6. The cover of island scrub oak (*Quercus pacifica*) has increased over the past twenty years (2003 to 2022) with the removal of feral goats, which browse on basal resprouts. Without herbivory, a multi-stem tree can regenerate its canopy continuously, although individual branches have a maximum lifespan of 100 to 115 years. The removal of mule deer will further increase basal sprout recruitment.
7. The ecosystem function of highly denuded areas with topsoil loss and excessive erosive features will be rehabilitated to support woody island plant communities (e.g., island woodland and island chaparral) by modifying the connectivity of water and wind pathways (e.g., sheet flow erosion, erosion rills and gullies) to promote the accumulation of resources (e.g., moisture, organic matter, silt, litter, seed) in patches.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

8. Restoration of native vegetation cover in areas with moderate to high levels of nonnative annual grass will improve water retention, reduce erosion, and improve water quality in the watershed.
9. Island scrub oak chaparral understory and the open areas between trees are currently dominated by nonnative annual grass and forbs. Revegetating these gaps with coastal sage scrub associated flora will promote acorn regeneration niches with reduced competition with nonnative grasses, reduced topsoil erosion, increased silt and soil organic matter, and increased soil water holding capacity.

1.5.3 HABITAT RESTORATION PRINCIPLES

The following are key habitat restoration principles, with the goal of increasing biodiversity and ecosystem function on the island. By applying these principles, the Conservancy can develop effective and sustainable strategies to improve island habitat and support the recovery of rare, listed, and protected island species.

1. Focus restoration efforts at the top of the watershed for multiple benefits, including (a) reduction of topsoil loss and expansion of erosive features, (b) maximization of natural seed dispersal processes downslope by gravity and water, (c) protection of rare plant populations (e.g., Catalina ironwood, *Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus*) and/or at-risk wildlife (e.g., Santa Catalina shrew) directly downslope or lower in the watershed, and (d) accessible restoration project areas near access roads and trails for crew and equipment.
2. Ecological sites with low native diversity in one or more plant functional groups (e.g., early successional species, grasses, herbaceous forbs, woody shrubs, trees) are most efficiently restored by diverse seed mix applications with natural rainfall rather than transplanting nursery grown container plants, which typically require expensive temporary irrigation systems and water.
3. To reduce the competitive effects of nonnative annual grasses and forbs on native plant establishment, a holistic weed management approach is necessary. This approach involves implementing at least three or four years of consistent "grow-and-kill" weed management, where three or four weeding events per year are conducted with natural rainfall to control weeds before significant viable seed set. The term of weed management should include at least one year with above-average rainfall, to ensure that the weed soil seed bank is adequately reduced before native seed addition. This weed management approach should be focused on areas that are consistently accessible throughout late winter through summer. By concentrating weed management efforts in these accessible areas, the Conservancy can ensure that seasonal crops of weeds are not regularly missed, thereby increasing the likelihood of successful habitat restoration.
4. It is significantly more efficient to use larger mechanized equipment (e.g., mowing with a tracked skidsteer or tractor, walk behind mower) or broadcast

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

herbicide application (e.g., grass-specific herbicide; broad-spectrum herbicide where there is little to no native vegetation) when desirable native vegetation can be avoided during the control of nonnative vegetation, such as in a nonnative annual grassland.

5. Pre-emergent herbicides are not compatible with habitat restoration in most circumstances because they reduce native cover and diversity by suppressing the native seedbank and seeded material—except in the case of highly invasive plants that do not have a feasible alternative and are a threat to at risk wildlife habitat or spreading into other watersheds.
6. Plant palettes for vegetation communities that are selected for specific ecological sites on the island are more likely to establish and will minimize waste of Conservancy and natural resources for plants that are not ecologically suitable for an area.
7. Plants that are (a) locally rare in a watershed due to legacy impacts, (b) either culturally significant, rare plants that need population expansion, or provide critical wildlife habitat, and (c) require digestion by animals (or artificially treated with acid by nursery propagation techniques) to germinate, such as berry producing plants (e.g., cherry, manzanita, redberry, elderberry, poison oak), can be strategically planted to encourage wildlife consumption and seed dispersal (e.g., Bartel et al. 2023).

   Collecting, propagating, or planting species that are state or federally listed as threatened or endangered is not a focus of this HRMP; the Conservancy would need to obtain the appropriate permissions or permits from either California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife (USFWS) to incorporate listed plant species in a specific habitat restoration project.
8. Plants that do not readily establish from seeding applications, do not have sufficient propagules in the watershed, and/or are critical to establish to avoid temporal impacts to at risk wildlife, can be strategically planted from nursery stock.
9. When nursery grown transplants are required, they should be planted in groupings that provide multiple project benefits including concentrating weed maintenance and temporary supplemental irrigation of the planting basins near accessible roads and trails, modifying connectivity, and maximizing natural rainfall capture by planting in erosion rills and gullies, and increasing protection of rare plant or at-risk wildlife populations downslope.
10. Do not actively remove, but not necessarily maintain stock ponds or reservoirs that are not part of the drinking water supply for the human population or for the welfare of the bison herd. Allow the ponds to fill up during high rainfall years and provide migratory and local birds with open water habitat. Retention of water increases groundwater recharge and increases near surface soil moisture downstream later into the dry season. Invasive amphibians like American

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

bullfrogs (*Lithobates catesbeianus*) can be cost-efficiently controlled in most of the island backcountry ponds in higher rainfall years after successive low rainfall years that dry out the ponds.

11. Successful island habitat restoration requires the involvement and support of a wide range of stakeholders, including local communities, land managers, and scientists. Engaging these groups in the island restoration project through compatible education, community volunteer, and recreational opportunities can help to build support for conservation efforts and ensure the long-term sustainability of Catalina Island.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2 EXISTING CONDITIONS

Nestled within the California Pacific Islands, Catalina Island forms part of the California Floristic Province, a globally recognized biodiversity hotspot teeming with plant life found nowhere else on Earth (Myers et al. 2000). This remarkable ecological region owes its high diversity and endemism to a relatively stable climate throughout the Pleistocene epoch (Lancaster and Kay 2013, Sniderman et al. 2013). Catalina Island's separation from the mainland, which occurred over 5 million years ago (Vedder and Howell 1980), has resulted in a rich tapestry of unique plants and animals found only on its shores. This high level of endemism highlights the island's immense value for conservation, as oceanic islands like Catalina often harbor species distinct from their mainland counterparts (Ratay et al. 2014).

The California Pacific Islands, a chain of 18 islands stretching from the Farallones in the north to Isla Natividad in the south, are an ecological marvel off the Pacific coast of California and the Baja California Peninsula. These islands share a distinctive and diverse flora, rich in endemic genera, species, subspecies, and varieties that cannot be found on the mainland. Collectively, the California Pacific Islands are home to 1,239 native plant taxa (Knapp and Randall 2017). The California Channel Islands, a subset of this archipelago, boast approximately 100 endemic species, significantly contributing to more than 10% of California's known flora. The California Channel Islands can be further divided into northern and southern groups, each characterized by its unique composition of flora. The northern group consists of Anacapa, Santa Cruz, Santa Rosa, and San Miguel, while the southern group includes San Clemente, Santa Catalina, Santa Barbara, and San Nicolas (Junak et al. 2012) (Figure 1-1).

Although the vegetation communities on these islands are like those found on the mainland, island-endemic taxa are a prominent feature across most of them. On Catalina Island, vegetation evolved over millions of years without mid-sized or large herbivores. The only land mammals arguably native to Catalina Island are the deer mouse (*Peromyscus maniculatus catalinae*), Catalina Island shrew, Catalina Island fox, which was introduced 6,000 years ago (Sacks et al. 2022), harvest mouse (*Reithrodontomys megalotis catalinae*), and Catalina ground squirrel (*Otospermophilus beecheyi nesioticus*) (Rick et al. 2012). The island's maritime-moderated Mediterranean climate and isolation led to the evolution of numerous island-endemic plant species, all of which developed in the absence of larger herbivores.

Catalina Island's significance extends beyond its ecological riches, as it also holds a wealth of cultural history dating back thousands of years. Evidence of human settlements on the island can be traced back to 6,165 to 5,745 years before present through radiocarbon dating (Radde et al. 2024). Neighboring San Clemente Island and San Nicolas Island have documented settlements from around 8,500 (Gusick et al. 2021) and 8,400 (Rick et al. 2005) years before present, respectively. Indigenous settlements are found along the island's coasts and terraces, with some sites now submerged due to the island's gradual sinking and rising sea levels (Porcasi et al. 1999). Indigenous peoples

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

actively managed the island's vegetation through fire (Hardiman et al. 2016), while their staple foods primarily consisted of marine resources (Salls 1988, Raab et al. 1994, Porcasi and Fujita 2000). Catalina's Indigenous communities were present during Vizcaino's 1602 visit (Williamson 1903) and endured hardships during conflicts with Russian fur traders (Mead 1899) and the Spanish Mission period. By the 1830s, as deduced from baptismal records at the San Gabriel Mission (The Huntington Library 2006, Chavez 2017), the island's entire indigenous population had either died or relocated to the mainland to work in missions or as ranch hands for private landowners. This displacement occurred because of various factors, including the arrival of European explorers, the spread of diseases, and the impacts of colonization (Williamson 1903).

Spanish exploration led to the island being claimed for the Spanish Empire in the 16th century. During the Mexican ownership period, which began in 1821, the island was primarily used for ranching purposes by various settlers. In 1846, Thomas Robbins became the first private landowner of the island through a Mexican Land Grant. Upon the conclusion of the Mexican–American War in 1848, the United States annexed the Mexican territory of Alta California. The westernmost part of this territory eventually transitioned into the American state of California. The island changed hands several times, eventually falling under the ownership of James Lick in 1864. Lick attempted to develop the island as a resort destination but ultimately sold it to the sons of Phineas Banning in 1891. The Banning Brothers established the Santa Catalina Island Company in 1894, which played a significant role in developing the island's tourism infrastructure, including hotels, attractions, and roads. In 1915, William Wrigley Jr. purchased a controlling interest in the Santa Catalina Island Company. Under his direction, the island saw further development, such as the construction of the Catalina Casino. The Wrigley family continued to own and manage the island until 1975, when they transferred most of their holdings to the Catalina Island Conservancy.

Today, the Catalina Island Conservancy owns and manages approximately 88% of the island, focusing on preserving the island's natural and cultural resources. The Santa Catalina Island Company, a descendant of William Wrigley Jr.'s original company, owns another 11% and focuses on tourism and hospitality services.

Recognizing Catalina Island's unique biological and cultural heritage is crucial as we undertake habitat restoration initiatives. This understanding ensures the protection of its irreplaceable flora, fauna, and human history, all of which contribute to the island's distinct identity. The island's remarkable evolutionary history emphasizes the vital role of conservation efforts in maintaining the region's ecological balance. By prioritizing the preservation of Catalina Island's unique plant and animal life, we safeguard these extraordinary ecosystems for future generations to enjoy, study, and protect. Ultimately, these efforts will secure Catalina Island's future as a sanctuary for both nature and culture, allowing its rich heritage to thrive for years to come.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2.1 ISLAND HISTORY AND HABITAT DEGRADATION

2.1.1 GEOLOGY

Santa Catalina Island's geology dates back over 200 million years, composed mainly of metamorphic rocks formed by ancient geological events. Intense heat and pressure transformed surrounding materials, creating the island's unique foundation. Since its formation, the island has experienced significant erosion, volcanic activity, and changing sea levels, contributing to the diverse landscape we see today.

As summarized in the recent USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (2008) Soil Survey of Catalina Island, around 65 million years ago, at the end of the Cretaceous period, the rate of subduction and uplift slowed significantly. In the following 40 million years, erosion outpaced any significant geological uplift, carving out the landscape and depositing silt and sandstones across other islands and along the California coast. Approximately 30 million years ago, in the Oligocene period, the California borderland's transform fault system emerged. As tectonic plates transitioned from a head-on collision to the lateral motion now parallel to the coast, numerous faults formed, causing extensive land repositioning. This period marked the beginning of another phase of volcanic activity, which lasted from about 23 million to 5 million years ago, during the Miocene period. During the Miocene Epoch, the portion of Catalina Island we see today was submerged beneath the ocean. Evidence of underwater andesite extrusion sits adjacent to a large quartz diorite pluton on the island's eastern end, labeled as map code “Tmqd” on Figure 2-1.

Catalina Island comprises two primary geological provinces: the igneous and metamorphic formations. The igneous province of rock extends from the eastern end to the western slopes of Black Jack Mountain and Mount Orizaba, marked by the map codes "Tv" and "Tmqd" on Figure 2-1. This younger igneous layer overlies the basement metamorphic formation, spanning from Salta Verde Point in the south to the western end of the island.

The basement rock consists of a mélange of metamorphic components, such as Catalina schist (blueschist and greenschist), amphibolite, serpentinite, hornblende gneiss, muscovite, and talc (USDA 2008). This assemblage, known as the Franciscan Formation, is identified by the map code "Jcs."

The igneous province is further categorized into extrusive and intrusive regions (Rowland 1984). From east of Avalon to Thompson Reservoir, intrusive igneous rock, Catalina Island pluton, quartz diorite is represented by the map code "Tmqd." Moving westward, various andesite rock, a fine-grained extrusive igneous rock that is formed when volcanic magma erupts and crystallizes outside of the volcano, encompasses prominent landmarks like Mount Banning, Mount Orizaba, and Black Jack Mountain, signified by the map code "Tv."

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-1 Generalized Geology Map for Catalina Island.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

During the Quaternary Period, spanning the last 2.58 million years, numerous landslide deposits (Qal) and alluvium accumulations (Qls) formed. This period encompasses the Pleistocene and Holocene epochs, characterized by significant geological and climatic events. The Pleistocene was marked by multiple cycles of glacial growth and retreat, while the Holocene, which began 11,700 years ago, saw the final glacial retreat and the spread of humans across the globe, including to California and the California Pacific Islands. Alluvium (Qls) is found lower in the watershed in larger alluvial plains and at the Isthmus.

Less extensively found are marine sedimentary deposits (Tms), San Onofre Breccia (Tmso) (breccia is rock composed of large angular broken fragments of minerals or rocks cemented together by a fine-grained matrix), and marine and nonmarine sedimentary rocks (Tkf).

2.1.2 TOPOGRAPHY

Santa Catalina Island's landscape is characterized by steep, dissected mountains, and hills, with watersheds that predominantly flow laterally towards the northeast and southwest. The island's highest point is Mount Orizaba, which reaches an elevation of 639 m (2,097 ft) while Silver Peak, located on the western end, stands at 550 m (1,804 ft) (Figure 2-2). The island's watershed structure exhibits an asymmetrical pattern, with longer, more gradual stream systems on the windward side, contrasting with steeper and shorter systems on the leeward side.

The topography of the island was first surveyed between 1853 and 1878 by the United States Coast Survey (USCS) and these maps are commonly referred to as “T-sheets” (see Figure 2-3 to Figure 2-5) (NOAA 2023). Land IQ used aerials from 1942 (Fairchild Aerial Surveys 1943) and 1953 (Pacific Air Industries 1953) to create historic georectified photo mosaics of the island: Figure 2-6 and Figure 2-7. These surveys and historical aerials do not predate the initial impacts by invasive herbivores and ranching practices on the island. Sheep (*Ovis aries*), cattle (*Bos taurus*), and goats (*Capra hircus*) were introduced in the 1820s. However, reconstruction of the historic topography from the T-Sheets and historic aerials when compared to recent surveys may elucidate areas that may have experienced change in the past 150 years, such as recently completed by Longcore and Ethington (2023) for selected indigenous village sites in southern California.

The north-facing, channel-facing side of the island is generally leeward, along with the north-facing slopes of Middle Canyon and Bullrush Canyon (Figure 2-8). These valleys bend westward due to active tectonic forces influencing the southeastern portion of the island (Legg et al. 2004). Major valleys on the windward side, such as Avalon Canyon, Middle Canyon, Cottonwood Canyon, Cape Canyon, Silver Canyon, and Bullrush Canyon, are characterized by significant alluvial deposits, narrow hillslopes, and flood deposits (USDA 2008).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-2 Elevation.

.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-3 Western End of Santa Catalina T-Sheet 1603, Surveyed 1876 to 1877.
(USDA 2023).




Figure 2-4 Western End of Santa Catalina T-Sheet 1603, Surveyed Between 1853 to 1873.
(USDA 2023).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-5 Eastern End of Santa Catalina T-Sheet 1603, Surveyed in 1878.
(USDA 2023).




Figure 2-6 Aerial Photomosaic from 1943.

The historic aerials (Fairchild Aerial Surveys 1943) are courtesy of UCSB Library Geospatial Collection.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-7 Aerial Photomosaic from 1953.

The historic aerials (Pacific Air Industries 1953) are courtesy of UCSB Library Geospatial Collection.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-8 Aspect of Slope.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Steep side slopes (Figure 2-9) often terminate in narrow drainageways. In certain regions, particularly at the island's eastern end, these drainageways exhibit a distinctive pattern, forming curved, continuous S-shaped structures as they collect material from the side slopes. This unique curving feature signifies that the side slopes are eroding at a more rapid pace than the material being transported by the drainageways directly beneath them. Moreover, this characteristic is typical of the quartz-diorite parent material, which is more durable when compared to the metamorphic Catalina schist rock. Some of these drainageways are experiencing an increase in their base levels or a filling sequence, further contributing to the dynamic nature of the island's geological landscape. The northern coast has many large alluvial deposits that meet the shoreline (USDA 2008).

Human activities have significantly altered numerous drainageways across the island's valleys. Historically, various check dams and water reservoirs were constructed to support ranching operations, with many of these retaining water year-round. Examples include Cape Canyon, Buffalo Springs, and the Upper and Lower Buffalo Corral Reservoirs. There are several more unnamed dams in Middle and Cape Canyons. Middle Canyon was dammed to help maintain sufficient hydrostatic pressure in the interior aquifer, to increase the reliability of the groundwater supply for the island's municipal needs (USDA 2008). Potable water is also provided through a desalination plant.

Perennial streams and seeps can be observed throughout the island for several weeks following the rainy season, with some areas in Bullrush, Cottonwood, and Middle Canyons with surface water throughout the year, except in periods of extended drought. Echo Lake, the island's only natural lake, sits at an elevation of approximately 396 m (1,300 ft) (USDA 2008) (Figure 2-10).

2.1.3 Climate

Santa Catalina Island exhibits a Mediterranean climate featuring warm, dry summers and cool, moist winters, often accompanied by year-round fog. This climate is primarily influenced by ocean currents and mainland pressure gradients. The prevailing northwesterly winds and subtropical storms drive the ocean currents, which flow south around Point Conception and follow the California coast as it curves eastward. During summer and fall, subtropical storms push warm air and water northward over the mainland (USDA 2008).

The island experiences considerable interannual rainfall variation and multi-year trends of wetter or drier periods, with a 100-year average precipitation of 312 mm (12.3 in.) (Figure 2-11). Orographic factors significantly affect rainfall distribution across the island, causing higher rainfall at elevated locations (Figure 2-12). Nearly all precipitation occurs between November and April (Figure 2-13), with rare occurrences of summer thunderstorms.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-9 Slope Steepness.



Figure 2-10 View of Echo Lake.

Photo Taken April 28, 2023 from the main road looking north. The island's only natural lake, which functions as a vernal pool.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-11 Precipitation Record for Catalina Island.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-12 Island Weather Station Average Precipitation

Mont h ly a vera ge la yers were provided b y UCSD Scripps I nst it ut ion of Ocea nogra ph y (Clemesh a et a l. 2021). Th ese 1-km resolut ion la yers were derive a t ime series of Geost a t iona ry Opera t iona l Environment a l Sa t ellit es (GOES) ima gery spa nning from 1996 t o 2018.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-13 Island Weather Station Accumulation of Precipitation in a Water Year.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

The island's southern coast is often shrouded in fog as prevailing fog banks sweep in from the Pacific Ocean, while the northern leeward side remains clear. Fog layers can occur at limited elevations, creating diverse weather conditions at different altitudes (Figure 2-14). The island's topography also influences the amount of solar radiation reaching the surface (Figure 2-15), resulting in notably more mesic conditions on north-facing slopes (Paudel et al. 2016). North-facing slopes receive less sunlight and solar radiation than south-facing slopes, leading to cooler air temperatures (15 to 17°C or 59 to 63°F) and isothermic soil temperature regimes. Isothermic regimes can also be found on south-facing slopes where island woodland, island scrub oak chaparral or island chaparral provide adequate shade and cooling, creating more stable temperature conditions like those found in areas with less direct sunlight exposure. Remaining areas of the island experience thermic temperature regimes with warmer and more variable annual air temperatures (16 to 22°C or 61 to 72°F) (USDA 2008).

The interplay of topography, coastal profile, and large atmospheric pressure gradients generates the regional "coastal eddy" phenomenon, which is more pronounced around Point Conception and the northern Channel Islands. Santa Catalina Island is affected by strong northwest winds that drive onshore airflow (Figure 2-16). Thick, low fog often accompanies periods of heating and cooling when the eddy effect weakens and stabilizes under the influence of high-pressure systems over the nearby Mojave Desert (Clemesha et al. 2021).

The Channel Islands, including Santa Catalina, are subject to offshore Santa Ana winds from the northeast. These winds arise from a relative low-pressure system over the eastern Pacific Ocean near southern California and a high-pressure system over the Great Basin (Muhs et al. 2007), producing northerly and northeasterly winds across the Mojave Desert, southern California coast, and Baja California.

Santa Catalina Island has a warmer and less windy climate compared to San Miguel Island, the coolest, windiest, and foggiest of the Channel Islands. Frost occurs on all the Channel Islands but is short lived. On Santa Catalina Island, frost occurs on a few days annually, typically during brief morning periods in interior valleys, such as Bullrush Canyon, Middle Ranch Valley, and Escondido Ranch. Each winter, freezing temperatures briefly occur in these valleys and deep drainageways. Fog, although more common along the coast, can also form in low interior valleys due to local temperature inversion layers. Frost-free periods span from 355 days in interior valleys and higher peaks to 365 days in coastal areas, making the latter less susceptible to frost (USDA 2008).

Like rainfall, wind is significantly influenced by the topography of the island. Weather stations on the leeward side had average windspeeds of 0.8 to 1.1 meters per second, m/s (1.8 to 2.5 miles per hour, mph), while those on the windward side were as high as 3.1 m/s (6.9 mph) average (Figure 2-17 and Figure 2-18). The airport location, although technically on the leeward side, is located at the exposed ridge of the island and has higher average windspeeds than typical leeward locations.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-14 Monthly Mean Cloud Albedo (Proxy for Cloudiness) for 1996 to 2018.

Monthly average layers were provided by UCSD Scripps Institution of Oceanography (Clemesha et al. 2021). These 1-km resolution layers were derive a time series of Geostationary Operational Environment Satellites (GOES) imagery spanning from 1996 to 2018.



Figure 2-15 Solar Radiation Received During Equinox.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-16 Mean Wind Speed in the Southern California Bight.

Source: Davis et al. 2023.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B





Figure 2-17 Island Weather Station Average Annual Wind Speed and Prevailing Wind Direction.


Source: Cooperative Climatological Data Summaries, Western Regional Climate Center, 2024. Web. 18 Feb. 2024. http://wrcc.dri.edu/climatedata



1. Parson's Landing (Ave. 1.6 m/s)




2. White's Landing (Ave. 1.1 m/s)




3. Whitley's Peak (Ave. 3.1 m/s)



4. Avalon School (Ave. 0.8 m/s)




5. Silver Peak Trail (Ave. 2.3 m/s)




6. Airport (Ave. 3.1 m/s)

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



7. Hayfield (Ave. 1.0 m/s) **8. Cactus Peak** (Ave. 3.1 m/s) **9. Wild Boar Gully** (Ave. 2.9 m/s)



10. Dakin Peak (Ave. 2.6 m/s)

Beaufort Wind Speed Scale

	Description	Speed (m/s)
0	Calm	0 to 0.9
1	Light Air	0.9 to 1.8
2	Light Breeze	1.8 to 3.6
3	Gentle Breeze	3.6 to 5.85
4	Moderate Breeze	5.85 to 8.55
5	Fresh Breeze	8.55 to 11.25
6	Strong Breeze	11.25 to 14.4
7	Near Gale	14.4 to 17.55
8	Gale	17.55 to 21.15
9	Strong Gale+	21.15+



Figure 2-18 Island Weather Station Wind Rose Charts Showing Prevailing Winds from the West.

Source: Cooperative Climatological Data Summaries, Western Regional Climate Center, 2024. Web. 18 Feb. 2024. http://wrcc.dri.edu/climate

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2.1.4 SOIL

The soils of Santa Catalina Island are a result of the interplay between diverse geological, topographical, and climatic factors. The island's geology, which includes volcanic, metamorphic, and marine sediments, sets the stage for the formation of distinct soil types through the process of soil genesis. In combination with the island's steep topography and contrasting microclimates on its leeward and windward sides, these factors contribute to a rich mosaic of soil characteristics and properties.

Soils, coupled with geologic condition and landscape position, are critical in determining the appropriate target vegetation type and treatments for restoration especially in areas of California that have been historically disturbed and may lack clear indications of pre-European native plant communities. Soil texture is a soil characteristic that is especially valuable for understanding soil behavior and management of the land (Brady and Weil 2002).

Soil genesis is the process of soil formation and development over time, which involves the transformation of parent material into a complex and dynamic mixture of minerals, organic matter, and living organisms (Soil Survey Staff 1999). This process is driven by various soil-forming factors, including parent material, climate, topography, biological activity, and time. These factors interact in unique ways to influence the physical, chemical, and biological properties of the soil, ultimately shaping the characteristics of the resulting soil profile. The distribution and diversity of soil types found in different environments and is essential for understanding the functioning of terrestrial ecosystems and their response to environmental change.

Since 1975, the United States National Cooperative Soil Survey Program has used a systematic approach to classifying soils based on their properties and characteristics called Soil Taxonomy. This soil taxonomy framework was used to prepare the Soil Survey of Santa Catalina Island, published in 2008 (USDA 2008). There was also an unpublished Soil Survey of the island prepared by the US Soil Conservation Service in 1955, which is presented in Appendix D. The 2008 Soil Survey is a more useful document than the 1955 Soil Survey because the pre-1975 classification system could not be consistently applied by soil scientists (Ditzler and Ahrens 2006). And for the development of potential island plant species distribution models in Appendix D, the 2008 Soil Survey had more explanatory value than the 1995 Soil Survey. Out of 94 plant distribution models, the 2008 Soil Survey Map Units were a significant explanatory variable for 84 models, whereas the 1955 Soil Survey Map Units were only significant for 2 models.

Using the USDA Soil Taxonomy (Soil Survey Staff 1999), soils can be classified into several levels: order, suborder, great group, subgroup, family, and series. There are 12 soil orders, but not all occur on Catalina Island. Soil orders are frequently defined by a single dominant characteristic affecting soils in that location—for example, the prevalent vegetation (Mollisols, Histosols), the type of parent material (Andisols, Vertisols), the climate variables such as lack of precipitation (Aridisols), or the presence of permafrost (Gelisols). Also significant in several soil orders is the amount of physical and chemical weathering present (Oxisols, Ultisols, Alfisols, Inceptisols, Entisols) and/or

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

the relative amount of soil profile development that has taken place. These soil orders can be subdivided into suborders and great groups. Great groups are a midlevel classification point in the hierarchy of soil taxonomy.

CATALINA ISLAND SOIL ORDERS

Entisols, Inceptisols, and Mollisols are Soil Orders on Catalina Island that are weathered from igneous rocks, which include volcanic and metamorphic rocks. The exception are the soils formed by the construction of the airport, which are fill material from Catalina schist. The Alfisols on Catalina Island are primarily slope alluvium over residuum weathered from Catalina schist, which is a metamorphic rock, and/or metasedimentary rock (e.g., slate).

The evolution of the contemporary landscape occurred during the Late Pleistocene and Holocene Epochs. Highly evolved soils are typically found on landforms that have remained stable over time. The hills and mountains in the survey area contain materials that began weathering during the Late Pleistocene, resulting in the formation of characteristic soil features such as clayey argillic or cambic horizons and mollic epipedons. The depth of these soils largely depends on the weathering susceptibility of the parent material. Soils derived from volcanic materials, tend to be shallow due to the slow weathering rate of their bedrock, while those derived from metamorphic rocks (e.g., Catalina schist) typically exhibit greater depth because of their faster weathering process. The volcanic and metamorphic rock types also weather into different types of clay minerals and contain different ratios of cations (USDA 2008).

An essential aspect of soil formation on Santa Catalina Island is the contribution of eolian parent material from mainland deserts across the eastern Pacific Ocean (Muhs et al. 2007). Less than 5,000 years ago, eolian deposition of medium and finer silt particles originating from the Mojave Desert in California. These particles, measuring less than 0.5 microns, are most abundant in the atmosphere during seasonal Santa Ana winds. Once deposited, these materials can become local sources of PM-10. Disturbances to these fine soil material deposits can significantly alter the soil profile on Santa Catalina Island (USDA 2008).

Determining the relative age of soils can be a complex task, as various factors, such as climate, geology, and biological activity, influence soil development. Additionally, different regions may experience unique conditions affecting soil formation rates. However, in general, we can consider a rough chronological order of soil orders based on their degree of development, from youngest to oldest for the five soil orders represented on Catalina Island:

1. **Entisols** - poorly developed soils with minimal soil horizons (major component of 5 map units; minor component of several map units)
2. **Inceptisols** - weakly developed soils with some identifiable horizons (major component of 6 map units; minor component of 1 map unit)
3. **Vertisols** - clay-rich soils with high shrink-swell potential (minor component of 3 map units)

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4. **Mollisols** – soils with dark, organic-rich surface horizons, which contain high levels of organic matter and have high cation exchange capacity and good water-holding capacity (major component of 10 map units; minor component of many map units)
5. **Alfisols** - moderately developed soils with subsurface accumulation of clay and a moderate to high base saturation (major component of 20 map units; minor component of many map units)

Keep in mind that this list serves as a general approximation, and the relative age of soil orders may vary depending on local conditions and specific site characteristics. Soil scientists consider various soil properties and environmental factors to assess the development level and age of soils.

CATALINA ISLAND SOIL SERIES AND MAP UNITS

Soil series are the fundamental units of soil classification in the soil survey, representing a group of soils with similar characteristics and formation processes. Soil series is the lowest taxonomic class and consists of soils within a family that has horizons similar in color, texture, structure, reaction, consistency, mineral composition, and arrangement in the profile.

However, for purposes of mapping the distribution of soil types, it is common for multiple soil series to be intricately connected in a landscape in topographically complex landscapes like Catalina Island, necessitating their combination into larger mapping units. These units can be classified as complexes or associations.

Complexes are formed when two or more soils or miscellaneous areas are interwoven in a complex pattern or occupy small areas that cannot be accurately represented on maps individually. Although their pattern and proportion may vary, they share similar characteristics across different locations. An example of a complex is the Masthead-Coastwise-Dewpoint Complex, which comprises 20 to 55 percent slopes.

Associations, on the other hand, consist of two or more geographically associated soils or miscellaneous areas depicted as a single unit on maps. Separate mapping of these areas may not be practical or necessary due to their present or anticipated uses within the survey area. The pattern and relative proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas within an association are somewhat similar. The Dewpoint-Luff Association, characterized by 15 to 45 percent slopes, serves as an example of such a grouping.

In the case of Catalina Island, the soil survey map features 22 complexes and 1 association, reflecting the intricate interplay of various soil series and their relationships within the island's diverse landscape (Figure 2-19, Table 2-1). Key features of the soil survey are visualized in a series of maps based on the most prominent characteristics of each soil complex or association:

- **Soil Parent Material**, Figure 2-20

  Parent material name refers to the general composition of unconsolidated material, either mineral or organic, in which soil develops. This name often

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

implies the mode of deposition and/or weathering that contributed to the soil's formation.

- **Depth to Restrictive Layer**, Figure 2-21

  Depth to restrictive layer due to an abrupt soil texture change refers to the vertical distance from the soil surface to a distinct layer where a significant shift in soil texture imposes restrictions on root penetration and water movement. This layer can result from various factors such as compaction, cementation, or the presence of layers enriched in clay, silt, or coarse fragments. These changes in texture can impact soil drainage, aeration, and overall soil productivity.

- **Available Water Supply**, Figure 2-22

  Available Water Capacity (AWC) measures the amount of water a soil can store for plant use, expressed in centimeters of water per centimeter of soil on the map. AWC depends on properties like organic matter, texture, density, structure, salinity, and rock fragments. It influences vegetation growth but does not indicate the actual water available at any given time.

  Available Water Supply (AWS) is calculated by multiplying AWC with soil thickness, providing an estimate of the total water available in the soil profile.

- **Organic Soil Horizon**, Figure 2-23

  This map displays the classification of the dominant soil series in the map unit as one of the following: (1) No Organic Soil Horizon: This category is when organic matter is absent or present in negligible amounts, with no accumulation of identifiable plant residues. (2) Slightly decomposed plant material**:** This category includes plant residues that have undergone minimal decomposition, retaining most of their original form and structure. Fibers and other recognizable plant parts are still easily identifiable. (3) Moderately decomposed plant material: Organic materials in this category exhibit a more advanced stage of decomposition, where plant residues have started to break down into smaller fragments. Some original plant structures are still visible, but many have begun to degrade and lose their identity.

- **Soil Organic Matter in the Topsoil**, Figure 2-24

  Organic matter in the topsoil refers to the portion of the soil comprising various forms of carbon-based substances derived from decomposing plant and animal residues. This includes living and dead microorganisms, partially decomposed organic material (humus), and stable organic compounds like humic and fulvic acids. Topsoil organic matter plays a critical role in enhancing soil fertility, improving water retention, facilitating nutrient cycling, and supporting soil biodiversity. This value is reported as a percentage, which serves as an essential indicator of soil quality and productivity.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- **Soil Texture of A Horizon**, Figure 2-25

  Soil texture classes are groupings of soils based on the relative proportions of sand, silt, and clay particles. These classes are as follows:

  1. Sand: Soils with large, coarse particles that feel gritty and allow water to drain quickly.
  2. Silt: Soils with medium-sized particles that feel smooth and hold water moderately.
  3. Clay: Soils with tiny, fine particles that feel sticky when wet and hold water tightly.

  Each texture class influences water retention, drainage, aeration, and fertility. Additionally, soil textures are often combined to describe intermediate classes such as sandy loam or silty clay, reflecting a mix of particle sizes and properties.

- **Soil Clay Content**, Figure 2-26

  Soil clay content represents the proportion of clay particles within the soil, significantly influencing soil properties and functions. Clay particles are the smallest soil particles, less than 0.002 mm in size, and have a large surface area. In the surface layer and throughout the soil profile, clay content impacts:

  1. Water retention: High clay content enhances water-holding capacity but may reduce drainage.
  2. Nutrient availability: Clay particles have negatively charged surfaces that attract and hold positively charged nutrients, making them available for plant uptake.
  3. Soil structure: Clay particles help form stable aggregates, improving soil structure, aeration, and root penetration.

- **Cation Exchange Capacity and pH of Topsoil**, Figure 2-27

  Cation-exchange capacity (CEC-7) measures the extractable cations a soil can hold at a specific pH, typically neutrality (pH 7.0). Soils with low CEC-7 or simply, CEC, hold fewer cations, possibly requiring more frequent fertilization than high CEC soils. CEC is essential for nutrient retention.

An overview of the Catalina Island soil series, organized by Soil Odder and Suborder, is presented in Figure 2-28. And the relationship between soil series and the soil map units (complex or association) they are included in, along with taxonomic family classification, parent material, and typical vegetation type are listed in Table 2-2.

The subsequent sections provide a summary of the similarities and differences between the soil series and the presentation is organized by Soil Order and Suborder. An analysis of these soils through the perspective of the soil taxonomy and the principles of soil genesis will offer valuable insights into the intricate processes shaping Catalina Island's landscape and its potential for varying ecosystem and habitat functions, including in the preparation of site-specific habitat restoration plans.



Figure 2-19 Soil Map Units for 2008 NRCS Survey.

See Table 2-1 for Soil Complex Names for the Soil Map Units.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 2-1 Soil Complexes with Primary Geology, Soil Series and Soil Texture (2008 Soil Map).

Map Unit Symbol	Soil Map Unit Name Soil Map Complex or Association | Slope Range	Primary Soil Series	Primary Soil Texture	Primary Generalized Geology Map Code | Geological Time Period | Rock Types
160	Beaches-Abaft complex | 0 to 5%	Beach Sand	Sand	Qb | QUARTERNARY | Beach sand
190	Typic Xerofluvents-Riverwash complex | 0 to 8%	Xerofluvents	Sandy loam	Qal | QUARTERNARY | Alluvium
191	Typic Haploxerepts-Xerofluvents-Argixerolls complex | 0 to 8%	Haploxerepts	Very gravelly sand	
184	Dewpoint-Luff association |15 to 45%	Dewpoint	Sandy loam	Qls | QUARTERNARY | Landslide deposits
293	Rock outcrop, coastal cliffs-Nauti-Haploxerepts complex | 50 to 120%	Rock Outcrop	NA	
156	Tongva-Freeboard-Starbright complex | 30 to 55%	Tongva	Loam	Tv | MIOCENE | Volcanic and volcaniclastic rocks
157	Tongva-Pachic Argixerolls-Freeboard complex | 55 to 75%			
181	Haploxerepts-Purser-Rock outcrop complex | 40 to 75%	Haploxerepts	Very gravelly sand	
182	Luff-Haploxerepts-Haploxeralfs complex | 15 to 35%	Luff	Silty loam	
183	Purser-Luff complex | 15 to 35%	Purser	Clay loam	
185	Purser-Rock outcrop complex, coastal cliffs | 45 to 75%			
400	Oboship-Nauti-Bosun complex | 50 to 75%	Oboship	Gravelly loam	Tmqd | MIOCENE | Catalina Island pluton, quartz diorite
407	Nauti-Flyer-Marpol complex | 25 to 55%	Nauti	Loam	
410	Express-Flyer-Loadline complex | 40 to 75%	Express	Sandy loam	
411	Flyer-Loadline-Nauti complex | 15 to 50%	Flyer	Gravelly loamy sand	
412	Flyer, gullied-Express, gullied-Bosun complex | 15 to 50%			
422	Dewpoint-Masthead-Coastwise complex | 20 to 55%	Dewpoint	Sandy loam	Jcs | JURASSIC | Catalina Schist
420	Masthead-Luff complex | 5 to 15%	Masthead	Gravelly silty loam	
421	Masthead-Luff complex | 8 to 30%			
423	Masthead-Coastwise-Dewpoint complex | 20 to 55%			
424	Masthead-Dewpoint-Rock Outcrop complex | 40 to 75%			
427	Masthead-Coastwise-Typic Haploxeralfs complex | 45 to 75%			
425	Coastwise-Masthead complex, cobbly | 40 to 75%	Coastwise	Gravelly sandy loam	




Figure 2-20 Parent Material.

2008 Soil Ma p

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Parent Material

ANTHROPOCENE

- Pavement and buildings human transported material over alluvium derived from quartz-diorite
- Fill human transported material derived from schist
- Human transported material over alluvium derived from quartz-diorite

QUARTERNARY

- Sandy alluvium derived from sandstone
- Sandy and gravelly alluvium
- Alluvium derived from metamorphic and sedimentary rock
- Colluvium derived from metasedimentary rock over alluvium derived from metasedimentary rock
- Alluvium derived from volcanic and metamorphic rock
- Slope alluvium over residuum weathered from schist and/or metasedimentary rock

MIOCENE

- Residuum weathered from volcanic rock and/or andesite
- Residuum weathered from andesite or other volcanic rock
- Residuum weathered from volcanic breccia, andesite or basalt
- Eolian deposits over residuum weathered from volcanic and metamorphic rock
- Colluvium and/or residuum weathered from basalt and/or andesite
- Residuum weathered from quartz-diorite porphyry
- Quartz-diorite
- Slope alluvium over residuum weathered from quartz-diorite and/or quartz-diorite porphyry

JURASSIC

- Residuum weathered from metasedimentary rock
- Slope alluvium over residuum weathered from Catalina Schist and/or metasedimentary rock




Figure 2-21 Depth to Restrictive Layer.

2008 Soil Ma p

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-22 Available Water Supply to a Depth of 150 cm.

2008 Soil Ma p




Figure 2-23 Organic Soil Horizon.

2008 Soil Ma p

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-24 Organic Matter in the Topsoil (0 to 15 cm).

2008 Soil Ma p




Figure 2-25 Soil Texture of the A Soil Horizon.

2008 Soil Ma p

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-26 Clay Content of the Surface Layer and Average of the Full Soil Profile.

2008 Soil Ma p




Figure 2-27 Topsoil (0 to 15 cm) pH and Cation Exchange Capacity (CEC).

2008 Soil Ma p

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-28 Taxonomic Relationship of Soil Map Units by Soil Order and Suborder.

Soil map units for soil types that are major constituents are listed in parentheses (USDA 2008).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 2-2 Soil Type, Taxonomic Family, Parent Material and Typical Vegetation.

Soil Type *Map Units Containing Soil Series as a Major or Minor (≤10% Cover) Component*	**Family**	**Parent Material**	**Typical Veg. Type**
ENTISOLS			
Typic Fluvaquents *Major: --- Minor: 191*	---	alluvium derived from volcanic and metamorphic rock	CSS
Fluvaquents *Major: --- Minor: ---*	---	alluvium derived from volcanic and metamorphic rock	CSS
Fluvents *Major: --- Minor: 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 454*	---	alluvium derived from volcanic and metamorphic rock	CSS
Typic Xerofluvents *Major: 190, 191 Minor: 181, 182*	---	alluvium derived from volcanic and metamorphic rock	MFS, SRW, RH
Xerofluvents *Major: --- Minor: 410*	---	alluvium derived from metamorphic and sedimentary rock	CSS
Abaft *Major: 160 Minor: ---*	Mixed, thermic Typic Xeropsamments	eolian sands derived from volcanic and sedimentary rock	SBD
Typic Xerorthents, fill *Major: 456 Minor: ---*	Loamy-skeletal, thermic Typic Xerorthents	fill human transported material derived from schist	D
Typic Xerorthents, steep fill *Major: 456 Minor: ---*	Loamy-skeletal, thermic Typic Xerorthents	steep fill human transported material derived from schist	CSS, GR
Xerorthents *Major: 450 Minor: ---*	---	alluvium derived from quartz-diorite	D, NNH, GR
Beaches *Major: 160 Minor: ---*	---		SBD, B
Riverwash *Major: 190 Minor: 191*	---	alluvium derived from volcanic and metamorphic rock	MFS, CSS< B
INCEPTISOLS			
Haploxerepts *Major: 181, 182, 293 Minor: ---*	Thermic Haploxerepts	residuum weathered from andesite or other volcanic rock	GR
Express *Major: 410 Minor: ---412*	Coarse-loamy, mixed, active, thermic Typic Haploxerepts	residuum weathered from quartz-diorite porphyry	CSS, NNS, MCS, CBS, IC, ISOC

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Soil Type *Map Units Containing Soil Series as a Major or Minor (≤10% Cover) Component*	**Family**	**Parent Material**	**Typical Veg. Type**
Express, gullied *Major: 412* *Minor: ---*	Coarse-loamy, mixed, active, thermic Typic Haploxerepts	residuum weathered from quartz-diorite porphyry	CSS, GR, ISOC
Typic Haploxerepts *Major: 191* *Minor: ---*	Loamy-skeletal, mixed, active, thermic Typic Haploxerepts	alluvium derived from volcanic and metamorphic rock	MFS, CSS, GR, ISOC
VERTISOLS			
Aridic Haploxererts *Major: ---* *Minor: 420, 422, 423*	---	TBD	CSS, GR
MOLLISOLS			
Starbright *Major: 156* *Minor: 157, 183, 185*	Fine, smectitic, isothermic Typic Argiustolls	residuum weathered from volcanic rock and/or andesite	IC, CSS, ISOC, IW, NNS
Bosun *Major: 400, 412* *Minor: 407, 411, 451, 454*	Loamy-skeletal, mixed, superactive, isothermic Typic Argiustolls	slope alluvium over residuum weathered from quartz-diorite and/or quartz-diorite porphyry	CSS, IC, ISOC, IW, NNS
Topdeck *Major: ---* *Minor: 156, 157, 181, 182*	Loamy, mixed, superactive, thermic Lithic Argixerolls	colluvium and/or residuum weathered from basalt, andesite and/or volcanic breccia	CSS, GR
Starboard *Major: ---* *Minor: 156, 157, 182*	Fine-loamy, mixed, superactive, mesic Pachic Argixerolls	residuum weathered from volcanic rock and/or andesite	CSS, ISOC
Pachic Argixerolls *Major: 157* *Minor: 156*	---	residuum weathered from volcanic rock and/or andesite	CSS, MCS, GR, IC, CBS
Flyer *Major: 407, 410, 411* *Minor: 400, 412, 451*	Coarse-loamy, mixed, active, thermic Typic Argixerolls	residuum weathered from quartz-diorite porphyry	CSS, MCS, GR, IC, CBS, NNS
Flyer, gullied *Major: 412* *Minor: ---*	Coarse-loamy, mixed, active, thermic Typic Argixerolls	residuum weathered from quartz-diorite porphyry	CSS, GR
Tongva *Major: 156, 157* *Minor: 181, 182*	Fine-loamy, mixed, superactive, thermic Typic Argixerolls	colluvium and/or residuum weathered from basalt and/or andesite	CSS, MCS, GR, ISOC, CBS
Typic Argixerolls *Major: 453* *Minor: ---*	Fine-loamy, mixed, superactive, thermic Typic Argixerolls	colluvium derived from metasedimentary rock over alluvium derived from metasedimentary rock	GR, CSS
Typic Argixerolls, golf courses *Major: 454* *Minor: ---*	Fine-loamy, mixed, superactive, thermic Typic Argixerolls	human transported material over alluvium derived from quartz-diorite	D
Loadline *Major: 410, 411* *Minor: 293, 400, 407, 412*	Loamy, mixed, active, thermic, shallow Typic Argixerolls	residuum weathered from quartz-diorite porphyry	CSS, MCS, GR, IC, CBS

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Soil Type *Map Units Containing Soil Series as a Major or Minor (≤10% Cover) Component*	**Family**	**Parent Material**	**Typical Veg. Type**
Argixerolls *Major: 191* *Minor: ---*	---	alluvium derived from volcanic and metamorphic rock	MFS, GR
Calcic Haploxerolls, golf courses *Major: 454* *Minor: ---*	---	human transported material over alluvium derived from quartz-diorite	D
Cumulic Haploxerolls *Major: ---* *Minor: 190*	---	mixed alluvium derived from volcanic and sedimentary rock	UNK
Pachic Haploxerolls *Major: ---* *Minor: 190*	---	mixed alluvium derived from volcanic and sedimentary rock	UNK
Haploxerolls *Major: ---* *Minor: 407*	---	mixed alluvium derived from volcanic and sedimentary rock	UNK
Oboship *Major: 400* *Minor: 407, 410, 411, 412*	Coarse-loamy, mixed, superactive, isothermic Pachic Haplustolls	slope alluvium over residuum weathered from quartz-diorite and/or quartz-diorite porphyry	IW, IC, ISOC, CSS
Marpol *Major: 407* *Minor: 400, 411*	Fine, mixed, superactive, thermic Typic Palexerolls	residuum weathered from porphyry quartz-diorite	CSS, MCS, GR, IC, NNS
Marpol, gullied *Major: ---* *Minor: 412*	Fine, mixed, superactive, thermic Typic Palexerolls	residuum weathered from porphyry quartz-diorite	CSS, GR
ALFISOLS			
Purser *Major: 181, 183* *Minor: 157, 184, 453*	Clayey, smectitic, thermic Lithic Haploxeralfs	residuum weathered from volcanic rock and/or andesite	CSS, GR, NNH
Purser, coastal cliffs *Major: 185* *Minor: ---*	Clayey, smectitic, thermic Lithic Haploxeralfs	residuum weathered from volcanic rock and/or andesite	CSS, GR, B
Coastwise *Major: 422, 423* *Minor: 420, 421, 424, 427, 456*	Clayey, smectitic, thermic, shallow Mollic Haploxeralfs	slope alluvium over residuum weathered from Catalina schist and/or metasedimentary rock	CSS, MCS, NNS, GR, CBS
Coastwise, cobbly *Major: 425, 427* *Minor: ---*	Clayey, smectitic, thermic, shallow Mollic Haploxeralfs	slope alluvium over residuum weathered from Catalina schist and/or metasedimentary rock	CSS, GR
Coastwise, nongravelly *Major: ---* *Minor: 422*	Clayey, smectitic, thermic, shallow Mollic Haploxeralfs	slope alluvium over residuum weathered from Catalina schist and/or metasedimentary rock	CSS
Nauti *Major: 293, 400, 407, 411* *Minor: 412, 451, 454*	Fine-loamy, mixed, superactive, thermic Mollic Haploxeralfs	slope alluvium over residuum weathered from quartz-diorite and/or quartz-diorite porphyry	CSS, MCS, ISOC, CBS
Nauti, landscaped *Major: 451* *Minor: ---*	Fine-loamy, mixed, superactive, thermic Mollic Haploxeralfs	slope alluvium over residuum weathered from quartz-diorite and/or quartz-diorite porphyry	NNS, B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Soil Type *Map Units Containing Soil Series as a Major or Minor (≤10% Cover) Component*	**Family**	**Parent Material**	**Typical Veg. Type**
Typic Haploxeralfs *Major: 427* *Minor: 156*	Loamy-skeletal, mixed, superactive, thermic Typic Haploxeralfs	residuum weathered from Catalina schist and/or metasedimentary rock	CSS, MCS, GR, IC, CBS
Freeboard *Major: 156, 157* *Minor: 182, 183, 184, 185*	Fine, smectitic, thermic Vertic Haploxeralfs	colluvium and/or residuum weathered from andesite or other volcanic rock	GR, CSS
Haploxeralfs *Major: 182* *Minor: 183, 410*	---	residuum weathered from volcanic rock and/or andesite	CSS, GR
Dewpoint *Major: 184, 422, 423, 424* *Minor: 420, 421*	Fine, smectitic, isothermic Typic Paleustalfs	slope alluvium over residuum weathered from Catalina schist and/or metasedimentary rock	IW, ISOC, IC, SRW, RH, NNW, CSS
Masthead *Major: 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 427* *Minor: 453, 456*	Fine, smectitic, thermic Mollic Palexeralfs	slope alluvium over residuum weathered from Catalina schist and/or metasedimentary rock	CSS, MCS, GR, IC, CBS
Masthead, cobbly *Major: 425* *Minor: ---*	Fine, smectitic, thermic Mollic Palexeralfs	slope alluvium over residuum weathered from Catalina schist and/or metasedimentary rock	CSS, MCS, GR, IC, CBS
Masthead, nongravelly *Major: ---* *Minor: 422*	Fine, smectitic, thermic Mollic Palexeralfs	slope alluvium over residuum weathered from Catalina schist and/or metasedimentary rock	CSS
Petrocalcic Palexeralfs *Major: ---* *Minor: 420, 423*	---	slope alluvium over residuum weathered from Catalina schist and/or metasedimentary rock	CSS
Luff *Major: 182, 183, 184, 420, 421* *Minor: 156, 181, 185, 407, 423, 425, 453*	Fine, smectitic, thermic Vertic Palexeralfs	eolian deposits over residuum weathered from volcanic and metamorphic rock	ISOC, SRH, CSS, MCS, GR
OTHER			
Dams *Major: DAM* *Minor: ---*	---	---	D
Gravel Pits *Major: GP* *Minor: ---*	---	---	D
Rock outcrop *Major: 181* *Minor: 156, 157, 160, 182, 183, 184, 190, 400, 407, 410, 411, 412, 422, 423, 425, 451*	---	---	B
Rock outcrop, coastal cliffs *Major: 185, 293, 424* *Minor: 427*	---	---	B
Urban Land	---	---	D

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Soil Type *Map Units Containing Soil Series as a Major or Minor (≤10% Cover) Component*	**Family**	**Parent Material**	**Typical Veg. Type**
Major: 450, 451, 454 *Minor: 456*			
Urban Land, landscaped *Major: 453* *Minor: ---*	---	---	D
Water *Major: W* *Minor: ---*	---	---	VPR

Vegetation Types (after Knapp 2005a as identified in the 2008 Soil Survey with the addition of Island Scrub Oak Chaparral as distinct from Island Chaparral by Land IQ):

- ***IW*** *Island Woodland*
- ***IC*** *Island Chaparral*
- ***ISOC*** *Island Scrub Oak Chaparral*
- ***CSS*** *Coastal Sage Scrub*
- ***MCS*** *Maritime Cactus Scrub*
- ***CBS*** *Coastal Bluff Scrub*
- ***SRW*** *Southern Riparian Woodland*
- ***MFS*** *Mulefat Scrub*
- ***RH*** *Riparian Herbaceous*
- ***BSB*** *Bare Streambed*
- ***CM*** *Coastal Marsh*
- ***SBD*** *Southern Beach Dune*
- ***VPR*** *Vernal Ponds and Reservoirs*
- ***NNW*** *Nonnative Woodland*
- ***NNS*** *Nonnative Scrub*
- ***NNH*** *Nonnative Herbaceous*
- ***GR*** *Grassland*
- ***B*** *Bare*
- ***D*** *Developed*
- ***UNK*** *Unknown Vegetation Type*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

ENTISOLS

The Entisols suborders Psamments, Orthents, and Fluvents occur on Catalina Island (Figure 2-29):

- **Psamments** (major component of one map unit, the soil series Abaft, 160): Psamments are sandy Entisols with a coarse texture throughout the soil profile. They often form in areas with high rates of water movement or in regions with limited soil development, such as dunes or sandy uplands. Their coarse texture leads to rapid water infiltration and limited water-holding capacity. Abaft soils are typically found on stabilized sand dunes or beaches and are excessively drained.
- **Orthents** (major component of 2 map units): Orthents are Entisols that do not exhibit significant soil development and lack horizons. They are typically shallow, rocky soils found in areas with minimal weathering and vegetation. Orthents often occur in arid regions or areas with steep slopes and high erosion rates. On Catalina they occur in areas with human transported fill to construct the airport (major component of map unit 456) and developed areas of Avalon (major component of map unit 450).
- **Fluvents** (major component of 2 map units identified as Typic Xerofluvents, component of map units 190 and 191): Fluvents are Entisols that form on recent floodplains and terraces. They have a high concentration of organic carbon in the soil and better drainage than other Entisols. Fluvents typically exhibit stratified layers due to periodic flooding and sediment deposition. The term "Xerofluvent" is a combination of "xeric," referring to a dry soil moisture regime, and "fluvent," which indicates that the soil is found on floodplains or terraces. The term "Typic" is used in soil taxonomy to indicate a subgroup within a soil order, suborder, or great group that exhibits typical characteristics of that classification. In other words, a Typic Xerofluvent would be a Xerofluvent soil that does not have any unique or unusual properties that would classify it as a different subgroup.

Areas mapped as Beaches or Riverwash are also included in the Entisols soil order.

INCEPTISOLS

The Inceptisols soil order is represented by one suborder on Catalina Island, Xerepts (Figure 2-30). These soils are characterized by their xeric soil moisture regime and moderately developed soils, exhibiting some horizon differentiation and the beginnings of clay accumulation in the subsoil. However, they are not as developed as soils in the Alfisols order, such as Xeralfs, which also have a xeric moisture regime but exhibit more pronounced clay accumulation. Xerepts are represented by one great group on Catalina Island, Haploxerepts:

- **Haploxerepts** (major component of 6 map units: soil series Express, 410; Express, gullied, 412; Haploxerepts, 181, 182, 293; Typic Haploxerepts 191): These soils are characterized by minimal horizon development (indicated by the prefix "Haplo") and a xeric soil moisture regime (indicated by "xerept"). They typically have a loamy or sandy texture, with a relatively thin, dark-colored surface horizon overlying a lighter-colored subsurface horizon. Haploxerepts may be found in regions with Mediterranean-type

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

climates and are often associated with undulating topography or areas of sediment deposition. These soils support California sage scrub, including California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), sage (*Salvia mellifera, S. apiana*) and buckwheats (*Eriogonum giganteum*). Where these soils occur on floodplain terraces (major component of map unit 191) or coastal cliffs (major component of map unit 293), the scrub may be dominated or co-dominated by California sunflower bush (*Encelia californica*).

VERTISOLS

The Vertisols soil order is represented by one great group in the suborder, Xererts, on Catalina Island, Haploxererts (Figure 2-31):

- **Haploxererts**: These soils are relatively rare and occur as minor component in three soil map units classified in the subgroup Aridic Haploxererts (minor component of map units 420, 422, and 423). Vertisols are characterized by the presence of a high content of swelling clays, such as smectites, which can cause significant changes in soil volume with changes in moisture. Aridic Haploxererts are found in arid environments and exhibit minimal horizon development, as typical of Entisols. Haploxererts typically are characterized by plants that can tolerate low moisture conditions and have drought-tolerant adaptations, such as nonnative annual grassland, native annual forblands, native perennial grassland (e.g., *Stipa* grassland), California sage scrub, and cactus scrub.

MOLLISOLS

The Mollisols suborders Ustolls and Xerolls occur on Catalina Island (Figure 2-32). The presence of deeply rooted vegetation leads to the development of the characteristic dark, organic-rich surface horizon that defines Mollisols.

- **Ustolls**: These soils typically form under semi-arid conditions with an ustic soil moisture regime (moist winters and dry summers). They often develop on relatively level or gently sloping landscapes where water can accumulate during the wetter seasons. This results in a greater availability of moisture for plant growth and contributes to the development of island chaparral or riparian woodland. Two great groups in Ustolls occur, Argiustolls and Haplustolls (soil series Bosun and Oboship):
    - **Argiustolls** have an argillic horizon (subsurface horizon with an accumulation of clay), which is facilitated by greater moisture availability. This results in higher cation exchange capacity (CEC) and water-holding capacity, making Argiustolls more productive for plant growth than Haplustolls, which lack an argillic horizon. Argiustolls are represented by the soil series Starbright (major component of map unit 156) and Bosun (major component of map units 400 and 412).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

  - **Haplustolls** are represented by the soil series Oboship (major component of map unit 400).

- **Xerolls**: These soils form under Mediterranean-type climates with a xeric soil moisture regime (cool, moist winters and warm, dry summers). These soils are often found on sloping or well-drained landscapes where water drains more readily, leading to drier soil conditions during the summer months. Some examples of vegetation that can be found growing on Xerolls include CSS, xeric island chaparral (e.g., dominated by chamise), island scrub oak, and *Stipa* grassland. Three suborders occur, Agrixerolls, Palexerolls, and Haploxerolls.

  - **Agrixerolls** have an argillic horizon, similar to Argiustolls, but develop in drier conditions, and support CSS and island scrub oak. Argixerolls include the following soils described for Catalina Island: Argixerolls (major component of map unit 191), Typic Argixerolls (major component of map unit 453), Typic Argixerolls, golf courses (major component of map unit 454), Pachic Argixerolls (major component of map unit 157), Flyer (major component of map units 407, 410 and 411), Flyer, gullied (major component of map unit 412), Tongva (major component of map units 156 and 157), Loadline (major component of map unit 410, 411), Topdeck (minor component of map units 156, 157, 181, and 182), and Starboard (minor component of map units 156, 156, and 182).

  - **Palexerolls** have a calcic or petrocalcic horizon, indicating the presence of calcium carbonate or gypsum. Calcic horizons often occur where there is high evapotranspiration (ET) demand. These soils likely support CSS vegetation. There are two soil series described in the Palexerolls suborder, Marpol (major component of map unit 407) and Marpol, gullied (minor component of map unit 412).

  - **Haploxerolls** lack a diagnostic subsurface horizon, but still have a thick, dark surface horizon. Soil described include Calcic Haploxerolls, golf courses (major component of map unit 454), Cumulic Haploxerolls (minor component of map unit 190), Pachic Haploxerolls (minor component of map unit 190), and Haploxerolls (minor component of map unit 407).

ALFISOLS

Alfisols are characterized by a subsurface horizon with a significant accumulation of clay minerals, known as an argillic horizon. While this horizon is typically dominated by non-swelling clays, such as kaolinite and illite, smectite minerals can also be present in varying amounts. All the soils classified as Alfisols on Catalina Island are described as smectic. The term "smectic"

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

refers to a specific type of clay mineralogy that is characterized by the presence of swelling clays, also known as expansive clays or montmorillonite. Smectic clay minerals have a unique structure that allows them to swell when they encounter water and shrink as they dry out, like that observed in Vertisols. The occurrence of smectic soils within Alfisols is more common in areas with volcanic parent material rich in smectite minerals, such as occurs on Catalina Island. The Alfisols suborders Ustalfs and Xeralfs occur on Catalina Island (Figure 2-33):

- **Xeralfs** (major component of 20 map units): Xeralfs are characterized by a xeric soil moisture regime with an argillic (clay accumulation) horizon. Xeralfs in coastal southern California are often found in areas with chaparral vegetation, which is a dense, evergreen shrub community that includes species like chamise, manzanita, and ceanothus. Scrub oak woodlands are also common wtih an understory of grasses and wildflowers. There are two great groups of Xeralfs on Catalina Island, Haploxeralfs and Palexeralfs. Haploxeralfs exhibit a fine-textured (high proportion of silt and clay) surface horizon overlying a clay-rich (typically more than 40% clay content) subsurface horizon and have moderate to high base saturation (35% or more). Palexeralfs are like haploxeralfs but often display lighter-colored surface horizons compared to their underlying subsoil, a result of past erosion or leaching processes. Palexeralfs have a higher clay content than Haploxeralfs, which can lead to greater water-holding capacity, which can influence the types of plants that grow on these soils. There are four subgroups of Haploxeralfs (Lithic Haploxeralfs, Mollic Haploxeralfs, Typic Haploxeralfs and Vertic Haploxeralfs) and three subgroups of Palexarlfs (Mollic Palexeralfs, Petrocalcic Palexeralfs, and Vertic Palexeralfs) described for Catalina Island:
    - **Lithic Haploxeralfs** have a shallow profile underlain by bedrock or other hard material within 50 cm of the surface. They have a subsurface horizon with clay accumulation and moderate to high base saturation. Soil series include Purser (major component of map units 181 and 183) and Purser, coastal cliffs (major component of map unit 185). Typical vegetation communities include CSS, maritime cactus, *Stipa* grassland, and nonnative annual grassland.
    - **Mollic Haploxeralfs**: These soils have a thick, dark surface horizon rich in organic matter and minerals. Like other Haploxeralfs, they have a subsurface horizon with clay accumulation and moderate to high base saturation. There are two types of soil series in this subgroup, Coastwise and Nauti. Coastwise soils are clayey and shallow, weathered from Catalina schist, and are predominately vegetated by CSS, nonnative scrub, maritime cactus scrub and coastal bluff scrub. Soil series are Coastwise (major component of map units 422 and 423), Coastwise, cobbly (major component of map units 425 and 427), and Coastwise, nongravelly (minor component of map unit 422). Nauti soils are fine-loamy, weathered from quartz-diorite, and vegetated by island chaparral, CSS, nonnative scrub, maritime cactus scrub and coastal bluff scrub. Soil series are Nauti (major component of map units 293, 400, 407, and 411), Nauti, landscaped (major component of map unit 451).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- **Typic Haploxeralfs**: These soils (major component of map unit 427) represent the central concept of Haploxeralfs without any unique characteristics. They are loamy with a subsurface horizon with clay accumulation and moderate to high base saturation.
- **Vertic Haploxeralfs**: These soils have a significant shrinking and swelling property due to changes in moisture content, indicating the presence of smectite minerals. They also have a subsurface horizon with clay accumulation and moderate to high base saturation. These soils are represented by the Freeboard soil series (major component of map units 156 and 157).
- **Petrocalcic Palexeralfs**: These soils (minor component of map units 420 and 423) have a calcic horizon that is cemented or indurated by calcium carbonate, indicating a more arid environment compared to Haploxeralfs. They lack the argillic horizon found in Haploxeralfs.
- **Mollic Palexeralfs**: These soils have a thick, dark surface horizon rich in organic matter and minerals, like Mollic Haploxeralfs. However, they have a calcic or petrocalcic horizon, indicating a more arid environment compared to Haploxeralfs. There are three soil series described: Masthead (major component of map units 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, and 427), Masthead, cobbly (major component of map unit 425), and Masthead, nongravelly (minor component of map unit 422). Masthead soils are deep, and the vegetation is typically CSS or island scrub oak.
- **Vertic Palexeralfs**: Like Vertic Haploxeralfs, these soils exhibit vertic properties, meaning they experience significant shrinking and swelling with changes in moisture content due to the presence of smectite minerals. However, unlike Haploxeralfs, Vertic Palexeralfs do not have an argillic horizon. They typically have an abrupt textural change between the surface horizon and the underlying material. These soils are represented by the Luff soil series (major component of map units 182, 183, 184, 420, 421).

- **Ustalfs**: Ustalfs are characterized by an ustic soil moisture regime, featuring moist winters and dry summers, typical of Mediterranean-type regions, with slightly higher moisture levels during winter months compared to Xeralfs. Ustalfs also possess an argillic horizon, indicating clay accumulation in a subsurface layer. On Catalina Island, there is one great group in the Ustalfs suborder, known as Paleustalfs:
  - **Paleustalfs** are more highly developed than Haploxeralfs and have a higher base saturation (35% or more) compared to Palexeralfs. A distinctive feature of Paleustalfs is the presence of a buried soil horizon, along with a light-colored surface horizon that contrasts with the darker underlying subsoil. This results in a soil environment with higher nutrient availability and cation exchange capacity, which can support a more diverse range of plant species. These soils are in the soil series Dewpoint (major component of map units 184, 422, 423, and 424). Dewpoint soils are mesic and typically include island chaparral, island scrub oak

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

woodland, and other woodland groves, such as ironwood or cherry. The understory may consist of grasses and wildflowers.




Figure 2-29 Taxonomic Relationship of Soil Map Units in the Entisols Soil Order.

USDA 2008; Typical soil profiles visualized by California Soil Resources Lab (2024); Depth in cm.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-30 Taxonomic Relationship of Soil Map Units in the Inceptisols Soil Order.

USDA 2008; Typical soil profiles visualized by California Soil Resources Lab (2024); Depth in cm.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-31 Taxonomy of the Soil Map Unit in the Vertisols Soil Order.

USDA 2008; Typical soil profiles visualized by California Soil Resources Lab (2024); Depth in cm.




Figure 2-32 Taxonomic Relationship of Soil Map Units in the Mollisols Soil Order.

USDA 2008; Typical soil profiles visualized by California Soil Resources Lab (2024); Depth in cm.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-33 Taxonomic Relationship of Soil Map Units in the Alfisols Soil Order.

USDA 2008; Typical soil profiles visualized by California Soil Resources Lab (2024); Depth in cm.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

PLANT AVAILABLE WATER

Soil types and environmental factors play a crucial role in determining plant-available water, which in turn influences the composition of plant communities within specific ecosystems. Key soil characteristics, such as organic matter content, restrictive layers (e.g., bedrock, calcic horizon, or argillic horizon), soil depth, texture, and porosity, interact with various environmental factors to shape the distribution and composition of vegetation communities. Organic matter content affects water retention and nutrient availability, while restrictive layers can impede water infiltration and root growth. Soil depth and texture influence water storage capacity, and porosity affects water movement and drainage. These factors together determine the overall water availability for plants. Environmental factors also play a significant role in shaping plant communities. Solar radiation affects evapotranspiration rates, while slope steepness influences water runoff and erosion. Position in the watershed impacts water accumulation from stormwater runoff, horizontal water movement, or upwelling from the vadose zone due to fractured rock holding water. Fog and wind contribute to water input and moisture redistribution, while orographic influences on rainfall result in spatial variations in precipitation patterns. All these factors, in conjunction with soil characteristics, create a complex and interconnected system that defines the plant communities found in different landscapes. Understanding these relationships is essential for the effective management and conservation of ecosystems and their associated plant communities.

For example, using water balance models developed by the California Soil Resources Lab (2024), we can compare the amount of available water in two different Catalina Island soil series, Coastwise and Dewpoint (Figure 2-34). The soil moisture state can be roughly interpreted as “dry” when storage is depleted, “moist” when storage is between 0mm and available water capacity (AWC) (i.e., the amount of water that a soil can store and make accessible for plant use), and “wet” when there is a surplus.

Comparing the Coastwise and Dewpoint soil series on Catalina Island using water balance models reveals distinct differences in AWC and water availability throughout the year. The Dewpoint series, comprising moderately deep and well-drained soils formed from schist and meta-sedimentary rock, exhibits a higher AWC of 124 mm annually. This series maintains available water until September and experiences an annual net water deficit of 513 mm. In contrast, the Coastwise series consists of shallow, moderately well-drained soils formed from schist. This series has a lower AWC of 61 mm annually, with available water lasting only until August and an annual net water deficit of 534 mm. Variations in soil depth, drainage, and parent material contribute to differences in AWC and water availability, impacting plant communities. The Dewpoint series, with higher AWC, primarily supports Island Woodland and Island Chaparral, while the Coastwise series, with lower AWC, predominantly hosts Coastal Sage Scrub, Maritime Cactus Scrub, and Coastal Bluff Scrub. The geographic distribution of available water on the island is visualized in Figure 2-22.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-34 Water Balance Comparison Between Dewpoint and Coastwise Soils.

USDA 2008; Monthly water balance estimated by California Soil Resources Lab (2024) using a leaky-bucket style model.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

EROSION POTENTIAL AND BARE AREAS

The erosion of potential of soils on Catalina Island is lower than those reported for Santa Rosa and San Clemente, and more typical of erosion potentials in mainland southern California woodland and rangeland (Mertes et al. 2000). A high-resolution potential annual soil loss map for Catalina Island was prepared (Figure 2-35), which is consistent with the previous calculations by Mertes et al. (2000). It was developed using a 10-meter raster digital elevation model (DEM) derived from 2002/2003 Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar (IfSAR) (NAVD88 vertical datum) and an empirical model (Renard et al. 1997). Additional notes on model development are provided on the figure. The potential annual soil loss map identifies areas that may be subject to greater topsoil loss from sheet or rill erosion, especially due to loss of vegetation cover from past ranching practices, the impacts of introduced ungulates (e.g., feral goats and pigs that have been removed, mule deer that are a source of current browsing pressure on woody vegetation, and bison that are largely grass consumers), and the effects of vegetation cover loss from the interactive effects of recent large fires (e.g., 2006 Empire Fire and the 2007 Island Fire) that temporarily removed vegetation cover and the loss of post-fire vegetation recovery due to mule deer browse.

While erosion potential is lower on Catalina Island than some of the northern Channel Islands (e.g. Chaney and McEachern 2000), there is evidence of localized erosion impacts, including topsoil loss and highly incised drainages reported by Knapp (2010) that have been attributed to impacts from road construction and intensive browsing by introduced ungulates. As noted by Knapp (2010) and further illustrated in the Soil Survey (USDA 2008), the presence of soil series, such as Masthead, Dewpoint and Luff with prominent argillic horizons, suggest the stability of older soil profiles that take a long time to develop. An argillic horizon is a subsurface soil layer characterized by the accumulation of clay particles, indicating the translocation of fine-textured materials through the soil profile. These soil series are represented by several soil complexes, such as 420, 421, and 422, which currently are generally dominated by CSS, island scrub oak woodland, and island chaparral. This indicates that these areas have retained most of their soil profile, however, certainly there may have been a loss of organic matter from the O and A horizons that have changed the biological conditions for native scrub and woodland recruitment in these areas.

In areas with younger soils, such as Express or Express, gullied (Inceptisols that are major components of map units 410 and 412, respectively) and Flyer and Flyer, gullied (Mollisols that are major components of map units 410 and 412), material is lost downslope faster than weathered clays can migrate down through the soil profile (USDA 2008). As a result, these soils have few distinctive characteristics and few or no diagnostic subsurface horizons. Because argillic horizons can take hundreds if not thousands of years to develop depending on weathering conditions, it is likely that these subsoils would have been relatively similar in composition prior to introduction of invasive ungulates in the early 1800s.




Figure 2-35 Annual Soil Loss Potential.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

However, the extensive gulling and the infestation of invasive annual grasses in areas like map unit 412 (Flyer-gullied-Express, gullied-Bosun complex, 15 to 50% slope) indicate that natural vegetative cover has been lost, which is likely to have at least impacted the topsoil, including organic matter content.

To identify areas on Catalina Island with high-levels of bare soil, the Dry Bare-Soil Index (DBSI) was calculated (Figure 2-36). The DBSI is an indicator derived from Landsat imagery that allows for the identification of areas with bare soil or minimal vegetation (Rasul et al. 2018). This index can be used to study various aspects of land cover, such as land conversion, impervious surfaces, and their relation to surface temperature.

2.1.5 Indigenous People and Cultural Land Management

For thousands of years, indigenous peoples inhabited coastal southern California, establishing a complex network of groups and villages, including on Catalina Island. Their settlements were strategically situated near freshwater sources and ecosystems that provided essential resources, such as food and fuel (Anderson 2007). By the time Spanish explorers arrived, the region was already home to a well-established and thriving indigenous society. Evidence of human settlements on the island can be traced back to 6,165 to 5,745 years before present through radiocarbon dating (Radde et al. 2024). Indigenous settlements are found along the island's coasts and terraces, with some sites now submerged due to the island's gradual sinking and rising sea levels (Porcasi et al. 1999). The indigenous people who lived here at the time the Spanish explorers found them called Catalina Island “Pimu” or “Pemú’nga” (Maxwell et al. 2014).

Catalina Island is part of the traditional territory of the Gabrieliño-Tongva which included most of modern-day Los Angeles County, part of Orange County (to Aliso Creek), and the southern Channel Islands, including San Clemente and Santa Catalina (McCawley 1996). The Gabrieliño-Tongva were a semi-nomadic coastal hunter-gatherer tribe that traveled by foot and by canoe, called ti’ats. They speak a language called Takic that belongs to the Cupan group of the Takic subfamily of the UtoAztecan language family, a language family that includes the Shoshonean groups of the Great Basin (Golla 2011). The total Gabrieliño-Tongva population (mainland and islands) at about 1770 AD was roughly 5,000 people, based on an estimate of 100 small villages of 50 to 200 people (Bean and Smith 1978, McCawley 1996).

The Gabrieliño-Tongva people had sophisticated political systems capable of governing sizeable villages comprising diverse clans and lineages. Although the exact nature of their government remains a subject of debate among anthropologists, it is evident that their political structures were intricate and effective in maintaining order and cohesion within their communities (Cherny et al. 2021).

The staple foods of the indigenous people of Catalina Island consisted of marine resources (Salls 1988, Raab et al. 1994, Porcasi and Fujita 2000). The Gabrieliño-Tongva would supplement the resources gathered near them with resources from other ecological zones by obtaining them either directly or through trade (Bean and Smith 1978).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-36 Dry Bare-Soil Index.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

The Gabrieliño-Tongva were part of an extensive trade network among indigenous people from southern California to Arizona and New Mexico (Bean et al. 1978, Longcore and Ethington 2023). The main export item for the indigenous people of Catalina was steatite (commonly referred to as soapstone), a kind of rock found on the island used to make carvings of sacred animals and vessels (Howard 2000). They also exchanged salt, shellfish, dried fish, marine mammal meat, and sea otter pelts for acorns, obsidian, and deerskins from the inland territories (Bean et al. 1978, McCawley 1996, 2002, Cherny et al. 2021).

Indigenous peoples actively managed the island's vegetation through fire (Hardiman et al. 2016) but the extent and the purposes of cultural burning practices are not well understood. Pacific Coast tribes have a long history of using fire to manage the land, with their practices varying depending on the season and local environmental conditions (Anderson 2007, Vinyeta 2022). In southern California, indigenous people would likely burn the mainland coastal prairie annually to increase plant food yield for seed collection of plants such as red maids (*Calandrinia* spp.), Chia (*Salvia columbariae*), and tarplant (*Deinandra* spp.), and for bulb plants such as blue dicks (*Dichelostemma spp.*) (Timbrook et al. 1982). Burning may have also been used to improve hunting for small mammals, such as rabbits or rodents. There is limited evidence of these types of cultural burning practices to increase food yield on Catalina Island. Instead, there is more direct evidence that there was a marine-based diet supplemented with terrestrial plant food resources, either collected on the island or traded for from the mainland.

Referring to the pre-colonial setting as the “Indigenous Landscape,” Longcore and Ethington (2023) emphasize the role of humans in manipulating the region’s natural communities during the long period that predated large-scale introduction of nonnative plants and animals from Europe and elsewhere. This historical context serves as a reminder of the region's ecological diversity and the importance of human-environment interactions in shaping the landscape of Catalina Island.

2.1.6 Impact of Invasive Species Introductions

Nonnative Ungulate Introductions

European ranchers and small-lot farmers settled, and an era of extensive and eventually uncontrolled grazing and browsing by introduced ungulates began (Figure 2-37). Sheep, cattle, and goats were introduced in the 1820s and persisted for a century. Sheep were removed in the 1920s and were replaced by pigs (*Sus scrofa*). Bison (*Bison bison*) were added in the 1920s as well, followed by mule deer in 1928 (Landis 2000). Goats and pigs were controlled in the 1990s through the early 2000s, and bison kept in check through fertility management starting in 2009 (Duncan et al. 2017). Pigs were fully eradicated by 2004 and goats by 2005.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-37 Timeline of Presence of Invasive Ungulates on Catalina Island.

Spanish missionaries are believed to have brought goats to the island as food for the indigenous people in 1827 (Preston 1997). Goats introduced by the Spanish multiplied so greatly that they drove more than 48 animal and plant species to extinction (Cherny et al. 2021). A census in 1864 by the military determined that between 8 ranchers on the island there were approximately 620 cattle and 22,000 sheep. Feral goats were estimated at 15,000. Ranching operations on the Island were sometimes intermittent and managed primarily by what is now the Island Company. Cattle were barged on and off the Island from the Isthmus and sometimes White's Landing. Sheep ranching was common in the 1800s and some of the harbors, such as Ben Weston, were named after these ranchers. Most of the historic livestock fences have been mapped by the Conservancy but are no longer maintained and some sections have been removed (Figure 2-38). By the early 1900s, it became apparent that there was not enough vegetation for so many herbivores and sheep were removed from the Island in 1920 by William Wrigley, Jr. who purchased the island in 1919. Subsequently, invasive mule deer and feral pigs were introduced by the early 1930s (Sweitzer et al. 2005).

The historical presence of these introduced herbivores has significantly altered the vegetation communities on Catalina Island, as well as the other California Channel Islands (Junak et al. 2012). Native plant cover, diversity, and natural recruitment has been significantly reduced due to the legacy of the introduction of ungulates, including browsers that primarily consume woody vegetation (e.g., feral goat, sheep, pigs, and mule deer) and grazers that primarily consume grasses and other herbaceous plants (e.g., cattle and bison) (Landis 2000, Laughrin et al. 1994, Knapp 2005b, Knapp 2009, Minnich 1982, Manuwal and Sweitzer 2007). The legacy impact of invasive ungulates is the loss of the extent and diversity of native habitat, especially Coastal Sage Scrub and Island Chaparral on Catalina Island (Minnich 1980, 1982). Similar impacts from the introduction of sheep have been documented on Santa Cruz Island (Brumbaugh 1980, Van Vuren and Bowen 1987).

Channel Island and Catalina Island endemic plants are especially vulnerable to invasive ungulates. Because of the long-term isolation of island vegetation from the mainland, endemic island plants evolved in the absence of ungulates, leading to a reduction in defenses to herbivores (Bowen and Ban Vuren 1997, Orians and Ward 2010).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-38 Location of Historic Livestock Fences.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Many endemic island plants are preferentially consumed by invasive herbivores, thereby restricting their distribution from their natural habitat to difficult-to-access locations, such as sea bluffs, cliff faces in the interior of the island, and within thorny cactus patches (Junak et al. 2012). This selective browsing decreases island biodiversity and increases the frequency of other native plants that retained their herbivore defenses, such as lemonadeberry (*Rhus integrifolia*), toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*), white sage (*Salvia apiana*), black sage (*Salvia mellifera*), and prickly pear cactus (*Opuntia littoralis*). Many of these browse resistant plants are now more frequent in many areas of the island. Coastal Bluff Scrub, because of its inaccessibility to invasive ungulates is one of the best-preserved vegetation communities on Catalina Island (Thorne 1967).

Island vegetation lifeform (e.g., tree, shrub, herb) is responsive to long-term climatic trends (i.e., wetter, or drier periods of time) and impacts from invasive ungulate browsing, and to a lesser extent grazing and trampling from the small managed herd of bison. The introduced bison population is currently managed by the Conservancy through an immunocontraception program, with about 90 individuals currently living on Catalina. Browsing pressure from invasive ungulates is magnified during periods of drought, as the animals are driven to consume less nutritious forage to survive, which impacts the limited island vegetation resources that grow below the browse line (e.g., green leaves and small stems within reach of mule deer to a height of about 4 to 5 feet).

Recent large fires, coupled with the impacts of drought and mule deer browsing, have significantly altered the vegetation structure on Catalina Island (Appendix C). The human-caused Empire Fire in 2006 and the Island Fire in 2007 collectively burned 12% of the island, with the latter being the largest recorded fire since 1915 (Figure 2-39). The Island Fire alone scorched 4,723 acres, surpassing the previous record set by the Goat Fire, which burned 285 acres. From 1985 to 2022, unburned watersheds saw a 5.2% decrease in barren soil cover and an 8.1% increase in shrub cover, which coincides with successful removal of feral goats and pigs between 1990 and 2005 (Figure 2-40). Tree cover increased from 40.2% to 48.7% in 1998 but then declined to 40.1% in 2022 following successive drought years from 2011 to 2016 and 2020 to 2022. While in watersheds that burned in the 2006 and 2007 fires, tree cover had increased from 52.0% in 1985 to 63.2% in 2005 (before the Empire Fire). However, 15 years after the fires tree cover has not recovered and is at 54% in 2022, 9.2% below pre-fire levels. Following fire, newly germinated plants from the native soil seed bank and basal resprouting shrubs and trees are subject to intense browsing pressure from mule deer (e.g., see Figure 2-41), even for plants that deer wouldn't find palatable after they have grown to a mature size (e.g., chamise, *Adenostoma fasciculatum*) (Minnich 1982, Ramirez et al. 2012). The browsing pressure from mule deer on the island is intensified during drought when forage is limited.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-39 Vegetation Cover in 1985, 2007 after two large fires, and 2022.

Tree Cover Increased and Barren Cover Decreased Between 1985 and 2022 Following Feral Goat and Pig Removal beginning in the 1990s. However, Tree Cover Has Not Fully Recovered in the 15 Years Since the 2006 and 2007 Due to Drought and Mule Deer Browsing Impacts. See Appendix C for more detail.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-40 Tree Cover has not recovered in Watersheds that Burned in the 2006 Empire and 2007 Island Fires.

See Appendix Cfor more det a il.



Figure 2-41 An Island Scrub Oak plant is unable to recover after the 2003 Airport Fire because of mule deer browsing basal resprouts.

Ph ot o t a ken Ma y 19, 2003, b y t h e Conserva ncy a ft er t h e Ja nua ry 6, 2023, Airport Fire.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

IMPACTS OF INTRODUCED FLORA

Predating the introduction of nonnative ungulates to Catalina Island, nonnative plants from Eurasia where first introduced to California by European explorers, including Juan Rodríguez Cabrillo in 1542. Spanish colonizers further introduced Eurasian plants to California in the late 1700s. On Catalina, the introduction of ungulates and colonial agricultural practices, created the disturbances that allowed for extensive invasion by the introduced flora. The Eurasian vegetation, having evolved alongside agricultural practices for millennia in a similar Mediterranean-type climate, was already well-adapted to the ecosystem upon its introduction to California. The concurrent introduction of agriculture created additional landscape disturbances, which further facilitated the spread and establishment of naturalized plant populations. This combination of factors contributed to the successful integration and persistence of these nonnative species in their new environment (Jackson 1985).

Invasive annual grasses and forbs have become a significant component of Catalina Island's flora, constituting approximately one-third of its species (see Table 2-4 and Appendix B). These nonnative plants compete with native vegetation for resources, often hindering the recruitment and growth of native species. For instance, a study by Knapp (2007a) documented a 30% reduction in island scrub oak cover between 1943 and 2005, potentially linked to the aggressive spread of invasive annual grasses. Research suggests that the presence of nonnative annual grasses can impede oak recruitment by outcompeting oak seedlings for water resources (Griffin, 1973; Bernhardt & Swiecki, 1991; Danielson & Halvorson, 1991). This competition may have contributed to inadequate regeneration of valley oaks in California during the 20th century. Given these findings, managing and controlling invasive plant species on Catalina Island is essential for preserving native plant communities and fostering the successful recruitment of key species such as island scrub oak.

Other common invasive plants on the island that impact ecosystem health include Italian thistle (*Carduus pycnocephalus*), sweet fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*), Harding grass (*Phalaris aquatica*), and Mediterranean broom (*Genista linifolia*). Mediterranean broom is particularly aggressive and has the potential to establish on most of the island (see Appendix D). First introduced in 1920 as a horticultural landscaping plant at the Saint Catherine Hotel at Descanso Beach that replaced the Banning home burned down in the 1915 Avalon Fire, Mediterranean broom has naturalized in the Avalon watershed, and as of 2015, has infested at least 9 percent of the island (Dion 2018).

2.1.7 INVASIVE MULE DEER IMPACTS

Following the successful removal of feral goats and pigs by the Conservancy from 1990 to 2003, mule deer have become the most significant remaining invasive browser on Catalina Island, threatening the island's biodiversity and ecosystem health (Ramirez et al., 2012). Although native vegetation cover has recovered since the removal of feral pigs and goats by 2005 (see Appendix C), there is a disproportionate representation of deer-resistant plants such as laurel sumac (*Malosma laurina*), lemonade berry (*Rhus*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

integrifolia), and invasive annual grasses and forbs. This recovery also lacks a significant presence of island endemic and rare plant species.

Concurrently, bison remain as the other invasive ungulate on the island, primarily impacting the ecosystem through trampling and soil compaction. However, their population is currently managed via an immunocontraception program, which has successfully maintained the population at less than 100 individuals in recent years.

The detrimental effects of mule deer overpopulation and introduction to novel habitats on biodiversity are well-documented in scientific literature (e.g., Anderson 2003, Anthony 2019, Côté 2004). Moreover, the impact of the introduction of mule deer to the ecological health of Catalina Island has been extensively studied (Appendix C, Dvorak and Catalano 2016, Jacobsen, et al. 2018, Knapp 2005b, Knapp 2007a, Landis 1997, Manuwal and Sweitzer 2007, Ramirez, et al. 2012, Salladay and Ramirez 2018, Stapp et al. 2022).

The diet of mule deer varies seasonally depending on the availability of different plant resources throughout the year. Most of their diet consists of leaf and twig browse of woody shrubs (Collins and Urness 1983), supplemented with forbs in spring and summer (Longhurst et al. 1952), and acorns in fall and early winter when nutritional stress is highest (Cronemiller and Bartholomew 1950, Harlow et. al 1975, Ashcraft 1979, Pine and Mansfield 1980, Pavlik et al. 1991). In California Chaparral, mule deer heavily rely on oak leaves in the summer months and acorns in the fall (Urness 1981, Kucera and Mayer 1999).

Native woody plants on Catalina Island, particularly endemic species, are more vulnerable to deer browsing due to their lack of evolutionary defenses against large herbivores. Since these plants evolved in the absence of such herbivores, they did not develop or retain the necessary chemical and mechanical traits to protect themselves from browsing (Orians and Ward 2010). A forage palatability study comparing plants from ten matched taxonomic groups, consisting of samples from both the mainland and Catalina Island, revealed that ungulates showed a clear preference for island plants (Salladay and Ramirez 2018).

Mule deer have a significant impact on vegetation during post-fire successional periods when germinated seedlings are present in the landscape. The increased vulnerability of these seedlings to deer browsing can significantly influence plant community composition and hinder the recovery of native species. As observed in recent years following the 2007 Island Fire in the White's exclosure and as reported by Knapp (2005b) in exclosures erected following the 1999 Goat Fire, rare and endemic plants germinate and resprout when protected from mule deer browse but cannot establish in the presence of mule deer browsing (e.g., see Figure 2-42). Examples are the Channel Islands tree poppy (*Dendromecon harfordii*) and Catalina ironwood (*Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus*). In the Goat Fire exclosures numerous rare herbaceous species were observed, including fire poppy (*Papaver californicum*), which had not been previously recorded (Knapp 2005b).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 2-42 Exclosure (Outlined in Red) Protecting Island Chaparral Vegetation from the Impacts of Mule Deer Browsing Following the 1999 Goat Fire.
Photo Provided by the Conservancy, Taken in 2002.

Post-fire regeneration is a critical stage in a plant's life history, as limited stored resources are mobilized to establish stable growth. Herbivory during this fragile period can have a disproportionate impact on plant survivorship. A study by Ramirez et al. (2012) on post-fire regeneration in three woody re-sprouters (*Heteromeles arbutifolia, Rhus integrifolia*, and *Rhamnus pirifolia*) following the 2006 Empire Fire revealed that exposure to mule deer resulted in an eight-fold increase in plant mortality. In protected plots, 11% of resprouts died, compared to 88% in deer-exposed plots. Deer browsing also led to a more than 93% reduction in canopy coverage among dominant shrub species, paving the way for exotic species invasion and vegetation type conversion.

The effects of excess browsing after wildfires can be even more pronounced among taxa that rely solely on re-seeding for regeneration. After the 2007 Island Fire, Jacobsen et al. (2018) established long-term monitoring stations at four sites within the fire footprint, consisting of monitoring plots both within a protective exclosure and unprotected plots immediately outside the exclosure. They monitored seedling survival, density, browse damage, and water relations in three re-seeding taxa: *Arctostaphylos catalinae, Ceanothus arboreus*, and *C. megacarpus*. All three species produced dense fields of new plants after the fire, which gradually thinned over subsequent years. A clear effect on seedling height was observed within the first two years for *C. arboreus*, with protected individuals reaching four times the size of those outside the exclosures. Over a span of fourteen years, the differences in growth and survival rates within the protective exclosures led to substantial demographic changes. The exclosure plots with mature

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

stands of *Ceanothus arboreus* and *C. megacarpus* contributed to the soil seed bank, ensuring the population's potential for recovery following future fire events. In contrast, plants exposed to mule deer did not survive long enough to produce a seed bank, resulting in their effective extirpation from those locations.

The disruptive effect of mule deer following fire events can also be seen in legally protected plants. The island rush-rose (*Crocanthemum greenei*) is a federally listed as threatened species found exclusively on the Channel Islands. The California Native Plant Society ranks it CRPR 1B.2—a high threat level—and it's one of twelve top-priority native plant taxa identified by the Catalina Island Conservancy (Rare Plant Conservation Plan). The plant occurs in small, widely scattered populations, and its germination appears to be fire dependent. Following the 2007 Island Fire, the growth and reproductive success of *C. greenei* was assessed at nearly half of the species' known occurrences on the island, both within and outside protective exclosures. Populations exposed to mule deer browsing showed markedly lower reproductive success, with 58% of those populations failing to produce any seeds. Populations protected by exclosures contained significantly larger plants, and all the plants in exclosure populations successfully fruited, regenerating the soil seed bank (Dvorak and Catalano 2016). Any effective conservation strategy for this federally listed species must address the mitigation of deer impacts.

Mule deer not only impact plant diversity but also degrade habitat quality for the federally threatened Catalina Island Fox. Mule deer preferentially browse species such as island redberry (*Rhamnus pirifolia*) and Santa Catalina Island manzanita (*Arctostaphylos catalinae*), which are important berry sources for the fox. By reducing deer populations, these native plant species can recover, providing essential food resources for the Catalina Island Fox and other wildlife species.

Mule deer have been subject to nearly annual harvesting on the island since 1949, with recent management efforts conducted under the Private Lands Management Program of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Knapp 2014). Despite these ongoing management actions, research suggests that recreational hunting alone is insufficient to effectively mitigate the negative effects of mule deer on habitat and biodiversity (Mack et al. 2000).

2.1.8 Fire

The fire frequency of mainland chaparral and CSS communities is higher than on the Channel Islands. However, recent human-caused large fires (2006 Empire and 2007 Island) on Catalina Island have resulted in a dramatic loss of chaparral habitat due to the combination of post-fire browsing by mule deer and drought (years 2011 to 2016 and 2020 to 2022) (Appendix C, Ramirez et al. 2012).

Historically, fire frequency in mainland chaparral ecosystems ranged from 25 to 65 years, allowing sufficient time for native species to recover in the fire-free period (Keeley 1982, Lombardo et al. 2009). However, if fires occur too frequently, generally less than 20-year fire return intervals, obligate-seeding chaparral species may struggle

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

to replenish seed banks, reducing post-fire reestablishment (Zedler et al. 1983, Keeley et al. 2005). Similarly, obligate resprouting species can experience diminished recovery following short-interval fires, as their carbohydrate storage may be insufficient to support vegetative regrowth, particularly under extreme climatic conditions (Pratt et al. 2014). As native shrub recovery falters, gaps in the closed-canopy chaparral open opportunities for invasive grasses or sage scrub species to colonize. This invasion leads to varying degrees of "type-conversion," resulting in a regional continuum of canopy openness and altered plant community composition (Keeley et al. 2005, Jacobsen and Pratt 2018).

Chaparral and many CSS vegetation communities are typically resilience to invasion by nonnative plants when there is not a disturbance. These shrublands typically maintain a closed canopy, which provides resistance to invasive species. However, changes in fire regimes can lead to increased susceptibility to invasions (Zedler et al. 1983, Keeley et al. 2005). Land management practices, such as grazing and mechanical disturbances, can further exacerbate the susceptibility of these ecosystems to invasion (Stylinski and Allen 1999). Jackson (1985) proposed that the invasion of Eurasian annual grasses into California's grasslands in the late 1700s was a combination of intensive year-round livestock grazing and conversion to crop agriculture followed by land abandonment. Keeley (2002) hypothesized that frequent use of fire by indigenous people increased the susceptibility of the landscape to invasion by nonnative of Eurasian annual grasses.

On the Channel Islands, there are fewer fire events than on the mainland because ignition sources are much less common, and the foggy maritime climate generally limits fire spread. Fire caused by lightning rather than by human ignition is extremely uncommon (Minnich 1982, Carroll et al. 1993), likely a result of the maritime conditions (although 3 lightning fires were recorded between 2001 and 2005 in Catalina Island Conservancy records). There are 22 fires in the contemporary record since 1915 (Table 2-3). A fire perimeter has been mapped for the 18 most recent fires (Table 2-3 and Figure 2-43). Less than 15% of the island (about 7,000 acres) has burned since 1915. Except for a small portion of the 1982 Isthmus Fire and the 2011 Banning Fire, none of the fire perimeters overlap, meaning that the fire return interval for the burn areas is at least 100 years. Minnich (1982) observed that the loss of Island Chaparral on the island from the impact of invasive ungulates beginning in circa 1820 reduced fuel loads and may have reduced the likelihood of significant fire events in the last two hundred years. The two largest recorded fires (2006 Empire and 2007 Island) occurred in the last 20 years and were both ignited by human activity. Although similar plant communities on the mainland experience regular fire, fire on the islands would have been much less frequent during the evolutionary history of island plant communities until evidence of human occupation on Catalina Island 6,165 to 5,745 years ago (Radde et al. 2024).

Periodic fire has likely played a role in shaping the evolution of Catalina Island's flora, as suggested by studies such as Carroll et al. (1993), Landis (1997), and Knapp (2005b). Some plant species with traits favoring post-fire regeneration, like felt-leaf ceanothus (*Ceanothus arborus*) and Santa Catalina Island manzanita (*Arctostaphylos catalinae*), have become less common due to invasive ungulate browsing. Landis (1997) also

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

suggested that they may be less common in part because of a reduction in fire frequency. However, while periodic fire may be important recruitment events, these plants can also reproduce by seed. The occurrence of fire-adaptive traits in native plants might not be solely attributed to fire as a primary selective pressure in their evolution. Instead, these traits could have been retained from ancestral populations on the mainland and proven advantageous in the face of periodic fires on the island.

Table 2-3 Catalina Island Fire History, 1915 to Present.

Fire Name	Month-Year	Size (Acres)	Fire Perimeter Mapped	Watershed Management Units Impacted
Avalon	1915	>20	no	Not mapped
Isthmus Quarry	1920	4 to 6	no	Not mapped
Forester's Inn, Avalon	1920	>100 acres	no	Not mapped
White Rock Springs	1921	400 to 500	no	Not mapped
Middle Ranch Shop	1975	6.5	yes	61j
Isthmus	Jul-1982	184.2	yes	70, 11
Little Harbor	Sep-1998	1.2	yes	66a
Goat	Jul-1999	285.4	yes	27, 28
Airport	Jan-2003	142.8	yes	63c
Middle Ranch Junction	Jul-2006	2.6	yes	35, 61e
Empire	Jul-2006	1,063.2	yes	19, 20, 21, 65, 66c
Bulrush	Jul-2006	1.4	yes	61h
Island	May-2007	4,723	yes	32a, 32b, 32c, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40a, 40b, 50a, 50b, 50c, 61e, 61f
Plane Crash	Oct-2008	0.4	yes	64
Echo Lake	Jul-2010	24.1	yes	29
Plane Crash	Oct-2010	0.7	yes	63d
Banning	May-2011	118	yes	11, 12, 70
Castle Rock	Jan-2012	0.6	yes	61d
Howlands	2014	0.1	yes	7, 74
Banning	2019	1.5	yes	11
Banning	Dec-2020	1.5	yes	13
Middle	Nov-2021	17.1	yes	61d




Figure 2-43 Catalina Island Fire Perimeter History, 1975 to Present.

Data provided by the Conservancy.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Thus, while fire may have influenced the evolution of Catalina Island's flora in geological time, it is essential to consider the interplay of various factors, such as ungulate browsing and historical events, in shaping the current distribution of vegetation on the island.

2.2 CATALINA ISLAND CONSERVANCY HABITAT RESTORATION EFFORTS

The Catalina Island Conservancy was established in 1972, and in 1975, 88% of the island was transferred from the Island Company to the Conservancy. Over the years, the Conservancy has implemented several habitat restoration and conservation initiatives, including:

- Eradication of feral pigs and goats
- Management of the introduced bison herd
- Founding a native plant nursery
- Conducting restoration plantings
- Establishing exclosures to shield native habitats from invasive herbivores
- Facilitating the recovery of the Catalina Island Fox
- Controlling invasive plant species

Building upon the Conservancy's experience with habitat restoration, this Habitat Restoration and Management Plan (HRMP) updates and aligns existing restoration strategies with current habitat restoration goals and principles outlined in Section 1.5. Relevant past planning efforts and research that inform this HRMP include:

- Whole island restoration strategies and prioritization (Knapp & Knapp, 2005; Knapp, 2010b, 2014; Olson & Farley, 2013)
- Island Scrub Oak restoration research and planning (Knapp, 2009, 2010; Stratton, 2005, 2007)
- Vegetation Map identifying the distribution of vegetation types in the year 2000 (Knapp, 2005a)
- Potential Natural Vegetation Map (Longcore et al., 2018)

The HRMP aims to integrate this wealth of knowledge and experience to guide future restoration efforts on Catalina Island, promoting the long-term health and resilience of its unique and diverse ecosystems.

2.2.1 INVASIVE UNGULATE CONTROL

Between 1990 and 2005, the Conservancy successfully removed all feral goats and pigs from the island and reduced the introduced bison herd to 150 individuals.

Since 1969, the bison herd has been managed to minimize negative ecological impacts. Periodic captures and shipments to the mainland aimed to maintain a relatively small

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

herd (150 to 200 individuals) and reduce effects on native plants and animals (Duncan et al. 2013, Sweitzer et al. 2005). However, the costs of transporting animals became unsustainable due to high expenses, concerns about animal stress during transport, and herd expansion between shipments (Duncan et al. 2013). Moreover, genetic testing revealed a high prevalence of cattle gene introgression in the Catalina herd, raising concerns about shipping bison to mainland herds with no historical or genetic evidence of hybridization with cattle (Vogel et al., 2007).

In late 2009, the Conservancy shifted to using fertility control to replace periodic removals for herd management (Duncan et al., 2017). As of 2024, the bison population is approximately 90 individuals. This approach has allowed for a more sustainable and cost-effective management strategy while addressing concerns related to animal welfare and genetic integrity.

2.2.2 Catalina Island Fox Recovery

The Catalina Island Fox was federally listed as endangered in 2004 due to a 90% population decline in 1998 (from about 1,300 to 103 individuals), primarily caused by the canine distemper virus (Timms et al. 2009). Concurrently, three other Channel Island subspecies experienced crashes, likely resulting from increased predation by golden eagles. These eagles were uncommon in the Channel Islands before the 1990s but may have proliferated following the decline of bald eagles, which were affected by DDT pollution in the food chain starting in the 1950s (Roemer et al. 2002).

To address the Catalina Island Fox's population crisis, the Conservancy partnered with the Institute for Wildlife Studies to establish the Catalina Island Fox Recovery Program. This multifaceted plan combined vaccination, relocation, and captive breeding efforts. By 2012, the Conservancy estimated that there were 1,500 Catalina Island Foxes, and the population had stabilized. Consequently, in 2016, the Catalina Island Fox was downlisted to threatened (USFWS 2016).

While the fox population size has recovered, ongoing research continues to examine the genetic health of the population because of potential risks associated with genetic diseases that may become more prevalent due to the significant reduction in population size and subsequent genetic bottleneck (Hendricks et al. 2022. Adams and Edmands 2023). Monitoring the genetic health of the Catalina Island Fox population is crucial to ensuring its long-term survival and adaptability.

2.2.3 Restoration Plantings

The Conservancy opened the Ackerman Native Plant Nursery in 1987 in Middle Ranch to support the habitat restoration. The nursery's primary mission is to cultivate plants native to Catalina Island from seeds or cuttings, with a special focus on rare plants and endangered species. Because of the damage caused by invasive ungulates, nursery grown transplants needed to be placed in protective cages for them to survive herbivory pressure (e.g., Figure 2-44).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 2-44 Example of a Felt-Leaf Ceanothus Restoration Planting in an Herbivory Protection Cage.
Photo Taken February 28, 2023.

Mature plants can grow outside the protective cage above the mule deer browse line, but the deer keep the plants pruned at the perimeter of the cage, creating unnatural looking plantings sometimes referred to as “Catalina dis-topiary”. Caged restoration planting locations since 2008 are shown in Figure 2-45.

Beginning in 1998, the Middle Ranch hayfields were the focus of a restoration project to control invasive plants, such as Harding grass, and to revegetate with island natives. Restoration plantings needed to be caged and given supplemental water for up to three years. These efforts were labor intensive and relied on volunteer support.

By 2002, the Catalina Island Conservancy had successfully removed 99% of feral pigs and 100% of goats from Santa Catalina Island (Schuyler et al., 2002a, b). However, the anticipated significant increase in natural oak regeneration did not materialize as expected. Simultaneously, patches of dying mature oaks, referred to as "dieback" areas, were observed on the channel side of the island, and a 30% island-wide loss in island scrub oak chaparral was documented between 1943 and 2005 (Knapp, 2007a).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 2-45 Location of Caged Restoration Plantings Since 2008.

Stratton (2009) conducted experiments with acorn plantings of island scrub oak (e.g., Figure 1-4) and discovered that establishment rates were higher within openings between existing trees rather than at the edge of the tree canopy. This finding led to speculation that the lack of natural regeneration in oak dieback areas might be attributed to a scarcity of acorn dispersers, such as scrub jays. The impact of herbivory by mule deer and bison on acorn germination and seedlings was found to be minimal (Stratton 2009), although other studies have demonstrated adverse herbivory effects on oak regeneration (Tyler et al. 2008). The presence of non-native annual grasses was also found to impede germination.

2.2.4 EXCLOSURES

Presently, the Conservancy employs a two-fold strategy to conserve and restore native plant taxa and communities amidst the ongoing impacts of mule deer:

1. Caged restoration plantings (Section 2.2.3) in select areas that are accessible by roadways for regular maintenance.
2. Herbivore exclosures in regions containing relatively intact native vegetation or sensitive species.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

After successfully removing feral pigs and goats from parts of the island in the late 1990s (with complete eradication achieved by 2005), the Conservancy began constructing deer exclosure fences to shield ecosystems from deer browsing. Currently, the Conservancy maintains 39 exclosures, ranging in size from 0.02 to 45.44 hectares, covering about 0.4% of the island's total land area (78.3 hectares or 193.5 acres) (Figure 2-46).

The largest investment in exclosures occurred following the 2007 Island Fire, which affected 10% of the island. Funded by the Seaver Institute, the Conservancy erected eight miles of 8-foot deer fencing in 2008. Notable exclosures constructed post-fire include the White's Exclosure and the Farnsworth Exclosure (Figure 2-47).

The 7.99-hectare exclosure at White's Landing safeguards a diverse ecosystem, including at least five Catalina endemic plants (Catalina Manzanita, Trask's Yerba Santa, Catalina Ironwood, Catalina Bedstraw, and Catalina Bush Mallow) and all three California Lilac (*Ceanothus*) taxa found on Catalina in high abundance. This protected area offers vital habitat for rare plants and wildlife, such as the Catalina California Quail, Catalina Hutton's Vireo, and the Catalina Island Fox.

Despite these efforts, only 29.71 hectares of the 2,582.9 hectares (6,382.4 acres) affected by fires since 1999 have been protected from mule deer herbivory by exclosures—less than 1.5% of the fire-impacted land area. Safeguarding even this small portion of regenerating habitat incurs significant costs, and maintaining these exclosures remains an ongoing challenge for the Conservancy.

2.2.5 Invasive Plant Management

The Catalina Invasive Plant Program (CIPP) was established by the Catalina Island Conservancy in 2003 to address the escalating threat and spread of invasive plants following the removal of invasive herbivores.

Invasive plant surveys in the early 2000s indicated that the abundance and distribution of invasive plants on Catalina Island were more severe than initially anticipated. The Conservancy observed a significant population expansion of several highly ranked invasive plant species, including Italian thistle (*Carduus pycnocephalus*), sweet fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*), and Harding grass (*Phalaris aquatica*). This rapid growth occurred predominantly on the island's West End, where bison had been excluded for over 15 years and the Feral Animal Removal Program had been active for over a decade. These circumstances highlighted the potential consequences of eradicating and reducing feral herbivores from the East End of Catalina Island without proper invasive plant management strategies in place. Habitat suitability modeling for common invasive plants currently under management by the Conservancy show the potential risk of uncontrolled spread on the island, especially by sweet fennel (Figure 2-48), Harding grass (Figure 2-49), and Mediterranean broom (Figure 2-50) (Appendix D).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-46 Mule Deer Exclosures.

Select ed exclosures a re L b eled.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 2-47 Farnsworth Exclosure within 2007 Island Fire Footprint, Protecting Felt-Leaf Ceanothus Regeneration from Mule Deer Herbivory.

Photo Taken 2021 by the Conservancy. The protected felt-leaf ceanothus plants in the exclosure (top of photo) are reproductively mature and produce seed, while the few surviving individuals outside the exclosure (bottom of photo) remain just a few centimeters tall and have yet to flower.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-48 Potential Distribution of Seven Invasive Herbaceous Flowering Plants (excluding Grasses).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-49 Potential Distribution of Four Invasive Grasses.

Drawing from the experiences on Santa Cruz Island, where the removal of cattle in the 1990s led to a dramatic increase in fennel populations (Knapp 2007b), the Conservancy recognized the urgency to prevent a similar outcome on Catalina Island. Consequently, the CIPP program was developed to tackle the invasive plant issue before it became unmanageable.

The goals of the CIPP invasive plant management project are (Knapp, 2007b):

1. Prevent the reduction or loss of native Catalina Island flora and fauna due to the direct or indirect impact(s) caused by invasive plants by actively controlling invasives with the safest, most effective, and economical methods available.
2. Increase the Conservancy's and partner agencies' knowledge regarding invasive plant distribution, impacts, and management strategies.
3. Stop invasive plant introductions, establishment, and spread on Catalina Island by increasing invasive plant awareness among staff, contractors, local residents, and visitors through education programs and improving cultural practices and partnerships.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-50 Potential Distribution of Three Invasive Shrubs.

The Conservancy controls invasive plant populations in high priority areas with a strategic top-down approach. Starting at the top of watersheds, at the highest elevation, and working downwards reduces source populations and reintroduction.

To achieve successful invasive plant management, the Conservancy emphasizes consistent treatment of infestations, building upon lessons learned from eradicating feral animals. Consistency and follow-through are essential for achieving management objectives and maintaining the benefits derived from previous efforts.

Since the beginning of CIPP over 1.4 million individual plants have been treated, nearly 30,000 acres have been surveyed, over 3,000 acres have been treated, over 200 species have been treated, and over 68,000 management hours have been invested (e.g., see Figure 2-51) (Appendix A).




Figure 2-51 Invasive Plant Control Survey and Treatment Locations from 2016 to 2023.

Data provided by the Conservancy.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2.3 CONTEMPORARY ISLAND HABITAT

2.3.1 PLANT DIVERSITY

The diversity of plant life on Catalina Island can be summarized by the major taxonomic groups that occur on the island (Table 2-4): ferns and fern allies, gymnosperms, and angiosperms, which include magnoliids, monocots, and eudicots. There are more than 700 plant species, subspecies, or varieties on the island, a third of which have been introduced. See Appendix B for a list of plants recorded by the Conservancy.

1. **Ferns and Fern Allies:** These ancient plants reproduce via spores instead of seeds. They typically thrive in moist environments, with ferns producing large, feathery fronds, while fern allies (such as club mosses and horsetails) may have more specialized structures. Their unique reproductive strategies make them distinct from other plant groups on islands.
2. **Gymnosperms:** Also known as "naked seed" plants, gymnosperms bear exposed seeds within cones or cone-like structures. They include conifers (e.g., pine trees), cycads, and ginkgos. Their wind-pollinated reproductive structures and unique seed-bearing adaptations set them apart from plant groups. There are no native gymnosperms on the island.
3. **Angiosperms:** The most diverse group of plants, angiosperms, or flowering plants are characterized by their production of flowers and fruits. There are three groups of angiosperms that occur on the island:
    - **Magnoliids:** Representing the earliest branch of flowering plants, magnoliids display diverse characteristics, making them challenging to categorize. Magnoliids include magnolias, tulip trees, and black pepper plants, among others. There is one Magnoliid that occurs on the island, and it is native, yerba mansa *(Anemopsis californica*). Yerba mansa is commonly found in moist, alkaline, and saline habitats such as marshy areas, creek edges, and salt grass flats.
    - **Monocots:** These angiosperms have seeds with one embryonic leaf, or cotyledon. They typically exhibit parallel leaf veins, scattered vascular bundles in stems, and flower parts in multiples of three. Almost half of the monocots on the island are introduced species.
    - **Eudicots:** Also known as "true dicots," eudicots have seeds with two embryonic leaves or cotyledons. They generally feature net-like leaf veins, vascular bundles arranged in a ring in stems, and flower parts in multiples of four or five. Examples of eudicots include oak trees and sunflowers.

In island ecosystems like Catalina Island, understanding the distinction between native and introduced plant species is crucial for preserving the unique ecological balance. Native plants naturally occur within the island, having evolved and adapted to the specific environmental conditions over time. These plants form the foundation of island ecosystems, playing essential roles in supporting native wildlife and maintaining biodiversity.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 2-4 Summary of the Number of Santa Catalina Island Plants, including all Species, Subspecies, or Varieties, by Taxonomic Group.

	Native	Introduced	Total
PLANTS	**473**	**236**	**709**
FERNS AND FERN ALLIES	**18**	**1**	**19**
GYMNOSPERMS	**0**	**12**	**12**
ANGIOSPERMS	**455**	**223**	**678**
Magnoliids	1	0	1
Monocots	68	60	128
Eudicots	386	163	549

Plant Species: A group of individual plants with similar characteristics, such as appearance, reproductive traits, and genetic makeup, that are capable of interbreeding and producing fertile offspring. Species represent the basic taxonomic unit of biological classification, sharing a common ancestry and occupying specific ecological niches.

Subspecies: A geographic or ecological subdivision of a species that exhibits distinct characteristics from other individuals of the same species but is still capable of interbreeding. Subspecies are often isolated from other populations, allowing them to develop unique traits while maintaining their connection to the broader species.

Varieties: A taxonomic category within a species or subspecies that displays minor differences in morphological or physiological features from the more typical members. Varieties often result from genetic mutations or environmental factors, and they can be naturally occurring or selectively bred by humans for desired traits, such as increased pest resistance or improved taste.

On the other hand, introduced plant species are those that have been brought to the island by humans, either intentionally or accidentally. The impact of these nonnative plants on island ecosystems can vary significantly. Some introduced plants may be planted in the landscape but do not spread beyond their designated areas. These plants typically pose minimal threat to native species and habitats, as their growth and reproduction are controlled.

Other introduced plants may naturalize, meaning they can establish self-sustaining populations and spread outside the areas where they were initially planted. While some naturalized plants can coexist with native species without causing harm, others may pose a threat to native biodiversity by outcompeting native plants for resources and altering ecosystem processes.

A subset of introduced plants is considered invasive due to their aggressive growth, rapid reproduction, and ability to thrive in both disturbed and undisturbed native habitats. Invasive species can significantly disrupt island ecosystems by displacing native plants, reducing habitat quality for native wildlife, and changing natural processes such as fire regimes, water availability, and nutrient cycling. These negative impacts on the

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

native ecology or ecosystem make invasive plants a major concern for conservation efforts on Catalina Island.

RARE AND PROTECTED PLANTS

Islands often exhibit a higher degree of species endemism, extinction, and vulnerability compared to mainland areas (Keir et al. 2009). Catalina Island exemplifies this phenomenon, with an elevated occurrence of rare and endemic plant species.

The island's flora includes over sixty species with a California Rare Plant Ranking (CRPR) status (see Section 2.4.1), three species with federal endangered status (*Cercocarpus traskiae, Pentacheta lyonii,* and *Sibara filifolia*), one with federally threatened status (*Crocanthemum greenei*), three with California endangered status (*C. traskiae, P. lyonia,* and *Acmispon dendroideus* var*. traskiae*), and one with California threatened status (*Dithyrea maritima*). The Catalina Island rush rose (*Crocanthemum greenei*) is an example of a rare, federally listed species directly impacted by nonnative browsing pressure.

The Project aims to aid in the recovery of various sensitive plant species, including felt-leaf ceanothus (*Ceanothus arboreus*), Catalina grass (*Dissanthelum californicum*), southern island mallow (*Lavatera assurgentiflora* subsp. *glabra*), Catalina ironwood (*Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus*), Santa Catalina Island bush-mallow (*Malacothamnus fasciculatus* var. *catalinensis*), the federally and state endangered Lyon's pygmydaisy (*Pentacheta lyonii*), the federally endangered Santa Cruz Island rockcress (*Sibara filifolia*), and Catalina nightshade (*Solanum wallacei*). Many of these species are recognized by the California Native Plant Society with Rare Plant Ratings and are identified as Species of Greatest Conservation Need. Endemic island plant species are expected to experience the most significant recovery from the Project due to their lack of physical and chemical defenses against nonnative herbivores.

The situation is particularly critical for certain species like the Catalina ironwood and Santa Catalina Island mountain-mahogany, which currently have extremely low population counts. With only about 120 and 6 individuals, respectively, remaining for these species, action is necessary to protect and promote their recovery on Catalina Island.

2.3.2 VEGETATION COMMUNITIES

Knapp (2005a) developed a vegetation map based on a year 2000 aerial basemap and field surveys, which identified 18 distinct land cover classes. As part of an effort to quantify changes in vegetation cover from 1943 to 2005, Knapp (2007a) separately mapped Island Scrub Oak Chaparral. This distinction between Island Scrub Oak Chaparral and Island Chaparral resulted in a total of 19 vegetation classes, as shown in Table 2-5 and visualized in Figure 2-52.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 2-5 Catalina Island 2000 Vegetation Map (Modified from Knapp 2005a).

Vegetation Community (Veg Code)	Percent of Island	Acres	Hectares
Woodland, Chaparral, and CSS			
Island Woodland with Other Classifications (IW)	0.6	272	110
Island Chaparral (IC)	18.5	8,859	3,585.1
Island Chaparral with Other Classifications (IC)	7.7	3,716	1,504
Island Scrub Oak Chaparral (ISOC)	6.2	2,980	1,205.9
Mix of Island Chaparral and CSS (IC/CSS)	18.0	8,608	3,483.7
Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS)	20.2	9,682	3,918.5
CSS with Nonnative Grassland or Bare (CSS)	8.3	3,963	1,603.8
Maritime Cactus Scrub (MCS)	<0.1	3	1.2
Coastal Bluff Scrub (CBS)	0.2	78	31.4
Riparian, Marsh, Dune, and Reservoirs			
Southern Riparian Woodland with Bare Streambed (SRW)	0.3	164	66.3
Mulefat Scrub with Bare Streambed (MFS)	<0.1	9	3.7
Riparian Herbaceous with Bare (RH)	0.1	25	10
Bare Streambed (BSB)	0.1	40	16.4
Coastal Marsh with Bare (CM)	<0.1	3	1.3
Southern Beach and Dune (SBD)	0.3	128	52.1
Vernal Ponds and Reservoirs (VPR)	0.1	44	17.9
Nonnative Vegetation, Grassland, Bare, and Developed			
Nonnative Woodland with Nonnative Scrub or Grassland (NNW)	0.2	105	42.7
Nonnative Scrub with CSS (NNS)	0.1	59	24
Nonnative Herbaceous with Nonnative Grassland (NNH)	0.5	239	96.9
Grassland (GR)	12.0	5,734	2,320.4
Nonnative Grassland with Bare (GR)	0.4	203	82.1
Bare (B)	5.2	2,497	1,010.6
Developed (D)	1.1	544	220.3

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 2-52 Vegetation Map for Year 2000.

Data provided by the Conservancy (Knapp 2005a). Legend on the next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Woodland, Chaparral, and CSS

Veg Code | Percent of Island | Veg Community

- IW | 0.6 | Island Woodland with Other Classifications
- IC | 18.5 | Island Chaparral
- IC | 7.7 | Island Chaparral with Other Classifications
- IC/CSS | 18 | Mix of Island Chaparral and CSS
- ISOC | 6.2 | Island Scrub Oak Chaparral
- CSS | 20.2 | Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS)
- CSS | 8.3 | CSS with Nonnative Grassland or Bare
- MCS | <0.1 | Maritime Cactus Scrub
- CBS | 0.2 | Coastal Bluff Scrub

Riparian, Marsh, Dune, and Reservoirs

Veg Code | Percent of Island | Veg Community

- SRW | 0.3 | Southern Riparian Woodland with Bare Streambed
- MFS | <0.1 | Mulefat Scrub with Bare Streambed
- RH | 0.1 | Riparian Herbaceous with Bare
- BSB | 0.1 | Bare Streambed
- CM | <0.1 | Coastal Marsh with Bare
- SBD | 0.3 | Southern Beach and Dune
- VPR | 0.1 | Vernal Ponds and Reservoirs

Nonnative Vegetation, Bare, and Developed

Veg Code | Percent of Island | Veg Community

- NNW | 0.2 | Nonnative Woodland with Nonnative Scrub or Grassland
- NNS | 0.1 | Nonnative Scrub with CSS
- NNH | 0.5 | Nonnative Herbaceous with Nonnative Grassland
- GR | 12 | Nonnative Grassland
- GR | 0.4 | Nonnative Grassland with Bare
- B | 5.2 | Bare
- D | 1.1 | Developed

- Main Drainage Divide

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2.3.3 VEGETATION ALLIANCES AND ASSOCIATIONS

Due to the significant alteration of plant and community distributions on the island, primarily caused by invasive ungulate herbivory, and the high diversity of island-endemic plants, vegetation communities on the California Channel Islands may share similar lifeforms with mainland communities under comparable bioclimatic conditions and disturbance regimes but differ in their characteristic or dominant species. To address this, Junak et al. (2012) provided a crosswalk of vegetation types described for the California Channel Islands, incorporating the vegetation types identified by Knapp (2005a) in the 2000 Vegetation Map, and aligning them with the CNPS Manual of California Vegetation (MCV) as published in 2005.

Based on habitat suitability modeling for select island plants (Appendix D), analysis of co-occurrence models (Appendix E), we identified likely native vegetation alliances or associations using the most recent version of the CNPS MCV, which is maintained online (CNPS 2024). These native vegetation alliances or associations, along with potential vegetation maps, are presented in Appendix D and listed here for reference:

ISLAND WOODLAND

CALIFORNIAN BROADLEAF FOREST AND WOODLAND GROUP

Three potential woodland associations were identified:

a. **Island Live Oak Woodland and Forest** (*Quercus tomentella* Forest & Woodland Association) is defined by dominance by *Quercus tomentella* in the tree canopy.
b. **Catalina Ironwood Woodland and Forest** (*Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus* Forest & Woodland Association) is defined by dominance by *Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus* in the tree canopy.
c. **Catalina Cherry Woodland and Forest** (*Prunus ilicifolia subsp. lyonii* Forest & Woodland Association) is defined by *Prunus ilicifolia* subsp. *lyonii* in the tree canopy.

ISLAND CHAPARRAL

CALIFORNIA MARITIME CHAPARRAL GROUP

Two potential maritime chaparral associations were identified:

a. **Santa Catalina Island Manzanita Chaparral** (*Arctostaphylos catalinae* Shrubland Association) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Arctostaphylos catalinae* in the shrub layer.
b. **Island Scrub Oak Chaparral** (*Quercus pacifica* Shrubland Association) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Quercus pacifica* in the shrub layer.

CALIFORNIA XERIC CHAPARRAL GROUP

Five potential xeric chaparral alliances or associations were identified:

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

c. **Mission Manzanita – Lemonadeberry Chaparral** (*Xylococcus bicolor - Rhus integrifolia* Shrubland Association) is defined by co-dominance of *Xylococcus bicolor and Rhus integrifolia* in the shrub layer.

d. **Chamise – Sage Chaparral** (*Adenostoma fasciculatum - Salvia* spp. Shrubland Alliance) is defined by co-dominance of *Adenostoma fasciculatum* and *Salvia* spp. (e.g., *S. mellifera*).

e. **Island Ceanothus Chaparral** (*Ceanothus megacarpus* var. *insularis* Shrubland Association) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Ceanothus megacarpus* var. *insularis* in the shrub layer.

f. **Felt-Leaf Ceanothus Chaparral** (*Ceanothus arboreus* Shrubland Association) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Ceanothus arboreus* in the shrub layer.

g. **Big-Pod Ceanothus Chaparral** (*Ceanothus megacarpus* Shrubland Alliance) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Ceanothus megacarpus* var. *megacarpus* in the shrub layer.

COASTAL SAGE SCRUB

CENTRAL AND SOUTH COASTAL CALIFORNIAN COASTAL SAGE SCRUB (CSS) GROUP

Six potential CSS alliances or associations were identified:

a. **California Sagebrush – Coast Prickly Pear Scrub** (*Artemisia californica - Opuntia littoralis* Shrubland Association) is defined by co-dominance of *Artemisia californica* and *Opuntia littoralis* in the shrub layer.

b. **California Sagebrush Scrub** (*Artemisia californica* Shrubland Alliance) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Artemisia californica* in the shrub layer.

c. **Island Buckwheat Scrub** (*Eriogonum grande* var. *grande* Shrubland Association) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Eriogonum grande* var. *grande* in the shrub layer.

d. **California Brittle Bush Scrub** (*Encelia californica* Shrubland Association) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Encelia californica* in the shrub layer.

e. **White Sage Scrub** (*Salvia apiana* Shrubland Alliance) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Salvia apiana* in the shrub layer.

f. **Black Sage Scrub** (*Salvia mellifera* Shrubland Alliance) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Salvia mellifera* in the shrub layer.

COASTAL BLUFF SCRUB

COASTAL BAJA CALIFORNIA NORTE MARITIME SUCCULENT SCRUB GROUP

Five potential succulent scrub alliances or associations were identified:

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

a. **Giant Coreopsis Scrub** (*Leptosyne gigantea* Shrubland Alliance) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Leptosyne gigantea* in the shrub layer.

b. **Coast Prickly Pear Scrub** (*Opuntia littoralis – Opuntia oricola – Cylindropuntia prolifera* Shrubland Alliance) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Opuntia littoralis, Opuntia oricola,* or *Cylindropuntia prolifera* in the shrub layer.

d. **Island Tarplant – Saint Catherine's Lace Scrub** (*Deinandra clementina – Eriogonum giganteum* var*. giganteum* Shrubland Alliance) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Deinandra clementina* and/or *Eriogonum giganteum* var. *giganteum.*

e. **Green Liveforever Succulent Scrub** (*Dudleya virens subsp. hassei* Succulent Scrub Association) is defined by dominance by *Dudleya virens subsp. hassei* in the herb layer.

f. **Saint Catherine's Lace Scrub** (*Eriogonum giganteum* var*. giganteum* Shrubland Association) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Eriogonum giganteum* var*. giganteum* in the shrub layer.

MARITIME CACTUS SCRUB

COASTAL BAJA CALIFORNIA NORTE MARITIME SUCCULENT SCRUB GROUP

One potential succulent scrub alliances or associations was identified, which is in the same MCV Group as the five vegetation communities identified above in the Coastal Bluff Scrub Vegetation Type, but has previously been described as Maritime Cactus Scrub Vegetation Type:

c. **California Boxthorn Scrub** (*Lycium californicum* Shrubland Alliance) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Lycium californicum* in the shrub layer.

VERNAL PONDS AND RESERVOIRS

ARID WEST FRESHWATER EMERGENT MARSH GROUP

One potential marsh alliance was identified:

a. **Cattail Marshes** (*Typha* spp. Herbaceous Alliance) is defined by *Typha* (e.g., *domingensis*) dominant or co-dominant in the herbaceous layer.

CALIFORNIAN MIXED ANNUAL/PERENNIAL FRESHWATER VERNAL POOL/SWALE BOTTOMLAND GROUP

One potential vernal pool/swale bottom alliance was identified:

b. **Clustered Tarplant Fields** (*Deinandra fasciculata* Herbaceous Alliance) is defined by *Deinandra fasciculata* dominant or co-dominant with other herbs (e.g., *Hordeum intercedens*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

COASTAL MARSH

TEMPERATE PACIFIC TIDAL SALT AND BRACKISH MEADOW GROUP

One potential brackish meadow alliance was identified:

c. Salt Grass Flats (*Distichlis spicata* Herbaceous Alliance) is defined by *Distichlis spicata* dominant or co-dominant with other herbs (e.g., *Cressa truxillensis*).

SOUTHERN BEACH AND DUNE

VANCOUVERIAN/PACIFIC DUNE MAT GROUP

One potential dune mat association was identified:

d. Dune Mat (*Ambrosia chamissonis - Abronia maritima - Cakile maritima Herbaceous Association*) is defined by *Abronia maritima* other perennial herbs, grasses, and low shrubs, often including the invasive plant, *Cakile maritima.*

Not included above, are potential vegetation alliances for the following three vegetation types because there was insufficient data for the modeling effort in Appendix D: Southern Riparian Woodland (SRW), Riparian Herbaceous (RH), and Mulefat Scrub (MFS). While these three vegetation types represent only 0.3%, 0.1%, and less than 0.1% of the land area respectively, their association with riparian habitat gives them more value to the island ecology than the land area suggests. More detailed investigation focused on these island riparian systems would benefit management of associated wildlife, such as bats and the Catalina Island Shrew. Given the limited land area, these riparian systems can be censused as part of a future survey effort, as needed.

This updated information provides valuable insights into the unique plant communities that could be restored on Catalina Island and will help inform conservation efforts targeting these distinct and vulnerable ecosystems.

The vegetation types on Catalina Island are often afflicted by various invasive annual grasses (*Avena* spp., *Bromus* spp., *Brachypodium distachyon*) and forbs, which can alter the native plant communities. Some areas are dominated by patches of invasive perennial grass, such as Harding grass. Mediterranean Broom can be found throughout the island, particularly in the Avalon watershed, where it has formed dense, nonnative scrub communities. Similarly, sweet fennel and Italian thistle can create dense patches, defining nonnative herbaceous vegetation communities.

While the existing 2000 Vegetation Map (Figure 2-52) provides a valuable baseline understanding of the island's vegetation types, it lacks vital information on lifeform types (e.g., herbaceous, shrub, and tree cover) and dominant or characteristic plant species cover classes. Conducting a new vegetation mapping effort for the island in accordance with current CNPS Vegetation Mapping Protocols and Guidelines would help quantify changes in vegetation cover compared to the 2000 map. This could be achieved through a vegetation type crosswalk with the MCV classification levels used in the new map.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

An updated vegetation map would provide the Catalina Island Conservancy with more detailed information, enabling them to refine the identification of site-specific habitat restoration opportunities and better understand the dynamics of native and nonnative plant communities on the island. Additionally, this updated map would assist the Conservancy in effectively implementing management strategies for invasive species and support long-term conservation efforts on Catalina Island. However, there is sufficient information in this plan and in the Conservancy's geospatial database to implement the HRMP, as is.

2.3.4 WILDLIFE

The Project is anticipated to significantly enhance breeding, foraging, and refuge habitats for various wildlife species, including the Federally and State threatened Santa Catalina Island Fox (*Urocyon littoralis catalinae*), Catalina Hutton's vireo (*Vireo huttoni unitti*), Island loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus anthonyi*), two-striped gartersnake (*Thamnophis hammondii*), Catalina California quail (*Callipepla californica catalinensis*), and the Catalina Island Shrew. Each of these species is designated as a Species of Greatest Conservation Need under the 2015 California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) State Wildlife Action Plan.

The Catalina Hutton's vireo is expected to particularly benefit from habitat improvements, as its preferred oak woodland habitats have experienced diminished seed banks and persistent pressures from nonnative browsers that impede natural regeneration. By addressing these issues, the Project aims to promote the recovery and resilience of these critical ecosystems, ultimately supporting the conservation of the diverse and unique wildlife that inhabits Catalina Island.

2.3.5 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

Downscaled global climate models (GCMs) have been developed to provide guidance on future conditions within local regions. In southern California these models predict an increase in temperature (Cook et al. 2015) but without any significant change in average precipitation (Berg et al. 2015) (Figure 2-53).

Impacts to fog are not well understood but expected to result in less fog (Olson and Farley 2013). The resulting effect will be one of increased drought, wherein periods of low precipitation occur with higher temperatures (Diffenbaugh et al. 2015). Attributable to such conditions is an observed decrease in greenness of Chaparral and Coastal Sage Scrub vegetation over the period 2000 to 2016 in the nearby Santa Monica Mountains (Gillespie et al. 2018). Increased temperatures will affect plant phenology, affecting the start and end of the growing season, duration of the growing season, and total productivity (Parmesan and Yohe 2003). This is occurring in other Mediterranean regions, with the largest effects on the timing of spring growth and blooming (Gordo and Sanz, 2010).

Ecological niche models developed to predict the distribution of CSS under future climate conditions (Principe et al. 2013, Riordan and Rundel 2014) predicted large losses in suitable habitat for southern California plant taxa. More recent models using higher

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

resolution topographic data (270 m vs. 1 km resolution) predict a high degree of habitat stability for CSS species (modeled independently) (Riordan et al. 2018). This result is also consistent with State of California models showing that CSS habitat remains suitable in the Puente Hills under late 21st Century climate conditions (Thorne et al., 2016).




Figure 2-53 Historic Records and Future Climate Change Scenario for Catalina Island.

Source: Downscaled climate data from ClimateNA. Future Climate Scenario is based on a 13 Global Climate Model (GCM) ensemble for a worst-case scenario of continued fossil fuel dependence; Coupled Model Intercomparison Project 6 (CMIP6) of the World Climate Research Programme, Shared SocioeconomicPathways (SSP)–5, Representative Concentration Pathways [RCP] 8.5.

Although Coastal Sage Scrub was thought to be more vulnerable to drought, recent data from the 2012 to 2016 drought indicates that chaparral ecosystems were more heavily impacted (Okin et al. 2018). Chaparral plants rely on deeper soil water, making them more resistant to short-term drought but more susceptible to prolonged droughts. Local

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

responses to drought in both communities depend on soil texture and elevation, with lower, warmer sites experiencing greater drought sensitivity. This implies that future climate warming could intensify drought impacts on Chaparral ecosystems, suggesting that Chaparral may be more resilient in wetter landscapes on Catalina Island.

While climate change projections suggest increased soil moisture aridity, which will reduce resources for local wildlife populations, the most significant future threat may be increased fire frequency due to both wind-driven and fuel-driven fires. Too frequent fires in CSS and chaparral communities results in type conversion to invasive nonnative grasslands (Keeley 2002). Fire frequency in the South Pacific Coast is not affected by temperatures during any season (Keeley and Syphard 2017). Fire spread is driven predominantly by Santa Ana winds (Moritz et al., 2010) and human-caused ignitions (Syphard and Keely 2015). Extreme wind conditions spread fires and are more important than preceding drought (Keeley 2004), although drought conditions will extend the fire season (Dennison et al. 2008) and facilitate larger fires through vegetation die-back (Keeley and Zedler 2009).

The probability for large fires in California under climate change scenarios (RCP4.5 and RCP8.5 from 2040 to 2069 and 2070 to 2099) will intensify in summer and lengthen into spring and fall compared to historic conditions (1970 to 1999) is likely related to decreased fuel moisture and increased vapor pressure deficit (Dong et al. 2022). While the effects of Santa Ana winds (SAW) on autumn and winter wildfire may weaken in the future, projected to peak from November to January (Guzman-Morales and Gershunov 2019)—when SAW and human-ignition coincide there will continue to be high risk of large wildfires in southern California (Keeley et al. 2021).

Type-conversion of vegetation from shrubland to grassland will likely be a result of an increased frequency of wildfires and not directly correlated to changes in temperature and precipitation. The presence of mule deer and larger fires will drastically magnify these climate change impacts. While management of climate is beyond the scope of local management, removing the invasive mule deer and reducing human-caused fire ignition sources are two management actions that will significantly conserve existing island habitat and will likely lead to restoration of more diverse and climate resilient island ecosystem.

2.4 ENDEMIC TAXA

Dozens of plant and wildlife taxa (species, subspecies, varieties) are endemic to the Channel Islands, meaning that they are found on one or more of the eight islands that make up the archipelago but not on the mainland, and some species are found only on Catalina Island.

In the following lists of endemic taxa, an asterisk (*) denotes designation as “special-status species” by federal or state governments (see Section 2.5).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2.4.1 ENDEMIC PLANTS

Many plant species are found on Catalina Island and other Channel Islands, but the following ten taxa are endemic to Catalina Island.

- Catalina Island Dudleya (*Dudleya virens* subsp. *hassei*) *
- Catalina Island Mountain Mahogany (*Cercocarpus traskiae*) *
- Santa Catalina Island Bushmallow (*Malacothamnus fasciculatus* var*. catalinensis*) *
- Santa Catalina Island Ironwood (*Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus*) *
- Trask's Yerba Santa (*Eriodictyon traskiae* subsp. *traskiae*)
- Santa Catalina Island Manzanita (*Arctostaphylos catalinae*) *
- Santa Catalina Island Buckwheat (*Eriogonum giganteum* var*. giganteum*) *
- Santa Catalina Island Bedstraw (*Galium catalinense* subsp. *catalinense*) *
- Santa Catalina Island Popcorn Flower (*Cryptantha catalinensis*)
- Santa Catalina Island Monkeyflower (*Diplacus traskiae*) * [Potentially extinct]

Source: Catalina Island Conservancy (2022).

2.4.2 ENDEMIC INVERTEBRATES

The following invertebrate taxa are endemic to Catalina Island, and in some cases additional Channel Islands, as noted.

- Catalina Island Centipede (*Pectiniunguis catalinensis*)
- Catalina Island Parajulid Millipede (*Bollmaniulus catalinae*)
- Catalina Island Cambalid Millipede (*Nannolene catalina*)
- Catalina Lancetooth Snail (*Haplotrema catalinense*) *
- Catalina Cactussnail (*Xerarionta kellettii*); two other Channel Islands
- Catalina Mountainsnail (*Radiocentrum avalonense*) *
- Shepard's Snail (*Pristiloma shepardae*) *; three other Channel Islands
- Catalina Ribbed Vertigo (*Vertigo catalinaria*); four other Channel Islands
- Insular Birddrop Snail (Sterkia [*Vertigo*] *clementina*) *; three other Channel Islands
- Pimu Island Vertigo (*Vertigo pimuensis*)
- Avalon Islandsnail (*Micrarionta beatula*)
- Santa Barbara Islandsnail (*Micrarionta facta*) *; two other Channel Islands
- Santa Catalina Islandsnail (*Micrarionta rufocincta*); two other Channel Islands

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- Catalina Island Death Watch Beetle (*Euvrilletta catalinae*)
- Southern Island Death Watch Beetle (*Xarifa insularis*); two other Channel Islands
- Catalina Island Soldier Beetle (*Cultellunguis hatchi dorothyae*)
- undescribed minute brown scavenger beetle (*Fuchsina* n.sp.); three other Channel Islands
- Catalina Island Broad-Nosed Weevil (*Trigonoscuta catalina*)
- Catalina Island Rain Scarab (*Phobetus ciliatus*)
- Catalina Island Gleaming Scarab (*Serica catalina*)
- Channel Island Checkered Beetle (*Cymatodera insularis*); two other Channel Islands
- Catalina Island Soft-winged Flower Beetle (*Dasytastes catalinae*)
- Island Soft-winged Flower Beetle (*Dasytastes insularis*)
- Soft-Winged Flower Beetle (*Microasydates punctipennis*), recently described
- Catalina Island Junebug (*Coenonycha clypeata*)
- Yellow Channel Islands Junebug (*Coenonycha fulva*); one other Channel Island
- Catalina Island Rove Beetle (*Actium vestigialis*)
- Channel Islands Textured Darkling Beetle (*Apsena grossa*); five other Channel Islands
- Channel Islands Cluster Beetle (*Cibdelis bachei*); four other Channel Islands
- Channel Islands Dune Beetle (*Coelus pacificus*); seven other Channel Islands
- Channel Islands Oval Darkling Beetle (*Coniotis lata*); six other Channel Islands
- Channel Islands Stink Beetle (*Eleodes inculta*); seven other Channel Islands
- Channel Islands Narrow Darkling Beetle (*Metoponium insulare*); taxon's validity "dubious" (Gimmel et al. 2023)
- Blotched Leaf Miner (*Amauromyza insularis*)
- Catalina Island Cicada (*Tibicinoides* [*Okanagana*] *catalina*)
- Catalina Island Plant Bug (*Insulaphylus meridianus*)
- Catalina Island Longhorn Bee (*Anthophorula cockerelli*)
- Avalon Cuckoo Bee (*Nomada avalonica*); following major revisions of the genus *Nomada* (Alexander 1994, Odanaka et al. 2022), taxon's validity is uncertain
- Channel Islands Funnel Ant (*Aphaenogaster patruelis*); three other Channel Islands

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- Channel Islands Carpenter Ant (*Camponotus bakeri*); three other Channel Islands
- Avalon Sweat Bee (*Lasioglossum avalonense*); three other Channel Islands
- Large Spotted Sweat Bee (*Lasioglossum megastictum*); two other Channel Islands; mainland report (https://www.inaturalist.org/observations/163446889)
- Scavenger Moth (*Holcocera phenacocci*)
- Cambrid Snout Moth (*Evergestis angustalis catalinae*)
- Island Painted Tiger Moth (*Arachnis picta insularis*); three other Channel Islands; mainland report (https://www.inaturalist.org/observations/101729572)
- Meadows' Painted Tiger Moth (*Arachnis picta meadowsi*); mainland reports (https://www.inaturalist.org/taxa/478396-Arachnis-picta-meadowsi)
- Indistinct Tiger Moth (*Lophocampa indistincta*); three other Channel Islands
- undescribed twirler moth (*Chionodes* sp.); three other Channel Islands
- Catalina Island Geometer Moth (*Pero catalina*)
- San Clemente Island Geometer Moth (*Pterotaea crinigera*)
- Meadows' Owlet Moth (*Feralia meadowsi*); one other Channel Island
- Channel Islands Owlet Moth (*Zosteropoda clementei*); three other Channel Islands; mainland reports (https://www.inaturalist.org/observations?taxon_id=472726)
- Santa Cruz Island Snout Moth (*Acrobasis comptella*); one other Channel Island
- Channel Islands Snout Moth (*Sosipatra proximanthophila*); one other Channel Island
- Channel Islands Driedfruit Moth (*Vitula insula*); one other Channel Island; mainland reports (https://www.inaturalist.org/observations?taxon_id=364110)
- Avalon Tortrix Moth (*Pelochrista* [*Eucosma*] *avalona*); one other Channel Island; mainland reports (https://www.inaturalist.org/taxa/511578-Pelochrista-avalona)
- Avalon Scrub-Hairstreak (*Strymon avalona*)
- Catalina Island Orangetip (*Anthocharis cethura catalina*)
- Catalina Island Monkey Grasshopper (*Morsea catalinae*)
- Silk-spinning Cricket (*Cnemotettix miniatus*); preliminary analysis indicates the Catalina Island population "is genetically very distinct" from specimens collected at the Tijuana River Estuary (Backlin et al. 2005)
- undescribed Jerusalem cricket (*Stenopelmatus* sp.)
- Santa Catalina Island Shieldback (*Neduba propsti*)

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- Catalina Walkingstick (*Pseudosermyle catalinae*)

Sources: Gimmel et al. (2023) for beetles; Backlin et al. (2005) for Silk-spinning Cricket (*Cnemotettix miniatus*); Knapp et al. (2021) for all other groups and for most of the common names.

Knapp et al. (2021) reported *Melissodes scotti* as a long-horned bee endemic to Catalina Island (presumably following Menke and Miller 1985) but this species was described from a collection at San Clemente Island (Cockerell 1939) and the species does not appear to have been recorded on Catalina Island.

2.4.3 Endemic Reptiles

The Catalina Two-striped Garter Snake (*Thamnophis hammondii* subsp.), a special-status species, is endemic to Catalina Island (Backlin et al. 2005).

2.4.4 Endemic Birds

The following avian taxa are endemic to Catalina Island, and in some cases additional Channel Islands, as noted.

- Catalina California Quail (*Callipepla californica catalinensis*) *; introduced to two other Channel Islands
- Allen's Hummingbird (*Selasphorus sasin sedentarius*); other Channel Islands and mainland
- Catalina Hutton's Vireo (*Vireo huttoni unitti*) *
- Island Loggerhead Shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus anthonyi*) *; two other Channel Islands
- Island Horned Lark (*Eremophila alpestris insularis*); other Channel Islands
- Channel Island Western Flycatcher (*Empidonax difficilis insulicola*); three other Channel Islands
- Catalina Bewick's Wren (*Thryomanes bewickii catalinae*)
- House Finch (*Haemorhous mexicanus frontalis*); three other Channel Islands
- San Clemente Spotted Towhee (*Pipilo maculatus clementae*) *; two other Channel Islands, historically, but extirpated from San Clemente Island
- Dusky Orange-crowned Warbler (*Oreothlypis celata sordida*); other Channel Islands and mainland

Sources: Dvorak (2015), Catalina Island Conservancy (2022).

2.4.5 Endemic Mammals

The following mammalian taxa are endemic to Catalina Island.

- Catalina Ground Squirrel (*Otospermophilus beecheyi nesioticus*)

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- Santa Catalina Island Harvest Mouse (*Reithrodontomys megalotis catalinae*)
- Santa Catalina Island Deer Mouse (*Peromyscus maniculatus catalinae*)
- Santa Catalina Island Shrew (*Sorex ornatus willetti*) *
- Santa Catalina Island Fox (*Urocyon littoralis catalinae*) *

Sources: Backlin et al. (2005), Catalina Island Conservancy (2022).

2.5 SPECIAL-STATUS PLANT AND WILDLIFE TAXA

Federal and state regulations exist to protect and conserve plant and wildlife species identified by federal or state governments as endangered, threatened, rare, protected, sensitive, vulnerable, Species of Special Concern, or candidates for federal or state listing. On Catalina Island, these "special-status species" include a mix of island endemics (i.e., taxa denoted with an asterisk in the preceding Section 2.4) and species whose ranges include the mainland.

The following Table 2-6 identifies the special-status plants and wildlife known or believed to occur on Catalina Island on a regular basis, and generally in a role that is afforded protection, per the California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB 2024a, 2024b). Biologist Robert Hamilton selected the taxa for inclusion in Table 2-6 based upon review of the following materials:

- Backlin et al. (2005), Knapp et al. (2021), Gimmel et al. (2023), Catalina Island Conservancy (2022), and other relevant reports.
- Online databases and resources, including eBird (http://www.ebird.org), iNaturalist (http://www.inaturalist.org), Calflora (http://www.calflora.org), and NatureServe Explorer (http:// https://explorer.natureserve.org/).
- A Biogeographic Information and Observation System (BIOS) report of all special-status species reported from the U.S. Geologic Survey 7.5' topographic quadrangles Santa Catalina Island North, Santa Catalina Island South, Santa Catalina Island East, Santa Catalina Island West (CNDDB 2024c).

Excluded from Table 2-6 are marine mammals, species that occur only on offshore rocks (e.g., Ashy Storm-Petrel), and bird species that occur only in an unprotected role. For example, the CNDDB identifies the Olive-sided Flycatcher as a Species of Special Concern, but only on its nesting grounds; because this bird occurs on Catalina Island only as a non-breeding migrant, it is not included in Table 2-6.

One introduced plant species, Torrey Pine, is included in Table 2-6, but only to clarify that this species has no conservation status on Catalina Island, which lies outside of its natural range. For the remaining species that are included, the table provides their regulatory status, briefly describes their habitat requirements and general status on Catalina Island and provides notes on protecting the species in the context of this HRMP.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 2-6 uses the following abbreviations:

C **Candidate** for Listing (State or Federal governments).

E **Endangered** (listed by State or Federal governments). "Take" of the species or disturbance of occupied habitat are prohibited unless specifically authorized.

FP **Fully Protected** by the State of California. These species may not be taken or possessed at any time, although take may be authorized for necessary scientific research.

T **Threatened** (listed by State or Federal governments). "Take" of the species or disturbance of occupied habitat are prohibited unless specifically authorized.

PT **Proposed Threatened**. Species recently proposed to be listed as threatened by State or Federal governments.

SSC **Species of Special Concern**. The California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife has designated certain vertebrate species as Species of Special Concern because declining population levels, limited ranges, and/or continuing threats have made them vulnerable to extinction. The goal of designating species as Species of Special Concern is to halt or reverse their decline by calling attention to their plight and addressing the issues of concern early enough to secure their long-term viability.

California Native Plant Society (CNPS). Table B includes plant taxa assigned the following ranks by CNPS:

- **1A**, referring to taxa CNPS presumes to be extirpated in California and either rare or extinct elsewhere.
- **1B.1**, referring to taxa CNPS considers to be rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere; seriously threatened in California (over 80% of occurrences threatened / high degree and immediacy of threat).
- **1B.2**, referring to taxa CNPS considers to be rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere; moderately threatened in California (20-80% of occurrences threatened / moderate degree and immediacy of threat).
- **1B.3**, referring to taxa CNPS considers to be rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere; not very threatened in California (less than 20% of occurrences threatened / moderate degree and immediacy of threat).
- **2B.2**, referring to taxa CNPS considers to be rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere; moderately threatened in California (20-80% occurrences threatened / moderate degree and immediacy of threat).
- **3**, referring to taxa for which CNPS lacks the necessary information to assign them to one of the other ranks or to reject them; taxonomy is typically uncertain.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- **4.1**, referring to taxa of limited distribution or infrequent throughout a broader area in California, whose status should be monitored regularly; moderately threatened in California (>80% occurrences threatened / moderate degree and immediacy of threat).

- **4.2**, referring to taxa of limited distribution or infrequent throughout a broader area in California, whose status should be monitored regularly; moderately threatened in California (20-80% occurrences threatened / moderate degree and immediacy of threat).

- **4.3**, referring to taxa of limited distribution or infrequent throughout a broader area in California, whose status should be monitored regularly; not very threatened in California (less than 20% of occurrences threatened / low degree and immediacy of threat or no current threats known).

NatureServe Element Rankings. In some cases, species are recognized as ecologically sensitive by the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), which uses a ranking methodology maintained by NatureServe. Species are given a State rank (S-rank) that applies to the taxon's conservation status in California. "Q" denotes questionable taxonomy. Taxa with rankings of S1, S2, or S3 may be considered "sensitive" at the state level, and potentially worthy of special consideration in resource planning. Taxa with higher rankings (S4, S5) are considered "apparently secure" or "secure" at the state level and therefore are not treated as "sensitive" for purposes of this report. NatureServe Element Rankings are identified in Table 2-6 only for taxa that have no other federal or state special status. NatureServe Ranks:

- **S1, Critically Imperiled,** referring to taxa critically imperiled in the state because of extreme rarity (often 5 or fewer populations) or because of factor(s) such as very steep declines making it especially vulnerable to extirpation from the state.

- **S2, Imperiled,** referring to taxa imperiled in the state because of rarity due to very restricted range, very few populations (often 20 or fewer), steep declines, or other factors making it very vulnerable to extirpation from the state.

- **S3, Vulnerable,** referring to taxa vulnerable in the state due to a restricted range, relatively few populations (often 80 or fewer), recent and widespread declines, or other factors making it vulnerable to extirpation from the state.

- **SX,** referring to taxa presumed to be extirpated from the state.

Notes on Protection. The last column of Table 2-6 briefly discusses any resource-protection issues relevant to the planning and implementation of habitat restoration projects under this plan.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 2-6 Special-Status Species on Catalina Island.

Latin name Common name	Fed.	State	CNPS	Habitat/Status on Catalina Island	Notes on Protection
Plants — Bryophytes					
Tortula californica California Screw Moss	—	S2	1B.2	Sandy soils in shady locations. A few records from Catalina Island.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its habitat requirements.
Plants — Lichens					
Graphis saxorum Baja Rock Lichen	—	S1	3	Volcanic rocks that are moderately shaded, usually north-facing, vertical or almost vertical; underhangs, recesses, small cavities, and roofs of caves where the substrate receives little or no direct rainfall. Generalized records from northwestern part of Catalina Island.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its habitat requirements.
Plants — Vascular					
Abronia maritima Red Sand-Verbena	—	S3	4.2	Coastal dunes and sandy openings in scrub.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Acmispon dendroideus* var. *dendroideus Island Broom	—	S3	4.2	Coastal bluffs and cliffs, coastal sage scrub, grassland. Numerous Catalina Island records.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance.
Acmispon dendroideus* var. *traskiae San Clemente Island Broom	—	E	1B.3	Coastal bluffs and cliffs, coastal sage scrub, grassland. Record from Cape Canyon in 1973.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance.
Aphanisma blitoides Aphanisma	—	S2	1B.2	Coastal bluff scrub and beach dunes. Several records from Catalina Island, mainly on the west side.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Aphyllon parishii* subsp. *brachylobum Short-lobed Broomrape	—	S3	4.2	Coastal bluff scrub and beach dunes. A few records from the west side of Catalina Island.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Latin name Common name	Fed.	State	CNPS	Habitat/Status on Catalina Island	Notes on Protection
Arctostaphylos catalinae Santa Catalina Island Manzanita	—	S2	1B.2	Chaparral with volcanic soils. Numerous Catalina Island records.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Arctostaphylos crustacea* subsp. *subcordata Santa Cruz Island Manzanita	—	S3	4.2	Chaparral with rocky soils. Historical records from northern half of Catalina Island.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Atriplex coulteri Coulter's Saltbush	—	S1S2	1B.2	Inconspicuous. Clay or alkaline soils in coastal bluff scrub, coastal dune, coastal scrub, valley, and foothill grassland. Numerous Catalina Island records.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Atriplex pacifica South Coast Saltscale	—	S2	1B.2	Inconspicuous. Clay soils in coastal bluff scrub, coastal dunes and scrub, playas. Numerous Catalina Island records.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Atriplex serenana* var. *davidsonii Davidson's Saltscale	—	S1	1B.2	Inconspicuous. Alkaline soils on cliff faces and bluffs. Small number of records from Catalina Island.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Bergerocactus emoryi Golden-spined Cereus	—	S2	2B.2	Chaparral and coastal scrub. Scattered records from Catalina Island.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance.
Calochortus catalinae Catalina Mariposa Lily	—	S3S4	4.2	Grassland, coastal scrub, chaparral, cismontane woodland. Numerous records from Catalina Island.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, especially when it Is not in flower, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Calystegia macrostegia* subsp. *amplissima Island Morning-glory	—	S4	4.3	Rocky slopes and canyon walls, coastal sage scrub and chaparral. 2023 record from slopes above White Cove (iNaturalist).	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Ceanothus megacarpus* var. *insularis Island Ceanothus	—	S4	4.3	Chaparral with sandy soils. Numerous Catalina Island records.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Latin name Common name	Fed.	State	CNPS	Habitat/Status on Catalina Island	Notes on Protection
Centromadia parryi* subsp. *australis Southern Tarplant	—	S2	1B.1	Disturbed ground, usually on edges marsh, of vernally moist grassland, or coastal scrub. Generalized record(s) from eastern part of island.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Cercocarpus betuloides* var. *blancheae Island Mountain-mahogany	—	S4	4.3	Chaparral. Numerous Catalina Island records.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Cercocarpus traskiae Catalina Island Mountain-mahogany	E	E	1B.1	Chaparral, coastal scrub in sausserite gabbro soil. Very small population in Wild Boar Gully.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its localized distribution and endangered status.
Cirsium occidentale* var. *compactum Compact Cobwebby Thistle	—	S2	1B.2	Chaparral, coastal dunes, coastal prairie, coastal scrub, bluffs. Historical record along road at upper end of Avalon Canyon. Other varieties also recorded on the island.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, and the other varieties, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Cistanthe maritima Seaside Cistanthe	—	S3	4.2	Grassland and coastal scrub in sandy soils. Scattered records on Catalina Island.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Constancea nevinii Nevin's Woolly Sunflower	—	S3	1B.3	Coastal bluff scrub and coastal scrub on Catalina and other Channel Islands.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance.
Convolvulus simulans Small-flowered Morning-glory	—	S4	4.2	Grassland, seeps, coastal scrub, openings in chaparral, in clay or serpentine soils. Scattered records on Catalina Island.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Crocanthemum greenei Island Rush-rose	T	S3	1B.2	Rocky openings in chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub. Scattered records on Catalina Island.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Crossosoma californicum Catalina Crossosoma	—	S3	1B.2	Chaparral and coastal scrub in rocky soils. Numerous Catalina Island records.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Cryptantha wigginsii Wiggins' Cryptantha	—	S1	1B.2	Coastal scrub, often in clay soils. Scattered records on Catalina Island.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Latin name Common name	Fed.	State	CNPS	Habitat/Status on Catalina Island	Notes on Protection
Deinandra clementina Island Tarplant	—	S4	4.3	Dry slopes, valleys, and bluffs in grass and scrub communities, possibly rocky or with heavy soils. Numerous Catalina Island records.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Dendromecon harfordii* var. *rhamnoides South Island Bush-poppy	—	S1	3.1	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, and coastal scrub. Numerous Catalina Island records of D. harfordii but not of this variety, which is questionably distinct.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Dichondra occidentalis Western Dichondra	—	S3S4	4.2	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub, grassland. Numerous recent Catalina Island records (iNaturalist).	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Diplacus traskiae Santa Catalina Island Monkeyflower	—	SX	1A	Coastal scrub. Single collection in 1901.	**Unlikely to be affected** by restoration activities because presumed extinct.
Dissanthelium californicum California Dissanthelium	—	S1	1B.2	Coastal scrub. Scattered records on Catalina Island.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Dithyrea maritima Beach Spectaclepod	—	T	1B.1	Coastal dunes and strand. No recent records from Catalina Island.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance, habitat requirements, and lack of recent records.
Dudleya virens* subsp. *hassei Catalina Island Dudleya	—	S2	1B.2	Rock outcrops and cliffs. Endemic to Catalina Island.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Dudleya virens* subsp. *insularis Island Green Dudleya	—	S3	1B.2	Rock outcrops and cliffs. Endemic to Catalina Island.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Dudleya virens* subsp. *virens Bright Green Dudleya	—	S2	1B.2	Rock outcrops and cliffs. Endemic to Catalina Island.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Eriogonum giganteum* var. *giganteum Santa Catalina Island Buckwheat	—	S2	4.3	Chaparral and coastal scrub with rocky soils. Numerous Catalina Island records.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Latin name Common name	Fed.	State	CNPS	Habitat/Status on Catalina Island	Notes on Protection
Eriogonum grande* var. *grande Island Buckwheat	—	S4	4.2	Coastal scrub and grassland. Numerous Catalina Island records.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Eschscholzia ramosa Island Poppy	—	S4	4.3	Coastal scrub and chaparral. Numerous Catalina Island records.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Euphorbia misera Cliff Spurge	—	S2	2B.2	Coastal scrub and chaparral. Scattered records on Catalina Island.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Galium catalinense subsp. catalinense Santa Catalina Island Bedstraw	—	S2	1B.3	Coastal scrub and chaparral. Numerous Catalina Island records.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Galium nuttallii* subsp. *insulare Nuttall's Island Bedstraw	—	S4	4.3	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub. Numerous Catalina Island records.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Gambelia speciosa Showy Island Snapdragon	—	S3	1B.2	Coastal scrub. Numerous Catalina Island records.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Gilia nevinii Nevin's Gilia	—	S4	4.3	Coastal scrub, grassland. Scattered records on Catalina Island.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Harpagonella palmeri Palmer's Grapplinghook	—	S3	4.2	Grassland, coastal scrub, chaparral with clay soils. Numerous Catalina Island records.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Hordeum intercedens Vernal Barley	—	S3S4	3.2	Grassland, vernal pools, coastal dunes, coastal scrub. Numerous Catalina Island records.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Isocoma menziesii* var. *decumbens Decumbent Goldenbush	—	S2	1B.2	Chaparral, coastal scrub, in sandy, often disturbed, areas. Few Catalina Island records.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Latin name Common name	Fed.	State	CNPS	Habitat/Status on Catalina Island	Notes on Protection
Jepsonia malvifolia Island Jepsonia	—	S4	4.2	Chaparral, coastal scrub. Numerous Catalina Island records.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Juncus acutus* subsp. *leopoldii Southwestern Spiny Rush	—	S4	4.2	Alkaline seeps, coastal salt marsh, mesic coastal dunes, coastal scrub. Numerous Catalina Island records.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Lavatera assurgentiflora* subsp. *assurgentiflora Island Mallow	—	S1	1B.2	Coastal scrub in rocky or sandy soil. Historical records from Catalina Island.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Lepechinia fragrans Fragrant Pitcher Sage	—	S3	4.2	Chaparral. Numerous Catalina Island records.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Lonicera subspicata* var. *subspicata Santa Barbara Honeysuckle	—	S3	4.2	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub. Two records south of White's Landing.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Lycium brevipes var. hassei Santa Catalina Island Desert-thorn	—	S1	3.1	Coastal scrub. Four historical records. Taxon of questionable validity.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance, habitat requirements, and lack of recent records.
Lycium californicum California Boxthorn	—	S4	4.2	Coastal scrub. Numerous Catalina Island records.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus Santa Catalina Island Ironwood	—	S2	1B.2	Cismontane woodland, chaparral. Numerous Catalina Island records.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Malacothamnus fasciculatus* var. *catalinensis Santa Catalina Island Bush-mallow	—	S2	4.2	Chaparral, coastal scrub. Numerous Catalina Island records.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Microseris douglasii* subsp. *platycarpha Small-flowered Microseris	—	S4	4.2	Grassland, vernal pools, coastal scrub, cismontane woodland with clay soils. Scattered records on Catalina Island.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Latin name Common name	Fed.	State	CNPS	Habitat/Status on Catalina Island	Notes on Protection
Nemacaulis denudata* var. *denudata Coast Wooly-heads	—	S2	1B.2	Coastal dunes. Historically recorded on Catalina Island.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its habitat requirements and lack of recent records.
Ophioglossum californicum California Adder's-tongue	—	S4	4.2	Grassland, vernal pools, chaparral. A few recent records from Catalina Island.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Pentachaeta lyonii Lyon's Pentachaeta	E	E	1B.1	Chaparral, coastal scrub in rocky or clay soil. Records from near the Two Harbors isthmus.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Phacelia lyonii Lyon's Phacelia	—	S2	1B.2	Chaparral, coastal scrub, dunes. Numerous Catalina Island records.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Pinus torreyana* subsp. *torreyana Torrey Pine	—	S1	1B.2	Introduced species. Planted grove of mature trees at Black Jack Campground. 2018 record of a naturalized sapling south of Avalon.	**Species has no conservation status where planted outside of its natural range.**
Piperia cooperi Chaparral Rein Orchid	—	S3S4	4.2	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, grassland. Scattered records from Catalina Island.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Quercus pacifica Island Scrub Oak	—	S4	4.2	Chaparral, cismontane woodland. Numerous Catalina Island records.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Quercus tomentella Island Oak	—	S3S4	4.2	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, riparian woodland. Numerous Catalina Island records.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Rhamnus pirifolia Island Redberry	—	S4	4.2	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub. Numerous Catalina Island records.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Ribes viburnifolium Santa Catalina Island Currant	—	S2	1B.2	Chaparral, cismontane woodland. Numerous Catalina Island records.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Latin name Common name	Fed.	State	CNPS	Habitat/Status on Catalina Island	Notes on Protection
Scrophularia villosa Santa Catalina Figwort	—	S3	1B.2	Chaparral, coastal scrub. Numerous Catalina Island records.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Senecio aphanactis Chaparral Ragwort	—	S2	2B.2	Dry, open ground, especially alkaline flats in chaparral, cismontane woodland, and coastal scrub. One historical record from Avalon.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Sibara filifolia Santa Cruz Island Winged-rockcress	E	S2	1B.1	Currently known only from south-facing, sunny, volcanic screes but historical populations were apparently found in shady places. Rediscovered on Catalina Island in recent years.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Solanum wallacei Wallace's Nightshade	—	S2	1B.1	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, canyons, rocky hillsides.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Suaeda taxifolia Woolly Seablight	—	S4	4.2	Saline areas near the coast; salt marshes, beaches, dunes, scrub.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its distinctive appearance and habitat requirements.
Trifolium palmeri Southern Island Clover	—	S4	4.2	Various open habitats, including grasslands, grass/scrub, and disturbed areas.	**Restoration personnel should be trained to recognize this native species, to prevent inadvertent removal.**
Invertebrates					
Cicindela hirticollis gravida Sandy Beach Tiger Beetle	—	S2	—	Moist sand on beaches or in swales behind dunes.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its habitat requirements.
Coelus globosus Globose Dune Beetle	—	S1S2	—	Foredunes, sand hummocks, sometimes backdunes.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its habitat requirements.
Bombas crotchii Crotch's Bumblebee	—	S2/CE	—	Coastal scrub, chaparral, grassland. Nest typically underground. Three individuals reported in Avalon 8-26-23 (iNaturalist).	**Surveys should be undertaken to determine whether species is resident on the island or occurs only as a waif. If resident, surveys per CDFW-approved methods may be required prior to restoration involving ground disturbance.**

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Latin name Common name	Fed.	State	CNPS	Habitat/Status on Catalina Island	Notes on Protection
Haplotrema catalinense Santa Catalina Lancetooth Snail	—	S1	—	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, riparian woodland, coastal scrub; typically, under leaf litter. Few recent records from Catalina Island (where endemic).	**To minimize impacts to native snails, restoration personnel should check mesic areas (e.g., under rocks, wood, other debris, or deep leaf litter) prior to disturbing such areas.**
Radiocentrum avalonense Catalina Mountainsnail	—	S1	—	Coastal scrub on south-facing slopes in the southeastern part of Catalina Island; may be associated with roots of native shrubs. Few recent records from Catalina Island (where endemic).	**To minimize impacts to native snails, restoration personnel should check mesic areas (e.g., under rocks, wood, other debris, or deep leaf litter) prior to disturbing such areas.**
Pristiloma shepardae Shepard's Snail	—	S1	—	Habitat requirements not well known. Pristiloma species generally occur on moist surfaces of plants, wood, rocks. Few recent records from Catalina Island.	**To minimize impacts to native snails, restoration personnel should check mesic areas (e.g., under rocks, wood, other debris, or deep leaf litter) prior to disturbing such areas.**
Sterkia* [*Vertigo*] *clementina Insular Birddrop Snail	—	S1S2	—	Habitat requirements not well known. Few records from Catalina Island.	**To minimize impacts to native snails, restoration personnel should check mesic areas (e.g., under rocks, wood, other debris, or deep leaf litter) prior to disturbing such areas.**
Micrarionta facta Santa Barbara Islandsnail	—	S1S2	—	Habitat requirements not well known. Few records from Catalina Island.	**To minimize impacts to native snails, restoration personnel should check mesic areas (e.g., under rocks, wood, other debris, or deep leaf litter) prior to disturbing such areas.**
Reptiles					
Diadophis punctatus modestus San Bernardino Ringneck Snake	—	S2	—	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, riparian woodland, coastal scrub, grassland; moist microclimates. Numerous records from Catalina Island.	**To minimize chances of inadvertent mortality, restoration personnel should check for snakes in mesic areas (e.g., under rocks, wood, other debris, or deep leaf litter) prior to disturbing such areas.**

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Latin name Common name	Fed.	State	CNPS	Habitat/Status on Catalina Island	Notes on Protection
Thamnophis hammondii [Pop. 1] Santa Catalina Gartersnake	—	S1	—	Semiaquatic species; known only from a stretch of Cottonwood Canyon with permanent flow.	**To minimize chances of inadvertent mortality, restoration personnel should check for snakes in mesic areas (e.g., under rocks, wood, other debris, or deep leaf litter) prior to disturbing such areas.**
Birds					
Callipepla californica catalinensis Catalina California Quail	—	SSC	—	Cismontane woodland, chaparral, coastal scrub, grassland. Common and widely distributed on Catalina Island.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact; plan includes protections for nesting birds.
Haliaeetus leucocephalus Bald Eagle	—	E	—	Several pairs resident on Catalina Island, nesting on cliffs and rock shelves, and in trees.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact; plan includes protections for nesting birds. Restoration sites should be selected to avoid potential nest disturbance.
Falco peregrinus anatum American Peregrine Falcon	—	S3S4	—	Several pairs resident on Catalina Island, nesting on cliffs and rock shelves, and in trees. Two active nests as of 2022 (Sharpe 2022).	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact; plan includes protections for nesting birds. Restoration sites should be selected to avoid potential nest disturbance.
Synthliboramphus scrippsi Scripps's Murrelet	—	T	—	Nests in burrows and under dense bushes on steep slopes around the perimeter of Catalina Island.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact; plan includes protections for nesting birds.
Athene cunicularia Burrowing Owl	—	SSC	—	Grassland, coastal scrub. Rare in fall/visitor on Catalina Island.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact; plan includes protections for nesting birds in unlikely event a nesting pair is found.
Lanius ludovicianus anthonyi Island Loggerhead Shrike	—	SSC	—	Grassland, coastal scrub. Scarce but widely distributed on Catalina Island.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact; plan includes protections for nesting birds.
Vireo huttoni unitti Catalina Hutton's Vireo	—	SSC	—	Cismontane woodland, chaparral. Uncommon but widely distributed on Catalina Island.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact; plan includes protections for nesting birds.
Ammodramus savannarum Grasshopper Sparrow	—	SSC	—	Grassland, grass/scrub. May records of 1–2 singing males in hills between Emerald Bay and Parsons Landing (eBird data).	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact; plan includes protections for nesting birds.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Latin name Common name	Fed.	State	CNPS	Habitat/Status on Catalina Island	Notes on Protection
Pipilo maculatus clementae San Clemente Spotted Towhee	—	SSC	—	Cismontane woodland, chaparral. Common and widely distributed on Catalina Island.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact; plan includes protections for nesting birds.
Pooecetes gramineus affinis Oregon Vesper Sparrow	—	SSC	—	Grassland, grass/scrub. Some of the small numbers of Vesper Sparrows in fall/winter could involve this subspecies (eBird data).	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact; species does not nest in the region.
Mammals					
Sorex ornatus willetti Catalina Island Shrew	—	SSC	—	Riparian woodland and adjacent habitats. Recorded sparingly on Catalina Island, where it is endemic.	**Restoration personnel working in and near riparian areas should take feasible precautions to avoid inadvertent mortality of shrews.**
Antrozous pallidus Pallid Bat	—	SSC	—	Cismontane woodland, chaparral, coastal scrub, grassland. Roosts under bark and in rock crevices. Historical collection at Avalon.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its habitat requirements and apparent rarity on the island.
Corynorhinus townsendii Townsend's Big-eared Bat	—	SSC	—	Various habitats near roosting locations in caves, tunnels, crevices in cliffs, in trees under bark and in hollows, and in buildings. Historical collections and scattered recent records from Catalina Island	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its habitat requirements.
Lasiurus frantzii Western Red Bat	—	SSC	—	Roosts in foliage of many types of tree; feeds over a wide variety of habitats, often close to water in coastal lowlands. Record(s) of one or more at Wrigley Memorial and Botanic Garden (Catalina Island Conservancy unpubl.).	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its habitat requirements and apparent rarity on the island.
Myotis evotis Long-eared Myotis	—	S3	—	On mainland, occurs mainly in wooded areas at higher elevations. One historical collection from a roof at White's Landing (von Bloeker 1967).	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact because of its habitat requirements and rarity on the island.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Latin name Common name	Fed.	State	CNPS	Habitat/Status on Catalina Island	Notes on Protection
Urocyon littoralis catalinae Catalina Island Fox	T	T	—	Many habitats. Due to successful recovery efforts in response to steep decline from a distemper outbreak, the species is becoming once again common and widespread on Catalina Island.	Restoration activities are unlikely to negatively impact; plan includes specific protections for Catalina Island Foxes.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3 HABITAT RESTORATION AND ENHANCEMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND PRIORITIES

Landscape-scale habitat restoration and enhancement planning that leverages nature-based solutions is crucial for cost-efficient and feasible conservation of biodiversity. With long-term horizons in mind, combining passive and active restoration approaches can ensure the preservation of sensitive island flora and fauna while improving the overall health of the ecosystem.

Passive restoration focuses on:

1. Removal of invasive species, like mule deer, to promote passive recovery of biodiversity.
2. Utilizing natural processes, like succession, to enhance island habitats over time.
3. Weed management (CHRIP, Appendix A) to manage highly invasive plants.

Active restoration, on the other hand, involves more direct intervention, such as:

1. Restoration efforts targeting Island Scrub Oak Chaparral habitats.
2. Top-of-watershed habitat restoration projects to manage erosion and restore degraded areas affected by past land use and nonnative ungulates.

This plan seeks to identify and prioritize restoration opportunities that maximize the benefits to the island's ecosystem health and native habitats. By developing site-specific project plans under an adaptive management framework, this approach allows for flexibility in responding to changing conditions and new knowledge gained from monitoring efforts.

To ensure the protection of sensitive, protected, and locally rare species, all projects must adhere to the provided guidelines, methods, and sensitive species protection measures. It is important to note that nearly the entire island can be considered ecologically or culturally sensitive, including developed areas, as improper management of these areas may negatively impact adjacent areas. For instance, feeding island foxes in urban areas can lead to the spread of disease and human-wildlife conflicts. Additionally, the potential presence of indigenous and archaeological resources in the soil profile beneath developed properties must be considered. As a result, even developed sites can hold significant cultural and ecological value, further emphasizing the need for thoughtful and comprehensive restoration efforts.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.1 WATERSHED MANAGEMENT UNIT PRIORITIZATION

To address the challenges posed by invasive plant species on the island, Catalina Island Conservancy established Watershed Management Units (WMUs) as part of the Catalina Island Invasive Plant Control Program (CIPP; see Appendix A). The Conservancy strategically selected these units to prioritize habitat restoration efforts that would protect high-value biological and cultural resources (Figure 3-1 and Table 3-1). Additional WMUs were chosen due to their function as transportation corridors, with the goal of reducing the spread of invasive plants through habitat restoration in these areas (Knapp 2007b).

Table 3-1 Priority Watershed Management Units.

WMU Code(s)	WMU Name	Acres	Hectares
4, 5	Parson's Landing	631.3	255.5
6	Emerald	806.6	326.4
9	Cherry Valley	309.5	125.3
20	Empire Landing	225.2	91.1
28	Goat Harbor	197.2	79.8
32a	White's Landing	738.7	298.9
50b	Haypress	1,102.4	446.1
51	Coffeepot Canyon	935.8	378.7
61b, 61e, 61f, 61m	Middle Canyon	2,012.8	814.6
63a, 63c, 63d	Cottonwood Canyon	2,743.54	1110.3
64	Shark Harbor	499.9	202.3
65	Big Springs Canyon	417.8	169.1
66a	Little Harbor	135.1	54.7
66b	Little Springs	1,102.8	446.3

The WMUs serve as critical management areas for the Conservancy to focus its efforts on preserving the island's unique ecosystems and cultural heritage. By prioritizing these units, the Conservancy aims to enhance the effectiveness of its conservation strategies, ensuring that the most vulnerable and valuable resources receive the attention and protection they require. Moreover, the restoration of habitats within these units will not only help to mitigate the impacts of invasive species but also contribute to the long-term resilience of the island's native plant communities.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 3-1 Priority Watershed Management Units.

Da t a provided b y t h e Conserva ncy. Th e Wa t ersh ed Ma na gement Unit s were developed a s pa rt of t h e exist ing inva sive pla nt cont rol progra m c a re b a sed on wa t ersh eds t h a t defined b y t h e isla nd t opogra ph y. Th e la rger wa t ersh eds a re divided int o sma ller ma na gement unit s.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.2 HABITAT RESTORATION TARGETS

Utilizing the habitat suitability models developed in Appendix D, binary (i.e., suitable or not suitable) composite maps were generated for the three most common vegetation types based on the dominant or characteristic species selected to represent potential vegetation alliances or associations:

- Island Chaparral (Figure 3-2)
- Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS) (Figure 3-2)
- Coastal Bluff Scrub (Figure 3-6). The latter encompasses the Maritime Succulent Scrub vegetation alliance and California Boxthorn Scrub.

The combination of the individual vegetation alliance and association maps is presented in Figure 3-4, representing a potential natural vegetation map for the island, focused on the most common vegetation types. These maps serve as valuable tools to identify suitable locations and targets for habitat restoration efforts. By providing a comprehensive understanding of the distribution and suitability of these key vegetation types, these maps will aid in the development of site-specific habitat restoration targets that align with the unique characteristics and needs of each area.

The habitat suitability models and resulting maps offer essential guidance for the Conservancy to prioritize and tailor restoration projects effectively. This data-driven approach ensures that efforts are focused on the most suitable areas for each vegetation type, thereby enhancing the overall success of habitat restoration initiatives and promoting the long-term health and resilience of Catalina Island's ecosystems.

3.3 HABITAT RESTORATION PLANT PALETTES

The plant palettes presented in Table 3-2 and Table 3-3 focus on the primary restoration approaches and opportunities in this plan. The plant palettes developed for this project focus on species that are likely to be available from wild seed collection, seed bulking, or nursery propagation. While these palettes do not encompass all plant species found in each vegetation community, they emphasize those that contribute to the diversity of plant functional types. This targeted approach ensures that the seed mixes used in habitat restoration efforts support a range of ecological functions and promote the overall resilience of the restored communities.

In addition to these selected plant palettes, the Conservancy may develop different or more targeted plant palettes based on the (1) goals and objectives of a site-specific or habitat-focused restoration project, (2) known native flora of the island (Appendix B), (3) the identification of suitable revegetation locations based on reference site surveys in the field and review of existing resources on environmental preferences of the plant species, including the potential vegetation models presented in Appendix D, (4) the availability of plant material for seeding or container-based planting of nursery transplants, and (5) the guidelines presented in Section 5 of Appendix F for seed mix development, plant propagation, and planting.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 3-2 Island Chaparral and CSS Suitability Maps.

See Appendix D for details on the development of the models. The geospatial data set can be used to help develop site-appropriate habitat restoration plans.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 3-3 Coastal Bluff Scrub Suitability Maps.

See Appendix D for details on the development of the models. The geospatial data set can be used to help develop site-appropriate habitat restoration plans.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 3-4 Potential Natural Vegetation Map for Island Chaparral, CSS, and Coastal Bluff Scrub.

See Appendix D for details on the development of the models. The geospatial data set can be used to help develop site-appropriate habitat res

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

ISLAND CHAPARRAL

The Island Chaparral plant palette (Table 3-2) emphasizes the establishment of shrub communities resembling coastal sage scrub (CSS) due to the challenges associated with propagating and transplanting many longer-lived chaparral plants. Selecting from this plant palette to develop site-specific seed mixes would be most appropriate for the active habitat restoration Approach 2, Island Scrub Oak Chaparral Restoration (see Section 4.1 for more discussion of the different approaches). Restoring chaparral habitats is an intensive process because many of these plants require specific germination cues (Allen et al. 2018). The primary objective is to enhance soil health and establish native vegetation from seed that facilitates the recruitment of longer-lived chaparral plants from surrounding seed sources in the watershed and through animal-mediated propagule (Brooks et al. 2019).

To achieve successful restoration, it is essential to address various barriers to the natural recruitment of longer-lived chaparral species in these habitat areas. These barriers include controlling invasive animals (e.g., removing mule deer and managing the bison herd) and mitigating the impact of highly invasive plants (e.g., Mediterranean broom and sweet fennel) (see Approach 1, Whole Island Passive Recovery, in Section 4.1 for more detail). By implementing these measures, the restoration efforts will promote the recovery of native chaparral ecosystems and support overall ecosystem health and resilience.

LOW-DIVERSITY NATIVE COVER CROP

The installation of a low-diversity native seed mix is a key part of active habitat restoration method Approach 3, Top-of-Watershed Habitat Restoration (Table 3-3). The goal is to revegetate highly degraded areas, which are infested with invasive grasses and forbs, with a native cover crop to reduce topsoil erosion and rebuild soil health with deeper rooted native perennials and increased native vegetation cover. The species identified meet multiple criteria, including that they are either feasible to bulk in the seed farm and/or can be reliably collected from existing vegetation on the island, higher establishment rates, and relatively short-lived. For example, coyote bush (*Baccharis pilularis*) is a relatively aggressive wind dispersed native plant that readily colonizes in coastal areas of southern California. Coyote bush can grow in disturbed, low nutrient soils to help build soil health. Coyote brush is relatively short lived and can be replaced by longer-lived CSS and chaparral species, such as observed on Santa Rosa Island (Clark et al. 1990) and the Santa Monica Mountains (Brennan et al. 2018).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 3-2 Island Chaparral Plant Palette.

Scientific Name	Common Name
Arctostaphylos catalinae	Catalina Manzanita
Artemisia californica	California Sagebrush
Baccharis pilularis ssp. *consanguinea*	Coyotebrush
Calochortus catalinae	Catalina Mariposa Lily
Ceanothus arboreus	Feltleaf Ceanothus
Ceanothus megacarpus var. *insularis*	Island Bigpod Ceanothus
Cercocarpus traskiae	Catalina Mountain Mahogany
Comarostaphylis diversifolia ssp. *planifolia*	Summer Holly
Constancea nevinii	Catalina Silverlace
Crocanthemum greenei	Island Rush-rose
Dendromecon harfordii	Island Bush Poppy
Dichelostemma capitatum	Blue Dick
Dienandra clementina	Island Tarweed
Diplacus puniceus	Southern Monkeyflower
Dissanthelium californicum	Catalina Grass
Elymus condensantus	Giant Wild Rye
Epilobium canum	California Fuchsia
Epipactis gigantea	Stream Orchid
Eriodictyon traskiae	Trask's Yerba Santa
Eriogonum giganteum var. *giganteum*	Santa Catalina Island Buckwheat
Galium catalinense	Catalina Bedstraw
Gambelia speciosa	Island Snapdragon
Heteromeles arbutifolia	Toyon
Keckeillia cordifolia	Heartleaf Penstemon
Lepechinia fragrans	Fragrant Pitcher Sage
Leptosyne gigantea	Giant Coreopsis
Lonicera subspicata var. *subspicata*	Southern Honeysuckle

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Lupinus spp. *(albifrons, bicolor etc.)*	Lupine
Lycium californicum	California Boxthorn
Lyonothamnus floribundus ssp. *floribundus*	Catalina Ironwood
Malacothamnus fasciculatus var. *catalinensis*	Catalina Island Bushmallow
Malosma laurina	Laurel Sumac
Melica imperfecta	Small-leaf Melic
Cleomella arborea	Bladderpod
Prunus ilicifolia ssp. *lyonii*	Island Cherry
Quercus pacifica	Island Scruboak
Quercus tomentella	Island Oak
Rhamnus pirifolia	Island Redberry
Rhus integrifolia	Lemonadeberry
Ribes viburnifolium	Catalina current
Salvia apiana	White Sage
Salvia mellifera	Black Sage
Scrophularia villosa	Catalina Figwort
Stipa pulchra	Purple Needlegrass
Solanum wallacei	Catalina Nightshade
Xylococcus bicolor	Mission Manzanita

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 3-3 Low Diversity Cover Crop Plant Palette.

Scientific Name	**Common Name**
Achillea millefolium	Common Yarrow
Acmispon argophyllus var. *argenteus*	Island Silver Lotus
Acmispon dendroideus var. *dendroideus*	Island Broom
Artemesia californica	California Sagebrush
Baccharis pilularis ssp. *consanguinea*	Coyotebrush
Deinandra fasciculata	Clustered Tarplant
Diplacus puniceus	Southern Monkeyflower
Encelia californica	California Sunflower
Eriogonum giganteum var. *giganteum*	Santa Catalina Island Buckwheat
Eriogonum grande var. *grande*	Island Buckwheat
Isocoma menziesii	Coast Goldenbush
Stipa spp. (*pulchra, lepida, cernua*)	Needlegrass

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.4 TOP-OF-WATERSHED HABITAT RESTORATION OPPORTUNITIES

Many areas of the island have areas of significant topsoil erosion (Section 2.1.4) that have contributed to the degradation of island habitat and ecosystem function (Knapp 2010a). The spatial distribution of areas on the island with high-levels of bare soil are modeled using the Dry Bare-Soil Index (DBSI) and can be used to focus top-of-watershed habitat restoration projects in areas with bare soil or minimal vegetation cover (Figure 2-36). It should be noted however, that the most extreme soil conditions, such as in the "Valley of the Moons", where excessive erosion may be difficult to reverse without intensive soil stabilization efforts, should be a low priority for restoration until such time in the future that less challenging habitat restoration opportunities are exhausted.

Areas identified on Figure 3-5 within 500 feet (150 meters) of primary or secondary roads were selected based on their proximity to these transportation corridors. An additional qualifying factor for selection was the presence of significant degradation, indicated by substantial nonnative herbaceous or shrub cover or bare ground, as determined from the 2000 Vegetation Map geodatabase (Figure 2-52).

It is important to note that these opportunities are based on the 2000 Vegetation Map, and land cover change analysis (Appendix C) has identified areas that experienced sustained tree cover loss (comparable to Island Chaparral), as of 2022, following the 2006 and 2007 wildfires. Consequently, additional top-of-watershed habitat restoration opportunities may exist along roadways within the burn scar areas. To assess these potential opportunities, field reconnaissance would be valuable in determining whether there has been an increase in longer-lived chaparral shrub resprouts or germination in the years following mule deer removal.

3.5 ISLAND SCRUB OAK CHAPARRAL RESTORATION OPPORTUNITIES

Island Scrub Oak Chaparral (ISOC) Restoration Opportunities were identified by evaluating degraded areas with a substantial presence of nonnative vegetation, typically nonnative annual grassland, or bare ground. These areas were further assessed based on their classification as ISOC on the 2000 Vegetation Map and their proximity (150 meters) to primary or secondary roadways (Figure 3-5).

Degraded areas whose edges are more than 150 meters from the roadway were categorized as "Potential Other Habitat Restoration Opportunities." While these areas may be less accessible and thus less desirable for restoration efforts, the presence of sensitive resources in such locations could provide additional motivation for their inclusion in a restoration project. By considering both accessibility and the potential ecological benefits, this approach ensures that restoration efforts are targeted to maximize the overall impact on the island's ecosystem health.

For prioritizing areas with a higher likelihood of new oak establishment or growth, the Conservancy can consult the Potential Vegetation Map for Island Scrub Oak (Figure 3-6 and Appendix D).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 3-5 Opportunities for Island Scrub Oak Chaparral and Top-of-Watershed Habitat Restoration.




Figure 3-6 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Scrub Oak (Quercus pacifica).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4 ADAPTIVE WEED MANAGEMENT AND HABITAT RESTORATION

Having identified habitat restoration and enhancement opportunities and established a prioritization scheme for selecting suitable restoration projects by Watershed Management Unit (Section 3), this section presents cost-effective approaches for landscape-scale island habitat restoration. Four habitat restoration approaches are discussed, with the primary method being the removal of the invasive mule deer population to facilitate the natural recovery and growth of native vegetation, including island endemics, that are not deer-resistant (Section 4.1.2). Additionally, three additional approaches for active habitat restoration projects are outlined, targeting areas where further intervention is necessary to restore essential ecosystem functions and wildlife habitats (Section 4.1.3). These comprehensive strategies aim to promote the successful restoration and preservation of the island's unique ecological characteristics while ensuring efficient use of resources.

A central component of the Habitat Restoration and Management Plan (HRMP) is the recognition and management of uncertainties inherent in natural systems. Several common uncertainties are often encountered when implementing habitat restoration projects in southern California and the Channel Islands:

- Microsite edaphic diversity, including areas with dense summer fog banks that can increase soil moisture while simultaneously reducing solar insolation.
- Limited documentation of historical native vegetation community distribution and species diversity prior to disturbances from ranching and invasive ungulate introductions.
- Uncertainty regarding the composition of existing soil seed banks.
- Lack of information on past land use practices at a local scale, such as the intensity and duration of livestock grazing or vegetation clearance activities.
- Unclear understanding of local hydrological dynamics due to variable rainfall and alterations of the natural watershed from land development, road construction, groundwater extraction, and dam construction for stockponds.
- Uncertain impacts of climate change, including increased soil aridity earlier in the year, reduced fog duration, and a higher frequency of summer rainfall events.
- High variability in weather patterns between years, affecting the timing and intensity of rainfall events and wind events like Santa Ana winds.
- Unpredictable stochastic events, such as wildfires.

By acknowledging these uncertainties and incorporating flexible, adaptive management strategies, the HRMP aims to address the complex challenges associated with habitat restoration in the region and ensure the long-term success of conservation efforts. This HRMP strategically manages uncertainty through three project implementation steps:

1. Ecologically appropriate site selection
2. Adaptive weed management
3. Seed-based habitat restoration

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

The HRMP implementation is based on an adaptive management approach (Section 4.1.1). Key factors for recovering island biodiversity and restoring the ecosystem include removing mule deer (Section 4.2) and controlling high-priority invasive plants (Section 4.3). Four strategic habitat restoration methods have been identified, leveraging natural processes and cost-effective techniques such as seed-based, rainfall-driven restoration (Section 4.1.3). The following sections outline essential components for each restoration approach:

- Design of habitat restoration plant palettes (Sections 4.5 and 3.2)
- Erosion control measures to restore degraded soils (Section 4.7)
- Adaptive weed management for reducing the weed soil seed bank (Section 4.8)
- Seeding methods (Section 4.10)
- Container plant production for strategically introducing underrepresented shrubs and trees that do not establish easily from seed (Section 4.11)
- Post-seeding site maintenance (Section 4.12)

These components collectively contribute to the restoration of diverse habitats, promote ecosystem resilience, and support the recovery of native species.

4.1 OVERVIEW

Four approaches were identified for island habitat restoration. Figure 4-1 illustrates how these approaches are integrated, emphasizing the essential elements of implementation, monitoring, assessment, and adaptation to achieve the island habitat restoration goals. Table 4-1 provides additional details for each restoration action within the four approaches, along with citations of relevant subsections of this HRMP for further detail. Detailed guidance on restoration implementation methods can be found in Appendix F, Habitat Restoration Methods Guidelines, which serves as a valuable resource for Conservancy staff to support project success.

As a voluntary undertaking, the Catalina Island Conservancy acknowledges that the HRMP is guided by a commitment to conserve and restore the unique natural and cultural heritage of the island. The Conservancy is dedicated to using the best available science, planning, and practices to direct its efforts, while also recognizing that its primary obligations are to avoid adverse impacts and make a good faith effort to conserve and restore native habitats, protect culturally significant resources, and serve as responsible stewards of the island for the benefit of the public and future generations.

In pursuing this habitat restoration plan, the Conservancy aims to demonstrate its dedication to preserving the rich biodiversity and cultural legacy of Catalina Island, while promoting environmental stewardship and fostering a deeper understanding and appreciation of the island's natural and cultural treasures for generations to come.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 4-1 Catalina Island Adaptive Weed Management and Habitat Restoration Plan Overview.

Diagram identifying the 4 approaches to island habitat restoration in an adaptive management scheme, of designing site-specific projects, implementation, and monitoring, followed by analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of monitoring data to adapt restoration planning as needed to achieve restoration goals.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 4-1 Summary of Adaptive Weed Management and Habitat Restoration Activities by Approach.

HABITAT RESTORATION APPROACHES:	Passive	Active		
	1	2	3	4
Restoration Action	Whole Island mule deer removal and high priority invasive plant control	Island Scrub Oak Habitat Restoration	Top-of-Watershed Habitat Restoration	Infrastructure Maintenance Native Revegetation
Whole Island Restoration				
Mule Deer Removal (Section 4.2)	x			
High-Priority Invasive Plant Control (Section 4.3)	x	x	x	x
Site-Specific Restoration Project Design				
WMU Prioritization (Section 3.1)		x	x	
Habitat Restoration Approach and Site-Selection (Section 4.4.1)		x	x	x
Native Plant Palette Design (Section 4.5)		x	x	x
Site-Specific Restoration Project Implementation				
Native Plant Material Collection and Production (Sections 4.5.4, 4.5.2 and 4.11.1)		x	x	x
Restoration Project Site Protection (Section 5.2**)**		x	x	x
Initial Dethatch, *If Needed* (Section 4.6)		x	x	x
Install Nodes of Container Plants (Section 4.11.2)				
Erosion Control Measures (Section 4.7)		x	x	x
Adaptive Weed Management (Section 4.8)		x	x	x
Seeding Threshold Assessment (Section 4.9)		x	x	x
High-Diversity Native Seed Mix Installation (Sections 4.5.5 and 4.10)		x	x	x
Low-Diversity Native Cover Crop Seed Mix Installation (Sections 4.5.5 and 4.10)			x	
Restoration Site Maintenance (Section 4.12)		x	x	x
Remedial Seeding or Planting, *If Needed* (Section 4.12)		x	x	x
Site-Specific Restoration Project Monitoring				
Sensitive Species Protection (Section 5.1)		x	x	x
Horticultural Monitoring (Section 5.2.1)		x	x	x
Plant Establishment Monitoring (Section 5.2.2)		x	x	x
Long-Term Monitoring				
Vegetation Monitoring (Section 5.3.2)	x	x	x	
Wildlife Monitoring (Section 5.3.4)	x	x	x	
Soil Monitoring (Section 0)	x	x	x	x
Invasive Plant Species Monitoring (Section 5.3.7)	x	x	x	x
Assess and Adapt (Section 5.4)	x	x	x	x
Reporting (Section 5.5)	x	x	x	x

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4.1.1 Adaptive Management

The adaptive management approach employed in this habitat restoration plan encourages flexibility and continuous learning. The plan encompasses the design and implementation of site-specific projects, biological monitoring, data analysis, and periodic adjustments to restoration project design based on new insights. It allows for updates to key elements, such as restoration principles, management hypotheses, plant palettes, species distribution models, and restoration specifications, as well as monitoring methods, scientific research, and innovative techniques. Any deviations from the plan will be documented by the Conservancy. However, core elements of the HRMP, including goals, sensitive species protection measures, monitoring goals, and reporting requirements, will remain unchanged unless the plan is formally amended. This combination of adaptability and consistency ensures that the plan remains effective and responsive to new information while staying focused on its primary objectives.

4.1.2 Passive Habitat Restoration

Approach 1. Whole Island passive recovery of biodiversity through removal of mule deer and high priority invasive plant control using the existing CIPP program.

The term "passive restoration" might be somewhat misleading, as it still involves a significant amount of work. However, the primary goal of passive restoration is to convey that it relies less on active interventions compared to traditional habitat restoration approaches. The removal of mule deer alone will contribute to the enhancement and restoration of island biodiversity and native cover. This process will be further supported by maintaining the existing high-priority invasive plant control program, known as CIPP (Section 4.3). By combining these strategies, the Project aims to achieve a comprehensive and sustainable restoration of the island's unique habitats.

4.1.3 Active Habitat Restoration

There are two approaches to active habitat restoration, and a third approach that covers best practices for native revegetation for infrastructure maintenance and cultural-based projects:

- Island scrub oak chaparral habitat Restoration
- Top-of-watershed habitat restoration
- Infrastructure maintenance and cultural-based native revegetation

Approach 2. Island Scrub Oak Chaparral Restoration

The island scrub oak, a key species in the scrub oak chaparral community, faces significant threats due to habitat loss and the legacy effects of past land use practices. These threats include mule deer impacts, the effects of feral pigs, and invasion by nonnative grasses and forbs. To address these challenges, a restoration approach will focus on restoring diverse native island upland scrub in areas dominated by nonnative species. This will help improve soil health and create suitable conditions for island scrub

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

oak regeneration and other suitable co-dominant long-lived chaparral plants that may naturally recruit into suitable areas in the future.

Priority will be given to areas near accessible roads, allowing for effective seasonal weed management using natural rainfall-driven cycles to reduce the weed soil seed bank. However, areas with minimal weed presence may be considered for limited weed management prior to seed installation. Diverse native seed mixes, representing various plant functional groups, will be used to emulate the natural disturbance recovery process characteristic of island scrub ecosystems. By implementing this restoration approach, the Conservancy aims to enhance the resilience and long-term viability of the island scrub oak population and its associated plant communities.

Approach 3. Top-of-Watershed Habitat Restoration

To restore areas with eroded topsoil and loss of native vegetation due to historical overgrazing, overbrowsing, and the introduction of invasive ungulates, a targeted active restoration approach is proposed. This approach includes implementing erosion control measures, reducing the nonnative soil seed bank through weed management, strategically planting key shrub and tree species, and installing a low-diversity native cover crop. In some cases, a high-diversity native seed mix, like what is recommended for Approach 2, may be appropriate.

Weed management methods will involve mechanical and chemical treatments, with a focus on conducting most weed management prior to seeding. This approach aims to create a favorable environment for native seedling establishment by focusing on intensive weed management in the early stages of restoration.

The targeted areas, identified in Section 3.4, have been significantly impacted by topsoil loss and are accessible by well-maintained roads to facilitate crew access for weed management and container transplant maintenance. The prioritization of this habitat restoration approach across watershed management units will be based on the sensitivity of downstream biological resources that will be protected and enhanced by this approach.

Approach 4. Infrastructure Maintenance and Cultural-Based Native Revegetation

Infrastructure Maintenance Native Revegetation

For the maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure, such as roadways, buildings, and equipment, revegetation efforts should prioritize the use of native plant species that are compatible with the adjacent built environment. These restoration activities should align with the methods outlined in this plan for other active habitat restoration methods, but may require modifications to accommodate specific constraints, such as fuel modification zone requirements.

When undertaking habitat restoration in conjunction with infrastructure maintenance or erosion repair, the following steps can be taken to ensure compatibility with adjacent built environments and adherence to management restrictions:

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- Site assessment: Conduct a thorough assessment of the site to understand existing conditions and identify any specific requirements or constraints for revegetation efforts.
- Plant selection: Choose native plant species that are well-suited to the site conditions, considering factors such as soil type, sun exposure, and water availability. Prioritize species that are compatible with adjacent built environments and meet fuel modification zone requirements, if applicable.
- Restoration planning: Develop a restoration plan that incorporates the specific requirements and constraints of the site, including any necessary modifications to standard active habitat restoration methods.
- Implementation: Implement the restoration plan, ensuring compliance with all management restrictions and consideration of adjacent built environments.
- Monitoring and maintenance: Monitor the progress of revegetation efforts and provide ongoing maintenance as necessary to ensure the successful establishment and growth of native plant species.

By following these guidelines, restoration efforts can effectively enhance habitat while also supporting the maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure. This approach ensures compatibility with adjacent built environments and compliance with existing land management restrictions, contributing to the overall sustainability and resilience of the restored ecosystem.

CULTURAL-BASED NATIVE REVEGETATION

Cultural-based native revegetation projects are initiatives that focus on restoring and preserving indigenous plant species with significant cultural importance to tribal nations. These projects not only protect and promote native flora but also provide valuable habitat and resources for local wildlife. An example of such a project is the planting wetland plants, such as spiny rush (*Juncus acutus*) and tule (*Schoenoplectus acutus*), that are culturally significant plants for many indigenous communities, along the edges of reservoirs. This approach serves a dual purpose: it offers tribal nations the opportunity to collect culturally important native materials outside of the bird breeding season, while simultaneously providing a natural screen to shield birds from human activity. The enhanced habitat created by the tule plantings contributes to improved aquatic conditions for both resident and migratory bird species, fostering biodiversity and promoting the overall health of the ecosystem.

To accomplish cultural-based native revegetation projects, the Conservancy is encouraged to consider entering a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), or other appropriate instrument, with indigenous communities or nations of people (indigenous people) of southern California to establish a collaborative partnership that balances the preservation of sensitive biological resources with the cultural needs and traditions of the indigenous people. This partnership would create an environment of mutual

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

respect, cooperation, and shared learning, fostering a deeper understanding of local ecosystems and informing sustainable management strategies.

By granting indigenous people access to designated areas for the cultural collection of plant materials and animals, the Conservancy can support the continuation of traditional practices while ensuring the sustainability of these resources. In return, if willing indigenous people can contribute their traditional ecological knowledge and practices, enhancing the Conservancy's conservation efforts and fostering a richer understanding of the land and its ecosystems (Long et al. 2020).

The recommended MOU should include provisions for clear communication, consultation, and dispute resolution, ensuring that any issues are addressed promptly, and that the conservation of natural resources remains a priority. Furthermore, the agreement should be designed to be adaptable, allowing both parties to review and update the MOU as needed to incorporate new knowledge or best practices.

By considering this recommendation, the Conservancy has an opportunity to create a lasting partnership with indigenous people that respects and preserves both the cultural traditions of the indigenous people and the sensitive biological resources of the region. This collaborative approach serves as a model for the successful integration of cultural and conservation goals, promoting a harmonious coexistence between people and nature.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4.2 INVASIVE MULE DEER REMOVAL

The successful removal of mule deer from Catalina Island is a crucial step in achieving the Project's habitat restoration goals, as their presence and browsing habits significantly hinder the recovery of native vegetation. The removal process will involve ground shooting, along with the sterilization of select "Sentinel" deer to ensure comprehensive population control. In populated areas, deer management will be accomplished through capture using bait followed by culling, ground shooting, and sterilization. The timing of removal efforts will be strategically planned to align with the mule deer's reproductive cycle, specifically during the estrus period when they are more social, to maximize efficiency and reduce the need for additional removals. All project activities will adhere to the American Veterinary Medical Association's Depopulation guidelines for humane handling of animals, ensuring a safe, ethical, and responsible process.

After the mule deer are removed, the last introduced ungulate will be the bison. Sheep herding and cattle grazing ended in the 1950s, and the Conservancy removed the feral goats and pigs by the early 2000s. The Conservancy has sustainably managed the bison herd size since 2009 by injecting the females with porcine zona pelluciida (PZP), a contraceptive that had been used for fertility control in zoos, wild horses, and white-tailed deer. The bison herd is now around 80 individuals and at its height was at 527. Bison primarily graze on grasses but also selectively browse herbs and woody vegetation, especially during the summer dry season. Bison trample vegetation and compact rangeland but roam more and use riparian areas less intensively than do cattle (e.g., Steuter and Hidinger 1999).

4.3 HIGH-PRIORITY INVASIVE PLANT CONTROL

The Conservancy, in line with its mission to be responsible stewards of its lands through conservation, education, and recreation, recognized the need for a science-based invasive plant management program. This program, known as the Catalina Invasive Plant Program (CIPP), was established in 2003 to protect ecosystem health through monitoring and management of invasive plants.

Invasive species pose a significant threat to biodiversity worldwide, particularly in island ecosystems such as Catalina Island. With the removal of introduced ungulates (e.g., feral goats and pigs were removed beginning in the 1990s; pigs were fully eradicated by 2004 and goats by 2005), many invasive plant species have spread across the island, impacting flora, fauna, and ecosystem processes. To address this issue, the Conservancy commissioned an island-wide invasive plant survey and species-led management plan in 2003, which provided the necessary information to develop and implement a site-led invasive plant management plan.

Beginning in 2004, the Conservancy targeted approximately 30 species for eradication, maintaining most of their populations at less than 1 percent cover. The 2003 survey revealed that several widespread species were abundant, requiring a more focused approach to prioritize control efforts. To achieve this, the Conservancy developed a

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

watershed-based plan in 2008 that ranked the natural resources in each watershed or habitat management unit on the island (i.e., Watershed Management Units, WMU). This plan allows the Conservancy to systematically address new and widespread invasive species, preventing them from impacting high-value conservation sites. By integrating the species-led and site-led management plans into a comprehensive strategy, the Conservancy can holistically address invasive plants and protect important ecological areas.

The Conservancy has a 20-year history of managing invasive plant species, with notable achievements including the functional eradication of four species and the treatment of over 1.4 million individual plants. Over the years, the Conservancy has surveyed nearly 30,000 acres, treated over 3,000 acres, and managed over 200 species, investing more than 68,000 hours in these efforts. In 2023, the Conservancy surveyed 192 acres across 37 watershed management units, treating 15 different species and a total of 204,973 individual plants. In 2022, the Conservancy surveyed 274 acres across 70 watershed management units, treating 21 species and a total of 231,805 individual plants. Currently, the Conservancy targets over 40 invasive plant species for management.

The Conservancy has collaborated with various organizations, including American Conservation Experience (ACE) interns and the California Institute of Environmental Studies (CIES) contractor crews. CIES contractor crews bring valuable experience and expertise in invasive plant management, having worked on projects across the California Channel Islands. This partnership enhances the Conservancy's ability to address invasive species and protect the unique biodiversity of Catalina Island.

The CIPP program is an essential component of the broader Catalina Island habitat restoration plan, especially as the island transitions with the removal of the last large invasive browser, the mule deer. As invasive plants are released from browsing pressure, the CIPP program will play a critical role in managing and mitigating the potential spread of these species. More detailed information about the CIPP program and its role in high-priority invasive plant management can be found in Appendix A.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4.4 SITE-SPECIFIC RESTORATION PROJECT DESIGN

Selecting the right location is crucial for the success of active habitat restoration projects. To identify suitable project sites, it is essential to consider the existing mosaic of nonnative annual grasslands and native vegetation communities, including island chaparral, island scrub oak, CSS, native perennial grasslands, forblands, riparian, wetland, and woodlands. Since the pre-European condition of the island vegetation communities is not well understood in highly degraded areas that would benefit from active habitat restoration projects, it is necessary to carefully evaluate the current conditions of each potential site.

Particular attention should be given to sensitive native riparian and wetland habitats, which are more susceptible to changes from drought, climate change, and human alterations to the environment. These habitats depend on specific hydrological and geomorphic conditions that may have been altered due to past development, flood control measures, or extended drought conditions. Consequently, some species may struggle to recruit new individuals, leading to long-term shifts in the composition of riparian and wetland natural communities.

To ensure the long-term success of restoration efforts, priority should be given to sites that still retain some of their historical hydrological and geomorphic characteristics. In cases where these conditions have been significantly altered, additional restoration measures may be required to restore or mimic the natural processes that support the target habitat type, such as erosion control.

4.4.1 HABITAT RESTORATION APPROACH AND SITE-SELECTION

Once a Watershed Management Unit (WMU) and a habitat restoration approach have been selected based on the guidance provided in Section 3, it is crucial to conduct on-the-ground field assessments to create a detailed, site-specific habitat restoration plan. While the predictive potential vegetation modeling offers a consistent, probabilistic evaluation of suitable restoration targets, it is essential to recognize that these models, which form the basis for identifying habitat restoration opportunities, have limitations and may not be entirely accurate. Field assessments provide valuable site-specific information that may not be captured in a landscape-scale model, such as:

1. Existing plant species: Document both native and nonnative plant species present on the site, along with their distribution. Pay particular attention to sensitive or protected species that may require special considerations during the restoration process. The pattern of existing weed and native plants may also inform us about their surrounding growing environment (e.g. Pfieffer 2013) by serving as habitat proxy indicators and can be used to help refine weed management approaches and habitat restoration targets.
2. Reference habitat: Observations of nearby extant stands of vegetation communities that occur in similar environmental conditions may also help inform the development of habitat restoration targets in the project area.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3. Wildlife observations: Note any observations of wildlife, including the identification and presence of sensitive or protected species. This information can help guide restoration efforts to minimize disruption to local fauna.
4. Unique soil conditions: Identify any distinct soil conditions that may impact plant growth, such as alkaline soils, rock outcrops, or significant changes in soil texture. Understanding these conditions will help inform plant selection and placement during the restoration process.
5. Alterations of natural hydrology: Assess any modifications to the natural hydrology of the site. These alterations may impact the current and future hydrologic functions critical to vegetation communities, like oak woodlands and riparian habitats.
6. Fire severity assessment: Evaluate the qualitative impact of fire events on the site, as fire severity may influence the ability of native plants to regenerate. This information will help guide the restoration strategy and determine whether additional interventions are needed to promote native plant recovery.
7. Accessibility: It is important to determine what constraints there may be to access for equipment or restoration crews because it will influence the selection of viable weed management and seeding methods.

By incorporating data from field assessments into the site-specific habitat restoration plan, the Conservancy can address local conditions and factors that may not be captured in the broader landscape-scale models. This approach will help ensure that the restoration efforts are tailored to the unique needs and characteristics of each site, ultimately increasing the likelihood of successful habitat restoration and long-term ecological health.

Additional factors to consider when selecting a restoration site include current disturbance levels, such as unwanted trespassing, frequently used illegal trails, and vandalism. If the site is within an area accessible to the public, the level of use in the area should be considered, particularly when the goal is to restore habitat for sensitive species. Implementing measures such as fencing and educational signage can help protect the site and inform the public about the restoration project. Furthermore, leveraging the Conservancy's public recreation and education programs can play a vital role in minimizing potential disturbances caused by public activities, whether intentional or unintentional.

In some cases, it may be beneficial to conduct soil sampling and laboratory testing to gain a better understanding of the growing conditions or constraints present in the restoration area. Additionally, reviewing available historical aerials or photographs can provide valuable insights into past land use and disturbances, such as vegetation clearing or ranching, that may have impacted the native vegetation. This information can help inform restoration strategies and guide the decision-making process for the Project.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4.4.2 SITE-SPECIFIC RESTORATION PLAN

With restoration targets selected, knowledge of site-specific implementation opportunities and constraints, and explicit restoration hypotheses to guide plan development, sufficient information is available to create a site-specific habitat restoration plan. Choose the most appropriate methods based on factors such as site-specific constraints and opportunities, budget, available equipment, site access, and staff, while following one of the active habitat restoration approaches (Section 4.1.3), the guidelines in this section, and the detailed specifications in Appendix F.

Tailor success criteria to each site-specific habitat restoration project, considering factors such as project goals, regulatory requirements, habitat restoration targets, and the presence of rare, sensitive, or protected species. For vegetation-related success criteria, account for the significant impact of site and year (e.g., variable rainfall) on vegetation response, including diversity, cover, and phenology. Incorporate reference habitat samples (where available) into success criteria to address this variability.

4.4.3 SITE-SPECIFIC RESTORATION PROJECT SUCCESS CRITERIA

Developing success criteria for individual active restoration projects depends on several factors, including the most suitable active habitat restoration approach for the specific area (see Section 4.1.3) and local site conditions (see Section 4.4.1). Although the Conservancy is not obligated to meet any mandatory success criteria as a voluntary project, adhering to guidelines is crucial for proper implementation of the HRMP.

A common measure of habitat restoration project success is the establishment of native plant cover or diversity, including the survivorship of planted material. General plant establishment success criteria should be integrated into project plans, with monitoring methods detailed in Section 5.2.3.

In addition to these criteria, it is essential to consider any supplementary requirements associated with external funding sources, such as state or federal grants, private grants, and mitigation-funded projects. These requirements should be incorporated into the site-specific project success criteria.

4.5 NATIVE PLANT PALETTE DESIGN

This plan advocates for seed-based restoration of vegetation communities as an economical approach to convert sites dominated by nonnative grasses and forbs into native scrub or other suitable vegetation types. Seed-based habitat restoration in upland southern California has been shown to result in greater diversity (McGuire et al. 2022) and cost-effectiveness (Brooks et al. 2019) compared to container plant-based methods. The primary focus is on native seeds, but strategic groupings of outplantings are also included in the top-of-watershed approach to introduce a diverse range of large shrubs and trees that may not establish easily from seed and are underrepresented in the local watershed.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4.5.1 Ecological Succession Model

Ecological succession refers to the gradual change in species composition and structure within an ecological community over time. Chaparral and Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS) vegetation communities are characterized by fire-adapted traits, enabling them to recover following wildfire events. Understanding the natural recovery process of these communities is crucial for developing effective habitat restoration strategies.

The ecological succession model proposed in this plan focuses on incorporating a diverse range of native plant species in seed mixes, mimicking the natural succession of chaparral and CSS plant communities after disturbances like wildfires. This approach emphasizes seeding over planting to establish restoration sites.

In the initial stages, fast-growing, early germinating native annual species in the seed mix will outcompete nonnative weeds, dominating the restoration areas for the first few years. Subsequently, slower-developing native perennial species will begin to dominate beyond the third year of establishment.

Relying primarily on seeding ensures that native plant species will establish themselves in their preferred microclimate within the restoration area. This will build a seed bank consisting of early successional species and later successional community stages, providing a foundation for self-recovery and resilience in the face of future disturbances. Seeding with early successional native species will also encourage the development of arbuscular mycorrhizal associations between plant roots and fungi, promoting native habitat establishment and inhibiting the growth of nonnative species.

Using a diverse seed mix of native species with varied life-form characteristics, such as annuals and perennials, early and late-season species, and species with varying drought tolerance, is essential for adapting to potential changes brought on by climate change. The plant palettes for restoration areas should be designed to incorporate this diversity, ensuring a robust foundation for the restoration sites to thrive and withstand future environmental challenges. The exception is the development of the low-diversity native crop mix, which has different objectives focused on rebuilding healthy soil that will promote natural recruitment of endemic and rarer island plants over longer time periods.

4.5.2 Wild Seed Collection and Provenance

While researchers are exploring the benefits of sourcing seeds from bioclimatic regions that match future climate scenarios for habitat restoration (e.g., Ramalho et al. 2017, Vitt et al. 2022), the Conservancy will prioritize the wild collection of seeds from Catalina Island itself. Minimizing the import of seed collections from outside appropriate bioclimatic zones is a priority for conservation managers (e.g., Garrambone and Saroa 2020). This approach maintains local genetic integrity and ensures the use of plants adapted to the island's unique conditions, which is crucial given the Channel Islands' relative climatic stability and high rate of endemism.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

During wild seed collection, best practices will be followed, such as collecting at the appropriate time for each species, limiting collection to a maximum of 5 to 10% of individual plants' seed production, and collecting from no more than 5 to 10% of individuals in a population. To ensure genetic diversity, seeds will be collected from a variety of plants within each population. The genetic integrity of plant populations will be preserved by bulk-producing seeds for restoration efforts from Santa Catalina Island populations, and potentially other Channel Islands populations if necessary. This approach will protect the unique genetics of Catalina Island populations and prevent the introduction of mainland genetics that could outcompete or overshadow the native genetics. Seeds will be produced and processed at the island's seed farm and processing facility to maintain control over the genetic material or where feasible off island with biosecurity testing.

4.5.3 Seed Bulk In-Place for Rare Plant Populations

Managing competing weeds in areas with known or expected rare plant populations can reduce competition, allowing the desired rare plants to germinate more frequently, grow larger, and allocate more resources to flowering and producing viable seeds. This "seed bulk in-place" approach replenishes the native seed bank and is more cost-effective than nursery seed bulking programs, which involve wild seed collection, plant cultivation in a nursery, and the reintroduction of first-generation seeds (F1) back into the wild population.

4.5.4 Native Plant Production Decision Analysis

A major hurdle for large-scale habitat restoration is the consistent production of native seeds. Seed sources include commercial wildland seed collection, commercially grown seed operations, and landowner/manager seed collection and growing operations. While volunteer-based seed collection efforts are generally not suitable for large-scale projects, skilled and experienced volunteers can contribute by focusing on a limited set of easily identifiable and accessible species under proper guidance and oversight.

While most seed for restoration projects can be collected from Catalina Island, supply can vary by species and by year. For some species the existing stands that are on accessible for seed collection cannot be relied upon as a seed source because they are too small to provide the amount of viable seed required. Additionally, the viability of seed can be influenced by annual rainfall amounts, which can result in collections with low germination rates during periods of drought.

To enhance the availability of wildland collected seeds for restoration projects, seeds can be collected and stored over multiple years for later use, such as after multi-year weed management efforts. Additionally, establishing a regional native seed bank through coordination between seed suppliers and land managers can increase the number and amount of seed species available for native revegetation projects. Collaboration among land managers from other Channel Islands can help address the challenge of increasing native seed suppliers, reducing the cost of seed-based habitat restoration projects.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Since it is not practical to supply all required species quantities from wildland collections, bulked seeds produced using traditional farming methods can be an alternative source. The Conservancy plans to bulk seeds on island where feasible that are challenging to collect from the wild. If necessary, the Conservancy may consider sourcing seeds from mainland collections or mainland-produced container plants, employing biosecurity measures to prevent the introduction of invasive species or hybridized plants. Although third-party mainland seed collection, seed bulking, or nursery-grown container plants may be more cost-effective and feasible due to the Conservancy's staffing limitations and space constraints at Middle Ranch, appropriate biosecurity measures will be crucial. A native plant production decision tree has been developed to assist the Conservancy in assessing plant production opportunities (Figure 4-2).

4.5.5 High-Diversity Native Habitat Restoration Seed Mix Design

A well-designed seed mix is essential to the establishment of a diverse and sustainable native vegetation community. Seed species should be selected to include the appropriate level of diversity for the target vegetation community and based on the site conditions (e.g., soil type, hydrology, slope, aspect, landscape position). Seed mixes can also be augmented with additional species that are typical of the vegetation communities predicted to be suitable in the future (e.g., Riordan et al. 2018), which will help facilitate potential future shifts in plant assembly.

The composition of seed mixes for habitat restoration projects may need to be adjusted based on several factors:

1. Seed availability: The types and quantities of seeds available for the restoration project may vary, requiring alterations to the initial seed mix design.
2. Weed management response: Multiple years of weed management efforts and their impact on the restoration site can influence the choice of seeds in the mix. Adjustments may be necessary to address persistent weed issues or to accommodate successful weed suppression.
3. Natural recruitment: The emergence of new plants from the soil seed bank or surrounding native propagule sources during the weed management phase may change the desired diversity, functional groups, or specific species in the final seed mix.

These factors should be considered during the project's design phase and throughout the site preparation and weed management stages. By regularly re-evaluating and fine-tuning the seed mix, the project can better address site-specific needs, ensuring adequate cover and diversity. This adaptive approach allows for optimal restoration outcomes by accounting for real-time changes and challenges at the restoration site.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 4-2 Catalina Island Native Plant Material Decision Analysis

Decision tree to determine the most appropriate source of native plant material for restoration projects on Catalina Island.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

In addition to the factors previously mentioned, seed viability testing results should also be considered when adjusting seeding rates for habitat restoration projects. Seed viability refers to the percentage of seeds that are capable of germinating and developing into healthy plants under favorable conditions. Knowing the viability of the seeds in the mix is crucial for determining appropriate seeding rates.

If seed viability testing reveals lower-than-expected viability rates, it may be necessary to increase seeding rates to compensate for the reduced potential for germination and establishment. Conversely, if viability rates are high, seeding rates can be adjusted downward to avoid overcrowding or unnecessary resource expenditure. By incorporating seed viability testing results into the decision-making process, restoration project managers can optimize seeding rates to achieve desired plant cover, diversity, and overall restoration goals while considering the specific conditions and challenges of the restoration site.

Refer to Appendix F for detailed guidance on developing a site-specific seed mix, including information on plant functional groups, species selection, and seeding rates.

4.5.6 Low-Diversity Native Cover Crop Seed Mix

A low-diversity native cover crop offers several benefits for reclaiming soils that have lost their topsoil due to past land use practices. The native cover crop plants, such as coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*), California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), island buckwheat (*Eriogonum grande* var. *grande*), coast goldenbush (*Isocoma menziesii*), and clustered tarplant (*Deinandra fasciculata*), are fast-growing and have seeds that can be easily collected on the island and/or bulked. The primary goal of a native cover crop is to establish native perennial vegetation that contributes to soil health, reduces erosion, and fosters the conditions necessary for the long-term recruitment of diverse native island vegetation communities through natural processes.

1. Soil health: Native cover crops help rebuild healthy soils by improving soil structure, increasing organic matter content, and promoting nutrient cycling. These plants help restore the soil's natural fertility and create a favorable environment for other native plant species to establish and thrive.
2. Erosion control: The roots of native cover crops help bind the soil together, reducing the risk of erosion. Additionally, these plants intercept rainfall, slowing down water runoff and allowing more water to infiltrate the soil, further reducing erosion and promoting water retention.
3. Facilitating natural recruitment: Establishing a native cover crop creates a more hospitable environment for the germination and growth of other native plant species. As the cover crop plants grow and reproduce, they contribute to the local seed bank, increasing the likelihood of natural recruitment and the gradual development of a more diverse native vegetation community over time.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Overall, a low-diversity native cover crop serves as a catalyst for ecosystem restoration, providing essential services that help to repair degraded soils and promote the long-term recovery of diverse native plant communities.

Cover crops could be one to three shrub species depending on seed availability and likelihood of successful establishment based on site conditions, and the inclusion of an early germinating native cover crop (e.g., *Plantago erecta*). In general, all the shrub cover crop should total about 10 to 25 pure live seed (PLS) per squarefoot, and the early germinating species should total be between 50 to 75 PLS per squarefoot. See Appendix F for guidelines on how to calculate bulk seeding rates for seed mixes.

4.6 INITIAL DETHATCH

Dethatching, the initial stage of weed management, should be implemented in the fall before the first significant rainfall, if necessary. Not all sites have enough nonnative litter accumulation to require an initial dethatching event. Generally, if residual dry matter (RDM) is about less than 800 lbs per acre, then dethatching is not necessary to promote weed growth. Areas with high biomass accumulation from nonnative vegetation and little to no bare ground should be dethatched before beginning the weed management phase, if feasible.

Thatch removal exposes bare ground and optimizes weed germination from the seed bank for grow-and-kill treatments. Select the most appropriate and feasible method from the several dethatching options described below. For larger restoration sites, mechanical equipment such as mowing and windrowing is recommended for thatch removal, while hand or line trimmer dethatching is suggested for smaller sites, as needed. See Appendix F for details on methods.

Schedule the initial site clearing activity outside of the bird breeding season for all sensitive species present at the site, if possible. Follow all applicable resource protection measures, including biological monitoring during the bird breeding season, as outlined in Section 5.1.

4.7 EROSION CONTROL MEASURES

Erosion control measures are essential for restoring degraded areas affected by invasive ungulates and intense ranching practices. These measures help to stabilize slopes, trap soil, and promote the growth of healthy soil to support island vegetation. Some effective erosion control measures include:

1. Straw wattles: Biodegradable natural wattles made of straw or coir rolls, with non-plastic, biodegradable netting, help interrupt and slow down water flow on steep slopes, capturing sediment and preventing erosion of bare soil surfaces.
2. Fiber mats: Made from 100% natural biodegradable fiber, these mats provide erosion control on bare steep slopes, preventing topsoil and sediment movement until vegetation can establish for slope stabilization. They can be

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

used in combination with other erosion control measures, like straw wattles, and should have an open area percentage of at least 50% to allow for seeding.

3. Silt fences: Temporary permeable fabric fences that intercept and slow down sheet flow runoff, capturing sediment and preventing erosion around the perimeter of a project, below exposed and erodible soils, along streams, or around temporary spoil or stockpiles.
4. Check dams: Temporary erosion control tools used in smaller drainages or deep erosion gullies to reduce debris flow, scour, and erosion. They slow down water flow in channels or gullies and prevent undercutting when installed correctly.
5. Hydromulch with soil stabilizers: Effective for protecting bare erodible slopes, including steep slopes between 25% to 50%, by reducing raindrop impact, sheet flow, and providing favorable conditions for seed germination and establishment.

Details on the methods and implementation of these erosion control measures can be found in Appendix F. By employing these measures, restoration efforts can effectively address erosion issues and foster the recovery of native vegetation in degraded areas.

4.8 Adaptive Weed Management

Holistic weed management and high-priority invasive plant control are distinct approaches with different goals and methodologies. Holistic weed management focuses on depleting the nonnative soil seed bank through consistent and timely treatments over multiple years, often in non-irrigated grow-and-kill programs. This approach is typically part of a site-specific habitat restoration project, where the long-term success depends on a combination of natural recruitment from the extant native soil seed bank, propagules from nearby native vegetation, and the intentional introduction of native material through seeding and planting.

In contrast, the Catalina Invasive Plant Program (CIPP) is an early detection monitoring program aimed at detecting and eradicating new invasive plants, as well as monitoring and containing high-priority invasive plants. CIPP focuses on species that have a significant negative impact on wildlife habitat or ecosystem function, and which are feasible to eradicate. While both approaches involve weed management, CIPP is more targeted and reactive, focusing on specific invasive species, while holistic weed management is a proactive, broader strategy that supports overall habitat restoration efforts for as site-specific project.

4.8.1 Weed Management Principles

The Conservancy has a successful track record of controlling high-priority invasive species over the past two decades. However, many nonnative plant species in the degraded areas of the island are not as well-understood, as a significant portion of their population lies dormant in the soil seed bank at any given time. This means that even after a weed crop is controlled in an area for a single season, different weed species can germinate from the soil seed bank in subsequent seasons or years, occupying the same

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

space. The removal of mule deer may also lead to an increase in some invasive weed populations.

For effective full-community restoration, weed control efforts should focus on the weed soil seed bank rather than solely targeting the visible weeds at a particular point in time. The emergence of these weeds is influenced by annual and variable factors such as temperature, rainfall amount and timing, and competition. Therefore, understanding soil seed banks and their dynamics is a critical first step in implementing a comprehensive weed management strategy for habitat restoration.


SEED BANK DEFINITIONS AND DYNAMICS

The soil seed bank consists of the individual elements in the soil that might develop into a plant. Literally defined it includes seeds, but it also comprises rhizomes, tubers, stolons, and other vegetative structures produced by perennial weeds that might grow into new plants. The seed "bank" is an apt metaphor because its contents are a balance of "deposits" and "withdrawals" that result in a dynamic accumulation or depletion of plant propagules (Menalled and Schonbeck 2011) (see Figure 4-3).

Weed seed bank deposits include annual weed seed "rain" from reproductively mature weeds that are within or adjacent to a site. In some instances, seed rain can come from a distance, but it is most highly influenced by local plants. Seeds can be brought in by human action, such as hikers, vehicles, or equipment or by intentional or unintentional transport through other means. Seeds can also be brought to a site by wind, animals, or hydrologic movement. Viable seed that is still retained by dead plant matter in the surface thatch can also contribute to the seed bank.

Withdrawals from the soil seed bank take several forms as well (Liebman et al. 2001, Davis et al. 2005). First, seeds can germinate and grow to mature plants that themselves set seed. Alternatively, seeds may be lost through fatal germination, where a seed or propagule sprouts, but does not reach the soil surface because it is at an excessive depth or by exposure to allelochemicals (natural phytotoxic substances released by plants), microbial pathogens, insects, burrowing animals, or other organisms in the soil. Seeds can also be consumed before germinating by a range of organisms, including, but not limited to, ground beetles, crickets, earthworms, slugs, field mice and birds. Finally, seeds can lose viability or decay over time.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Source: Menalled and Schonbeck 2011

Figure 4-3 Conceptual Model of Deposits to and Withdrawals from a Soil Seed Bank

REDUCING THE WEED SOIL SEED BANK

Effective weed seed bank management at restoration sites involves several strategies to minimize the overall quantity of viable weed seeds within the soil and surface weed thatch. These strategies can be broadly categorized into two approaches: reducing seed inputs and decreasing germination.

1. Reducing seed inputs: Control methods can be employed to minimize seed production from weed species. These methods include:
    a. Chemical control: Applying herbicides after germination but before seed production can help control weed populations.
    b. Mechanical control: Hand weeding, mowing, and line trimming can be used to remove weeds before they produce seeds.
2. Decreasing germination: By limiting the exposure of seeds to conditions that stimulate growth, the weed seed bank can be reduced over time through decomposition and seed predation. Key factors influencing seed germination are light and temperature. To decrease germination:
    a. Minimize soil disturbance: Avoiding soil disturbance during weed management helps prevent seeds from being exposed to light and temperature conditions that promote growth. This approach is especially effective for seeds located at depths where germination is less likely.
    b. Consider vertical seed distribution: The effectiveness of minimizing soil disturbance depends on the vertical distribution of seeds in the soil. In

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

some cases, a significant percentage of seeds may be found at depths that do not lead to germination when the soil is undisturbed.

Each weed control method has pros and cons, considering the timing of application, equipment and trained staff availability, and site access limitations. Control nonnative seedlings and flowering plants before they produce viable weed seeds to minimize contributions to the weed seed bank. Minimize soil disruption to prevent new weed germination, injury to native species, and disturbance to biological soil crusts. However, limited soil disturbance, such as from mowing equipment, can be beneficial during the site preparation phase in areas with no biological crusts and low native cover to promote weed seed germination and enhance weed control efficiency.

Generally use only post-emergent herbicides, avoiding pre-emergent herbicides that hinder native seedling development. Adjust herbicide application rates based on the target weed species. Refer to Appendix F for sample specifications of weed management control methods.

In areas with significant native cover or sensitive species, trained crews should perform careful weeding to avoid damage to native species. Adaptive management, including regular monitoring by the project biologist or restoration specialist, is crucial for guiding the scheduling and selection of control methods.

By combining these strategies, restoration efforts can more effectively manage weed seed banks, promoting the growth and establishment of native plant communities while reducing the impact of invasive species.

See Appendix F for details on mechanical and chemical weed management methods.

GROW-AND-KILL WEED MANAGEMENT WITH NATURAL RAINFALL

The "grow-and-kill" weed control method, driven by natural rainfall, is a cost-effective approach for managing weed seed banks at many sites. This method involves treating seedlings and new growth before seed production to deplete the existing seed bank and prevent new weed seeds from entering it.

Typically, three or more years of rainfall-driven grow-and-kill weed management are needed to sufficiently control and deplete the seed bank, allowing for the successful recruitment and establishment of native plants from restoration seed mixes. The number of treatments per year depends on annual precipitation rates, germination cues, and the extent of the weed seed bank.

In drought years with low weed loads, fewer treatments per year may be required. In this case, reserve weed management budgets for future treatments such as may be necessary in wetter years. Conversely, higher rainfall years with greater weed productivity may require additional treatments per season in that year (e.g., late spring or summer).

Irrigation can be used to accelerate the process by stimulating weed germination, potentially reducing the time needed to treat the site. However, irrigation is a significant investment and may not be cost-effective or feasible at the landscape scale, especially

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

on Catalina Island. In cases with low weed loads due to limited disturbance history, successful restoration may be possible with just one year of irrigated grow-and-kill treatments.

Effective weed seed bank management may take several years, depending on the weed seed population size and the number of grow-and-kill events driven by rainfall and weather conditions. Relying on natural rainfall-driven grow-and-kill treatments is generally more cost-effective and feasible for managing large areas. However, this approach is subject to unpredictable weather patterns, which may impact the timing and effectiveness of treatments.

Germination of certain weed species depends on various cues, such as temperature and light, in addition to rainfall. If these conditions are not met, target weed species may remain dormant in the soil seed bank and emerge in later years when conditions are favorable. This unpredictability necessitates an adaptive weed management approach that allows for flexibility in the timing and intensity of grow-and-kill events.

Adaptive weed management is also crucial because it is challenging and impractical to accurately quantify the size and extent of the weed seed bank during the planning phase. Instead, the required weed management effort can only be estimated based on field observations and experience with similar habitat restoration projects.

In situations where it is essential to minimize the time required for habitat restoration, supplemental irrigation can be employed to accelerate weed seed bank management. Irrigation can facilitate more grow-and-kill events than natural rainfall alone, potentially shortening the restoration timeline. For instance, a site requiring eight grow-and-kill cycles before seed addition could complete the process in two to three years with supplemental irrigation, instead of four to five years with natural rainfall alone.

However, using a temporary irrigation system for habitat restoration projects must be both feasible (e.g., accessible water source) and justified by the need, given the significant costs associated with water purchase, installation, and maintenance of the system. Additionally, labor costs increase due to the need for constant monitoring and maintenance of the irrigation system during operation to prevent leaks or damage that could harm the restoration area or adjacent areas.

WEED MANAGEMENT METHOD IS A FUNCTION OF SITE AND YEAR

The choice of suitable weed management techniques largely depends on site-specific factors, such as land manager preferences, applicable regulations (e.g., herbicide restrictions), available resources (labor, equipment, funding), and site conditions like land use history, fire history, topography, and hydrography. Additionally, year-specific factors, such as weather patterns, can influence weed density and composition, affecting the feasibility and effectiveness of weed control efforts.

TIMING OF TREATMENTS IS CRITICAL

The success of mechanical or chemical weed control efforts heavily relies on precise timing. Delaying control by even a week can result in viable seeds being dispersed

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

instead of halting seed development. Timing varies between warm, dry microclimates and cool, moist microclimates, with earlier intervention needed in the former. The active nonnative species in the seed bank during a given year or season will influence the timing of treatments, which may vary across a management area.

Generally, at least two to three treatments per growing season are required, targeting:

- Nonnative annual grasses following winter rains
- Spring-growing broadleaf weeds
- Summer-growing broadleaf weeds

CONSISTENT AND THOROUGH WEED TREATMENT IS KEY

Manage weeds as consistently and thoroughly as possible between years during the weed management step. Gaps in treatments within and between years can significantly lengthen the time to reach weed management objectives and thresholds prior to seeding.

ADJUST METHODS AND TIMING YEARLY, AS NEEDED

Adjust weed control methods and timing each year, as needed, based on weed phenology and weather conditions. For example, a rotary mower may be used to cut nonnative annual grasses initially, but may be replaced later by a flail mower, which can cut closer to the ground, as nonnative grasses decrease in stature and abundance in response to weed management efforts. Over time, as the weed seed bank is depleted and weed cover decreases during the growing season, the increased amount of bare ground results in higher rates of evaporative loss of soil moisture. Many annual grasses respond to the increased water stress by growing shorter stems and flowering earlier in the season and thus, may require subsequent adjustments in weed management methods and timing.

TAILOR WEEDING METHOD TO FOCAL WEEDS

In some cases, it may be necessary to tailor the treatment method to the focal weed species because of growth habit. For example, controlling purple false brome (*Brachypodium distachyon*) can be difficult because it can have a low or prostrate stature when flowering making it impossible to cut the flowering parts with a rotary mower. In this case, flail mowing is an effective option as it allows cutting closer to the ground (except on rocky sites). In winter, post-emergent grass-specific herbicide is the preferred treatment for purple false brome.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

LEAVE CUT MATERIAL ONSITE

Generally, leave mowed or line-trimmed material in place to decompose, unless a significant amount of nonnative biomass accumulates and hinders the germination of the native seed bank. Leaving cut weed material (without viable seed) on-site reduces or eliminates disposal costs and provides wildlife habitat. The material will decompose over time, but it is essential to continue weed treatments to prevent substantial thatch buildup.

Place cut weed material with viable seed in mulch piles outside sensitive areas. Treat any germinating weed seeds in the piles during subsequent seasons with herbicide or cut flowers before seed set. The cost of controlling germination from mulch piles is usually minimal. Alternatively, cut material with viable seed can be disposed of offsite if preferred.

An exception to leaving cut biomass in place is when using an herbicide that retains the active ingredient in the dead plant material (e.g., clopyralid). In such cases, collect and mulch the biomass in a buffer area or remove and properly dispose of the material off-site.

MECHANIZED METHODS ARE MORE COST-EFFECTIVE THAN HAND METHODS

Mechanized weed control methods are cost-effective, efficient, and as effective as hand weed control methods, particularly in larger restoration sites with less native cover:

- Mowing is more cost-effective than line trimming.
- Truck-mounted herbicide spray system applications are more economical than backpack sprayer applications.

Line trimming can effectively replace tractor mowing for smaller restoration sites (e.g., <1-2 acres) or sites inaccessible to mechanized equipment. However, line trimming is more expensive due to increased labor time.

Restoration crews should use line trimmers or backpack sprayers instead of mechanized methods and larger equipment when working around dense native plants or in smaller project areas.

FIELD MONITORING IS KEY TO TIMING AND SELECTION OF WEED CONTROL TREATMENTS

Effective weed management requires decision-making based on field observations of weed phenology, typically obtained through visual estimates during walkover field assessments. Relevé samples, designed to cover uniform vegetation types and capture weed species diversity, are suitable for estimating nonnative weed cover and flowering status without being overly time-consuming or technical. For a sample methodology, refer to the CDFW-CNPS "Protocol for the Combined Vegetation Rapid Assessment and Relevé Field Form."

Surveys for weed management purposes can focus on recording the cover of target weed species or plant functional groups into relevant cover classes. Considerable field knowledge of target weed species is essential for proper timing of weed control

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

interventions, such as mowing or chemical treatments. For instance, mowing should be performed after nonnative annual grasses begin to flower but before seeds reach the "milk stage" to prevent regrowth and maximize seed viability reduction. Similarly, chemical control is most effective when applied before the milk stage of grass seed development.

CONSIDER PHASING LARGE PROJECTS

For large restoration areas, consider phased implementation of the weed management program to (1) ensure consistent, well-timed, and thorough treatment with available resources, and (2) retain some local wildlife habitat during project implementation (e.g., raptor hunting grounds within existing nonnative annual grasslands). “Stuck” sites may be prioritized for more intensive management in the future, if warranted.

ALLOW FOR “STUCK” SITES IN RESTORATION AREA

Allow for inclusions of weedy/nonnative “stuck” sites (smaller problematic areas within a larger habitat restoration project) that are not cost-efficient to restore but may have some wildlife habitat value.

Part of successful habitat restoration projects is planning for potential failure. Consideration should be given to allowing “stuck” sites to remain as isolated nonnative dominated vegetation communities. Assuming that the larger project area has been adequately managed and best practices applied to planning and implementation of the habitat restoration project—as evidenced by successful achievement of habitat restoration goals and performance criteria for the rest of the project area—relatively small areas that are resistant to habitat restoration efforts may be best left alone. However, it is advised to treat and eradicate highly invasive plant species that could readily invade the restoration area.

4.8.2 WEED MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES TO AVOID NATIVE VEGETATION

AVOIDANCE AND MINIMIZATION OF IMPACTS TO WOODY NATIVES

Woody native shrubs shall be identified by the crew and avoided when using mechanical approaches, mowing and line trimming. Crews will be trained to identify sensitive and rare plants to be avoided.

AVOIDANCE AND MINIMIZATION OF IMPACTS TO NATIVE HERBS

Mowing and line trimming shall be timed to the phenology of the flowering of invasive annual grasses and forbs, which typically germinate and flower earlier than the native herbaceous vegetation due to the adaptive traits that reinforce their invasive nature in disturbed areas.

No application of broad-spectrum herbicides except in areas that have been surveyed and don’t have any sensitive, rare, or protected species.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

AVOIDANCE AND MINIMIZATION OF IMPACTS TO NATIVE PERENNIAL BUNCHGRASSES

Grass-specific herbicides may be used in areas with significant infestations of nonnative annual grasses, applied before flowering to avoid seed set. Areas with known or suspected populations of native annual grasses shall be avoided. Native perennial bunchgrasses (e.g., *Stipa pulchra* and *Stipa lepida*), which are common on the island, are tolerant to applications of grass-specific herbicide when they are applied early in winter while they are still primarily senescent. Therefore, areas with large infestations of nonnative annual grasses shall be treated in early winter while the native needlegrasses haven't begun to put out significant amounts of new tillers, thereby avoiding long-term damage to the native perennial *Stipa* grasses.

4.9 SEEDING THRESHOLD ASSESSMENT

Guidelines for determining when a restoration site is ready for seeding after weed management (Brooks et al. 2019):

1. After three to five or more years of weed management, including at least two average to above-average rainfall years, assess the site's readiness for seeding.
2. Evaluate the extent of natural recruitment and determine if seeding is necessary.
3. If seeding is required to achieve project goals, ensure that absolute weed cover is around 10% or less in the spring of an average to above-average rainfall year before seeding in the following fall. Weed management can be concluded once this threshold is met.
4. High priority invasive species should generally be controlled to less than 5% cover prior to seeding or planting, depending on what is feasible, the habitat restoration goals of the project, and the resource management priorities.

The weed seed bank management timeline is important to consider, as it involves a significant "site preparation phase" before introducing native materials. This approach is analogous to preparing weathered wood siding for painting, where most of the work involves scraping, repairing, and sanding before applying paint. Similarly, successful landscape-scale revegetation programs demand a long-term commitment to weed management (typically 3+ years) to achieve optimal outcomes from subsequent seeding and planting efforts.

A one- or two-year weed management effort may not yield sustainable benefits due to the following reasons:

1. Short-term efforts may manage nonnative annual grass populations and associated thatch, but other weed seed bank components, such as broadleaf weeds, may become dominant, requiring further management.
2. Weed seeds, including Mediterranean annual grasses, have longer soil seed bank viability than often reported. Some seeds have thicker seed coats requiring more scarification to germinate, while others remain viable due to low decomposition rates during periods of low rainfall.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3. Shorter control periods are less likely to coincide with weather conditions that stimulate germination of a significant portion of the seed bank.

However, a shorter timeline may be appropriate if the primary goal of weed management is to reduce thatch and litter cover to stimulate germination of sensitive annual native plant species or if a viable native seed bank is already present. In these cases, a one- to two-year effort can be sufficient, and project success can be measured by observing the germination rate, seed production, and overall native species establishment and cover.

In some cases, such as revegetation of newly exposed virgin soil, there may be little to no weed seed bank present, eliminating the need for pre-seeding weed management or requiring only one or two weeding events. However, proper weed management before seeding or planting generally reduces the total project cost by minimizing the need for more labor-intensive and difficult weeding efforts after seeding or planting.

When there is a significant native seed bank that emerges alongside weed management efforts, the weeding process becomes more time-consuming and labor-intensive, particularly when hand methods are required to protect the native plants. This may increase costs but could be partially offset by reducing the amount of native plant material needed for the site. The seed mix can be adjusted by lowering species diversity or seeding rates as needed.

4.10 Seed Installation Methods

Native plant material will be primarily introduced to the habitat restoration area by seed after achieving seeding thresholds. Successful restoration depends largely on proper site preparation during the weed management step. It is crucial to adequately control nonnative species before installation. Weed management should continue until the weed management threshold is reached, rather than installing plant material prematurely.

Various methods can be employed for seed installation, including drill seeding, imprint seeding, broadcast seeding, hydroseeding, and the seed ball technique. The choice of seeding method will depend on site conditions and accessibility. Larger sites accessible by equipment can be efficiently seeded mechanically using a drill seeder, imprint seeder, hydroseeder, or broadcast seeder. Smaller sites, sites with a high density of native species, or sites with unavoidable sensitive species populations can be seeded (preferably during the fall season) by hand broadcast or the seed ball technique.

Hydroseeding is an effective method for seed application on very steep slopes (≥1.5:1), as the mulch provides an erosion control blanket when using materials like Flexterra® FGM™.

Seed installation should occur in the fall before the onset of significant rainfall that might limit access to the restoration site, but before the end of January at the latest. See Appendix F for details on seed installation methods.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4.11 NURSERY GROWN CONTAINER PLANTS

Cuttings and container plants play three crucial roles in habitat restoration:

1. Introducing plants past the vulnerable seedling stage to establish onsite more effectively.
2. Facilitating the introduction of species that do not establish well from seed.
3. Providing diverse plant age groups to encourage natural regeneration earlier in the restoration process.

These plants include plants grown from spores, divisions, cactus stems and pads, and various trees from larger seed (cherry pits, acorns, etc.). These container plants will be grown to plugs or various sized containers (e.g., one-gallon size, deep pot) for that best suit the plants for outplanting. These container plants will supply the stock material to be farmed at Middle Ranch for bulking or to be outplanted on the landscape for restoration.

Container plants will be strategically used in small nodes in the Top-of-Watershed Habitat Restoration Approach.

See Appendix F for details on planting layout, cuttings, acorns, and general nursery production guidelines.

4.11.1 BIOSECURITY FOR PLANT PRODUCTION AND TRANSPORT

The Conservancy will review and implement restoration design considerations and best management practices (BMPs) to help prevent pathogen contamination, as published by the "Working Group for Phytophthoras in Native Habitats" (www.calphytos.org), when there is a risk of introduction and spread of plant pathogens in site plantings.

The Conservancy will review and implement decontamination protocols to prevent the spread of pathogens among amphibians or other aquatic animals when working in aquatic habitats that may support native amphibians. Gear and equipment that may contact water will be cleaned and decontaminated to prevent the spread of chytrid fungus, following protocols in Aquatic Invasive Species Disinfection/Decontamination Protocols (CDFW 2016, or latest version).

4.11.2 NODES OF NURSERY GROWN CONTAINER PLANTS

Strategically planting nodes or small clusters of container plants containing key shrub and tree species that are underrepresented in the watershed and do not establish readily from seed can significantly enhance restoration outcomes. This approach offers several benefits:

1. Improved establishment: Container plants have a higher likelihood of successful establishment compared to direct seeding, especially for species that struggle to grow from seed.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2. Enhanced diversity: Targeted planting of underrepresented species promotes biodiversity and helps restore the natural balance of the ecosystem.
3. Efficient irrigation: Grouping plants in small clusters allows for efficient watering using a water truck or gravity-fed reservoir, reducing the time and resources required for irrigation.

To maximize these benefits, consider the following design principles:

- Spacing: Plant container plants at intervals that allow for the full mature development of each species. This ensures adequate space for growth and prevents overcrowding.
- Clustering: Arrange plants in small clusters to facilitate efficient irrigation, taking into account the road accessibility and water source.
- Manual irrigation: Employ a manually operated water system to prevent uncontrolled water flow, blowouts, and erosion from potential irrigation breaks.
- Regular monitoring: Check plants regularly until they are well-established to ensure their health and success.

By implementing these strategies, the restoration project can effectively introduce underrepresented species, promote biodiversity, and ensure the efficient use of resources for long-term success. The irrigated planting basins will require frequent hand weeding, which can coincide with irrigation events, to maximize the efficiency of each trip to the restoration site. See Appendix F for guidelines on the design of a temporary irrigation system (e.g., bubbler system).

4.12 RESTORATION SITE MAINTENANCE

A key goal of a restoration plan is to create self-sustaining, long-term native habitats. Initial maintenance is necessary for establishment, but ongoing management may be required for various reasons, including:

- Higher weed loads in some areas requiring post-seeding weed maintenance
- Containing or eradicating high-priority invasive plant species
- Supplemental irrigation for installed container plants or cuttings
- Remedial seeding in areas with germination failure after adequate rainfall
- Replacing container plantings or cuttings with less than 80% survival in the first two years
- Installing erosion control measures following significant erosion
- Conservation activities for sensitive species
- Pest and disease control (no rodenticides)
- Removing trash, debris, and litter (excluding illegal dumping and public littering)

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Remedial weeding needs will depend on weather, habitat development, and weed density. The maintenance period can last up to five years, with intense maintenance in the first two years and spot-weeding as needed in years three to five. Weed control should minimize disturbance and be scheduled by the project restoration ecologist/biologist.

Adequate weed management prior to seeding can significantly reduce remedial weeding efforts. It is crucial to add native plant material only after achieving sufficient weed management. See Appendix F for details on post-seeding restoration site maintenance, including remedial seeding, container plant replacement, erosion control, pest control, and trash removal guidelines.

4.12.1 WEED MANAGEMENT

After seed and plant installation, the primary weed management method should be hand weeding.

Under the guidance of the project restoration ecologist/biologist, targeted spot spray application of herbicide for high-priority invasive species or perennial weeds, or line trimming of dense weed stands may be permitted. The restoration ecologist/biologist must evaluate the cost-benefit of weed control effectiveness versus potential damage to native plants. Only post-emergent herbicides should be applied, following the methods and recommendations outlined in the restoration plan and adhering to the Conservancy's herbicide use policies. See Appendix F for more details on post-seeding weed management.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

5 BIOLOGICAL MONITORING AND RESOURCE PROTECTION

Appendix G provides the Regulatory Setting for the Project (i.e., the federal and state resource regulations potentially applicable to the proposed actions). Consistent with the applicable regulations, and the overall goal of minimizing harm to natural resources during restoration actions, the following General Protection Measures will be incorporated, as applicable, into project descriptions for individual restoration projects. Not all these measures may be appropriate or necessary to avoid and minimize impacts, depending on the scope, scale, and location of a project.

5.1 RESOURCE PROTECTION MEASURES

This section identifies resource protection measures to minimize potential adverse effects upon (a) listed or otherwise "special status" plant or wildlife species, and/or (b) nesting birds potentially present in or near the restoration sites.

Copies of Site-Specific Project Description and all required permits and supporting documents shall be always readily available at work sites (electronic copies are sufficient) during periods of active work and must be presented to any CDFW personnel, or personnel from another agency upon demand.

5.1.1 ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS TRAINING/ISLAND FOX PROTECTION

Prior to engaging existing or new personnel in restoration activities, new restoration personnel will participate in environmental awareness training conducted by a Biological Monitor. Personnel will be informed regarding the identification, habitat requirements, legal protections, avoidance and minimization measures, and applicable protection measures for special-status species and nesting birds with potential to occur in or immediately adjacent to the project site. Personnel will be informed of the procedures to follow should a special-status species or nesting bird be encountered during project activities. Training may be provided in an online/virtual meeting. For projects that may continue over an extended duration and require excessive training events, a training video developed under the supervision of the Biological Monitor may be used to train new personnel, if a Biological Monitor is available by phone to answer questions about the training or to answer questions that may arise during project activities.

Given the ubiquity of the state- and federally listed Catalina Island Fox (*Urocyon littoralis catalinae*) across the island, and the vulnerability of this unusually confiding species to various forms of take, the following points must be included in the training and enforced in the field:

- To avoid impacts to Catalina Island fox pupping season. Any activity that involves heavy equipment will not occur between March and April. If heavy equipment work must take place during March-April, a qualified fox biologist will conduct a pre-activity burrow surveys to look for Catalina Island fox burrows and submit the results to CDFW to request permission to work in the area if no burrows are found.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- Do not intentionally (or unintentionally) feed any wildlife, including foxes, deer, birds, and ground squirrels.
    - Foxes have lice, fleas, and ticks which are all transmittable to humans.
    - Foxes, ground squirrels, deer, and ravens have diseases and bite.
    - Feeding foxes causes them to live in higher densities which allows for:
        - Increased fighting between foxes, which can lead to lethal infections.
        - Increased spread of disease between foxes.
        - Foxes learning to cross the road daily to access food sources, increasing road mortality.
    - Foxes living in human environments (e.g., in Avalon, where they are fed) are generally unhealthier and flea-ridden than are foxes elsewhere on the island.
    - Once animals learn to beg they may be unable to unlearn the behavior.
    - Once personnel are permitted to feed animals it is very challenging to convince them to stop.
- Cover buckets and holes and ensure that doors to bathrooms and tents are closed.
    - Island fox and small terrestrial animals are prone to getting caught in small areas and holes, where they may die due to starvation or drowning.
    - Leave no open holes. If a hole cannot be permanently filled before the end of a working day, it must be *completely and securely* covered using tarp, plywood, rocks, etc. Foxes (and other wildlife) may access holes through even a small sliver of an opening, leading to potential mortality.
- Do not leave any open containers that can collect water.
    - Island Foxes drown in open containers every year.
- Use only designated restroom facilities and keep doors closed.
    - In large concentrations, both forms of human excrement can attract wildlife, change the soil chemistry, and kill native plants.
    - Foxes can easily fall into portable toilets if the door is left open.
- If a fox is present at a work area, work must cease until the fox moves out of the way to avoid harassment per the endangered species act.
- Because foxes are skilled at getting inside tents, all personal food and scented items must be secured in airtight plastic totes or Tupperware.
- Ensure doors to tents and buildings are closed during the day so wildlife cannot enter.
- All trash cans and dumpsters shall have functional sealing lids, as animals can be trapped in unsecured trash cans.
- Trash or debris cannot be allowed to accumulate and blow away. Foxes and other wildlife are known to eat plastic, trash, and food scraps.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- If a bat is seen during the daytime, do not touch as this may be a sign of rabies. Immediately inform the Biological Monitor and/or a Catalina Island Conservancy biologist right away.
- Do not touch or interfere with any wildlife found on site. If an animal needs to be relocated, please call the Biological Monitor and/or a Conservancy biologist right away.
- Do not walk off trail outside of the work site.
- If bison are on the runway, call Rangers to move them along. Only authorized personnel are permitted to move the bison, and people failing to interact correctly with bison can be badly injured.

5.1.2 Pre-Project Nesting Bird Survey

Under federal and/or state law, virtually all bird species are protected from disruption of active nesting. If project activities take place during the nesting season (generally February 1 to August 31), and the Biological Monitor determines that potential exists for birds to nest within or adjacent to the work area, the Biological Monitor shall conduct a pre-project nesting bird survey no more than one week prior to the planned start of work. If the active nest of a bird is found, a protective buffer shall be implemented using the methods described in Appendix H (Nesting Bird Management Plan).

5.1.3 Restrictions on the Use of Herbicides

As reviewed in Section 2, ten endemic plant species are known from Catalina Island, along with numerous other taxa given California Rare Plant Ranks by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) and the State of California. As reviewed in Section 1.5.3, restoration work will generally employ only narrow-leaf herbicides that target grasses. If a situation arises that calls for the use of broad-leaf or pre-emergent herbicides, any such use would be highly targeted and carefully planned to avoid or minimize any potential impacts to endemic/special-status plants.

5.1.4 Restoration Site Protection Measures

Temporary Fencing and Signage

In order identify restoration areas that adjacent to public access along approved trails and roads, a temporary perimeter fencing shall be installed along the public access route (e.g., yellow nylon rope strung on T-posts placed 30 feet on-center). Additionally, signs (e.g., all weather, anti-graffiti red with white lettering) designating the sensitivity of the habitat shall be placed on the yellow rope to discourage unauthorized entry. The temporary fencing and signage shall be removed at the end of the project.

Pre-Work Restoration Crew Briefings

Restoration crews shall receive environmental awareness training, as described in Section 5.1.1. Before a restoration crew works in a new site, the Biological Monitor shall provide the restoration crew a pre-work briefing that discusses the work methodology, permits, plant identification, protected species/resources present, and applicable

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

avoidance and minimization measures. Resources that can be provided to the restoration crew for field reference include laminated color printouts, or electronic versions (e.g., accessible on a smart phone), of the targeted invasive species, common or sensitive native plant species, and sensitive wildlife species.

BIOLOGICAL MONITORING OF INITIAL WEED DETHATCHING EVENT

At the beginning of most active restoration projects, the accumulated dead nonnative litter (or thatch) will be removed prior to beginning the weed grow-and-kill cycles. This initial detaching event will occur after the end of the bird breeding season and before the start of large winter rainfall events that will limit project access (i.e., between September 1 to approximately October 31). All vegetation removal activities will be monitored by a qualified biological monitor to ensure that no adverse impacts to biological resources occur. Vegetation removal shall not be conducted when rain is forecast (with greater than 50 percent probability to occur) at the work site within 12 hours, or within 24 hours after a rainfall event.

PROJECT ACCESS

No grading or construction of access roads will occur. Access by work crews will follow established paths that will be identified by the Conservancy for restoration crews, thereby avoiding impacts to native vegetation.
Crews will use natural openings in the vegetation or existing trails for access. Native tree and shrub branches with diameters less than two inches may be cut with the approval of the biological monitor if clearance is needed for accessing an area for vegetation removal. Crews will not create new paths into areas with dense riparian habitat or other native vegetation; existing game trails or other access trails will be used while minimizing impacts to native vegetation as much as possible.

MEASURES TO PREVENT SPREAD OF INVASIVE SPECIES

The spread or introduction of nonnative, invasive plant and animal species will be avoided using the following techniques. Vehicles will be pressured washed before arriving at the island. Before vehicles or equipment are loaded on the barge or other shipping vehicle, use a high-pressure washer with secondary containment to prevent spills from traveling to surface water or drains.

STORAGE OF PROJECT MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE

Project managers will establish staging areas for equipment storage and maintenance, construction materials, fuels, lubricants, solvents, and other possible contaminants in coordination with resource agencies. The discharge of any hazardous materials into any receiving waters shall be prohibited.

Staging areas will have a stabilized entrance and exit and will be at least 100 feet from waterbodies, unless site-specific circumstances do not provide such a setback; in such cases, the maximum setback possible will be used. Fluids will be stored in appropriate containers with covers and will be properly recycled or disposed of off-site. Machinery stored on site will have pans or absorbent mats placed underneath potential leak areas.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

All herbicide mixing, cleaning and maintenance of equipment, and related work, shall be performed within staging areas along the road and outside of the bed and banks of the river and stream. Drip pans or drip cloths shall be used where necessary, and workers shall always have a fully stocked spill kit on-hand.

MATERIAL DISPOSAL

All refuse, debris, unused materials, and supplies that cannot reasonably be secured will be removed daily from the project work area and deposited at an appropriate disposal or storage site. All construction debris will be removed from the work area immediately on project completion.

FUGITIVE DUST REDUCTION

Stockpiled materials susceptible to wind-blown dispersal will be covered with plastic sheeting or other suitable material to prevent movement of the material.

TRASH REMOVED DAILY

During project activities all trash, especially food-related refuse that may attract potential predators or scavengers, will be properly contained in sealed containers, removed from the work site, and disposed of daily.

PEST CONTROL

Local wildlife such as rabbits, pocket gophers and other rodents are expected to browse on the plantings and seed material. If the Biological Monitor determines that restoration plantings are being significantly jeopardized by wildlife, corrective measures such as organic, non-toxic deterrents and protective fencing/plant cages may be used. Invertebrate pests are rarely a serious problem in seed-based habitat restoration project if site conditions are appropriate to the desired habitats.

5.1.5 CULTURAL RESOURCE PROTECTION

Catalina Island was inhabited by indigenous ocean-going tribes before European colonization. The entire island, especially burial sites and village use areas, hold significant cultural, historical, and spiritual value, even when it is located within developed areas. These lands serve as important connections to the past, providing a tangible link to the traditions, customs, and heritage of indigenous communities. They also play a critical role in preserving biodiversity, as they often contain unique ecosystems that have been shaped by traditional land management practices.

Protecting these lands is essential for maintaining cultural continuity and ensuring that future generations can continue to learn from and be inspired by the wisdom and knowledge of indigenous cultures. Moreover, recognizing and respecting the rights of indigenous peoples to their traditional territories is a fundamental aspect of promoting social justice and equity. By acknowledging and safeguarding the importance of these lands, the Conservancy can help to foster a more inclusive and culturally diverse society, while also contributing to the conservation of biological diversity and the sustainable use of natural resources.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

The Conservancy has conducted outreach with representatives of the Gabrieliño-Tongva tribes, including hosting a site visits to Catalina to discuss the Project. This outreach has resulted in the development of an ongoing Gabrieliño-Tongva Community Collaborative Group to continue dialogue between the Conservancy and the indigenous community. Several California and federal regulations help protect archaeological resources on private land, such as land owned by the Conservancy. Some of the key regulations include:

- The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their actions on historic properties, including those located on private land (54 U.S.C. § 300101 et seq.).
- The Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) makes it illegal to disturb, excavate, or remove any archaeological resource located on public or Indian lands without a permit, and imposes penalties for violating these provisions (16 U.S.C. § 470aa et seq.).
- The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) applies to both public and private lands, requiring the protection of Indigenous people cultural items and human remains and providing for their repatriation to lineal descendants and culturally affiliated tribes (25 U.S.C. § 3001 et seq.).
- The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires lead agencies to consider the potential impacts of projects on archaeological resources and to mitigate any significant impacts (Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21000 et seq.).
- The California Public Resources Code protects archaeological resources on both public and private land by prohibiting the unauthorized disturbance or removal of such resources (Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 5097.98 et seq.).
- The California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) protects archaeological and cultural resources on both public and private land by requiring notification of certain activities that may impact such resources (https://nahc.ca.gov/).

Documentation and maps of culturally sensitive areas, including indigenous and archaeological resources, will be consulted by the Conservancy during the planning stages of habitat restoration projects that may disturb the soil surface. Habitat restoration projects with significant soil disturbance will avoid culturally sensitive areas whenever possible. However, if a project with significant ecosystem benefits and/or wildlife conservation value conflicts with cultural resource protection, a Cultural Resource Protection Plan will be prepared. This plan will include:

1. Plan Purpose and Goals: Clearly define the objectives of the plan, including the need for monitoring, protection, and mitigation measures.
2. Project Description: Provide a detailed description of the proposed project, including its scope, location, and timeline.
3. Cultural Resources Assessment: Conduct a thorough assessment of the cultural resources that may be affected by the project, including an inventory of known and potential archaeological sites and traditional cultural places.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4. Monitoring Plan: Develop a plan for monitoring the project's impacts on cultural resources, including the establishment of a monitoring schedule, criteria for monitoring, and procedures for reporting and addressing adverse effects.
5. Protection Measures: Identify and implement measures to protect cultural resources during project implementation, such as temporary fencing, signage, and protective barriers.
6. Mitigation Plan: Develop a plan for mitigating any adverse impacts on cultural resources, including strategies for avoidance, minimization, and data recovery.
7. Consultation: Consult with relevant indigenous tribes, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and other stakeholders to ensure that their concerns and input are considered in the development and implementation of the plan.
8. Reporting: Establish procedures for reporting on the implementation of the monitoring, protection, and mitigation measures and for updating the plan as necessary.

5.2 SITE-SPECIFIC RESTORATION PROJECT BIOLOGICAL MONITORING

The Conservancy will provide oversight of the restoration crew, conduct biological monitoring, and prepare annual reports on the status of site-specific restoration projects.

The Conservancy Restoration Specialist will layout project limits and temporary fencing and educational signage (if required) locations for the restoration crew. Prior to initial work during the bird breeding season, a qualified biological monitor will conduct a nesting bird and general biological survey of the areas to be weeded and communicate the location and duration of any buffers to avoid disturbance of sensitive and protected species to the restoration crew.

5.2.1 HORTICULTURAL MONITORING

Timing and consistency of weed treatments is critical to the outcome active habitat restoration projects. While the infestation of California's natural communities by nonnative annual grasses (e.g., bromes, oats) is evident following two centuries of agricultural and ranching practices first introduced by Spanish missionaries (White 1967, Heady 1988), including the introduction of goats to Catalina Island in 1827 (Preston 1997)—the weed seed bank in the soil is diverse, including weedy forbs that become much more abundant as nonnative annual grasses are controlled (White and Holt 2005, Bell et al. 2013, Brooks et al. 2019). As a result, the Restoration Specialist must conduct regular horticultural monitoring to assess the phenology of weed growth to direct the appropriate timing of weed management events, which will change from season-to-season and year-to-year due weather, site, and weed seed germination rates. See Section 4.1.1 for the key principles of wholistic weed management for Catalina Island.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

5.2.2 PLANT ESTABLISHMENT MONITORING

After material is planted or seeded, then the Restoration Specialist shall conduct horticultural monitoring to direct the timing of irrigation events, weeding of plant container basins, and remedial weeding events in seeded areas. The health, development, and cover of native vegetative shall be estimated visually by site walk overs, performed regularly during weed management by the Restoration Specialist. The Restoration Specialist will keep track of annual spring survivorship of planted container material.

In general, monitor habitat restoration sites for at least two years after seeding, or after the end of the initial weed management program if seeding is not required, to monitor native seed establishment and evaluate the need for additional weeding (including high priority invasive plant control), remedial seeding, pest management, or any other necessary remedial actions.

RESTORATION PLANTING SURVIVORSHIP AND EMPIRICAL HABITAT SUITABILITY MODELING

The habitat restoration targets for island vegetation communities and restoration plant palettes presented in this HRMP are based in part on the output of species habitat suitability models (Appendix D). While this is a practical approach for modeling species and vegetation communities where there is limited data (Brooks et al. 2019, Dobrowski et al. 2011, Fortini et al. 2013, van der Wal et al. 2012), for instance due to a significant disturbance history and little to no pre-disturbance floristic records, there are inherent inaccuracies in the predictions. One of the assumptions of species distribution models, such as MaxEnt used in the planning of this HRMP, is that species occurrences and the environmental factors that influence its distribution are at equilibrium. However, because of climate change, some of the established long-lived native island plant species may already be experiencing climate stress and may not currently be in their optimal environmental niche.

Therefore, the Conservancy can use annual survivorship data collected in habitat restoration projects that include outplanted nursery grown container plants to develop empirically based species distribution models. An empirical model is a type of statistical model that is based on observed data and is used to describe or predict phenomena in the real world. Empirical models are derived from actual measurements and observations, rather than being based on theoretical assumptions. A recent example of this approach was conducted by Krushelnycky et al. (2023) for Haleakalā silversword (*Argyroxiphium sandwicense* subsp. *macrocephalum*) using restoration outplantings in Hawai‘i. These models can be used to validate or falsity the MaxEnt species distribution models developed for this plan (Appendix D) to better inform future habitat restoration work in a changing climate.

This approach to learn about site suitability for restoration plant material can be applied to seeded species. However, because the dynamics that influence seed germination are complex (e.g., site, weather, interspecific competition, facilitation, soil health) and not well understood, it could take many years for some seeded species to emerge, well

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

beyond the period when a restoration project is being actively managed and monitored. Therefore, evaluations of the suitability of site characteristics for seeded species should be assessed as part of long-term monitoring efforts, at least 5 to 10 years after the end of active project management.

5.2.3 PROJECT SUCCESS MONITORING

Each site-specific restoration project will develop success criteria to measure whether the project has achieved the core habitat restoration objectives. Typically, these are based on vegetation characteristics, such as cover and diversity. Wildlife and soil health measures may also be monitored depending on the goals and objectives of the site-specific restoration project. Guidelines for annual restoration project success monitoring are provided below.

Seed mix establishment and nursery grown container plant survivorship guidelines are provided in Appendix F, and can be adopted or modified, as appropriate for the restoration goals for the site, to be plant establishment success criteria to judge whether the revegetation goals were achieved. Irrigation guidelines are also provided in Appendix F.

HABITAT RESTORATION PROJECT MONITORING GUIDELINES

Qualitative monitoring methods, such as photo points, field walk overs, species lists and spring vegetation cover estimates, will be used to monitor the full extent of the restoration area in a cost-effective manner, while providing relevant feedback to guide management and restoration actions. Fixed photo points shall be established in critical viewsheds that document the key features of the restoration site. At each photo point, estimates of vegetation cover classes by plant functional group will be made annually to monitor the progress of the native revegetation and the trajectory of the individual habitat restoration areas. If there is high variability within the restoration area, additional photo and vegetation cover assessment points shall be added, if necessary, to ensure all conditions of the site are represented to track the progress of the site and to guide any necessary remedial actions.

PHOTO POINTS AND COVER ESTIMATES

Permanent photo points will be established to conduct photographic documentation of restoration progress and development of the restored habitat. Photo points shall be established prior to implementation to provide representative to provide a representative overview before restoration for comparison to “after photos” taken annually during performance monitoring. The geographic coordinates will be recorded using a sub-meter precision global positioning (GPS) along with the general compass direction for each photo location.

Photo points will be taken in spring, timed to capture maximum native cover of live annuals and perennial growth. If native annuals have senesced prior to sampling due to weather or timing, individual plants can be included in the cover estimate made at each

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

photo point if it is clearly based on morphology and/or prior biological monitoring determines what species they are and that they are from the current growing year.

At each photo point location, relevé samples will be used to estimate cover of key plant functional groups (e.g., total native, total nonnative, native tree, native shrub, native forbs, nonnnative forbs, nonnnative grass) in a plot of approximately 300 square meters (approximate 10-meter radius from the photo point) and assigned to one of the following modified Braun-Blanquet cover-abundance scale classes: <1%, 1- 5%, >5-15%, >15-25%, >25-50%, >50-75%, or >75%. These methods are modeled after the current "California Native Plant Society – California Department of Fish and Wildlife Protocol for Combined Vegetation Rapid Assessment and Relevé," which was last updated April 2016.

SPECIES LISTS

Annual plant species lists of native and nonnative species that occur in each of project zones will be prepared based on field walk overs throughout the year, including spring. Observations of flowering by species will be noted during monitoring activities and documented in the species list generated for the project.

Incidental observations of wildlife within the project will be recorded each year and maintained as a cumulative list.

5.3 LONG-TERM MONITORING PLAN

The Long-Term Monitoring Plan (LTMP) aims to collect and analyze essential biological data across Catalina Island's diverse habitats to better understand the status and changes in the island's ecology. This proactive monitoring approach allows for the identification of trends, impacts, and potential threats to the island's natural systems, enabling timely and informed management responses.

To achieve this, the LTMP integrates various ecological assessment methods to gather consistent and comprehensive data on vegetation, soil health, and wildlife, resulting in a robust database to guide management decisions. Long-term monitoring is crucial for assessing the progress and effectiveness of the defined goals of the Project, and for providing valuable feedback to adjust and adapt the Habitat Restoration and Management Plan (HRMP) and LTMP as needed.

This plan will leverage historic vegetation monitoring data collected during the 2000s by the Catalina Island Conservancy. The Conservancy conducted a series of comprehensive vegetation surveys throughout the island during this time, gathering essential floristic information for various conservation and research purposes. For example, monitoring efforts included:

- Post-fire recovery among burn sites around Goat Harbor and the Airport.
- Responses to nonnative grazer removal on the West End.
- Sensitive habitat surrounding rare and endangered plants in Wild Boar Gully.
- Vegetation dynamics in relation to land bird populations island wide.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

These datasets provide a valuable snapshot into the state of vegetation of Catalina Island in the 2000s following the removal of feral goats and pigs. Changes in the cover and diversity of plant species of island vegetation communities will provide the primary measures of habitat recovery from the Project.

In landscape-level projects, such as habitat restoration of Catalina Island, clearly defining goals at the outset is critical for successful long-term management. However, this can be challenging due to the involvement of multiple habitat types and the need to accommodate various land uses (Mills et al. 2023). By establishing clear objectives, management thresholds, and implementing a comprehensive LTMP, the Conservancy can better ensure the conservation and sustainable management of Catalina Island's unique habitats and biodiversity. The Conservancy reserves the right to modify this LTMP based to meet organizational goals and funding constraints.

5.3.1 Project Objectives and Target Thresholds

Establishing measurable and achievable objectives for the Project goals (see Section 1.5.1) is crucial. In the context of the LTMP, measurable objectives and target thresholds (presented in Table 5-1) guide how success will be measured. These thresholds help identify when remedial management actions are needed. Having clearly defined and specific objectives is essential for effective monitoring design and choosing the appropriate sampling techniques. Without clear objectives, there is a risk of conducting unnecessary sampling or using improper methodologies. In the case of the LTMP, it is likely that multiple staff members will be involved in its implementation and monitoring. Having clear goals, objectives, and well-defined monitoring methodologies will ensure that all team members are on the same page, leading to more accurate and reliable results from repeated measurements.

Monitoring results will provide a feedback loop to allow for adaptive management, which could include adjustments to management actions, the LTMP, and/or the HRMP strategies, as needed. Sampling will be done in conjunction with each other as applicable for a more dynamic and robust data set and provide a clearer picture of ecosystem health. This will also aid in finding causal relationships between variables such as the relationship between changes in native vegetation cover and wildlife health and abundance. Analyses of long-term monitoring data will help with determining which efforts were most successful in restoring the biotic communities as well as gain a better understanding of the biological processes that are important for the long-term health of the island.

Long-term monitoring variables include measuring changes in vegetation cover and species richness, tracking wildlife occupancy and diversity, determining erodibility and water infiltration of the soil, and tracking invasive species under the CIPP program. Methods will include remote sensing techniques to look at broad changes in vegetation community structure, qualitative and quantitative sampling to assess vegetation composition and structure with field level sampling, photo monitoring, soil sampling, wildlife station monitoring, and invasive species mapping and control efficacy.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 5-1 Project Goals, Objectives, Monitoring Methods, and Management Actions.

Project Goal	Objective and Target Threshold	Monitoring Methods	Management Actions Passive Restoration Areas	Management Actions Active Restoration Areas
Increase Cover and Quality of Native Habitat for Wildlife	Increase of a Minimum of 15% in Native Cover Above Baseline and Species Richness and 20% increase in Wildlife (Number of Species and/or Population Size) 10 Years after Mule Deer Removal Compared to Baseline Conditions	• Remote Sensing Data, e.g., Landscape Change Monitoring System (LCMS) • Vegetation Plot Data • Vegetation Transect Data • Photo Point Monitoring • Wildlife Monitoring Stations	• Increase Intensity and/or Extent of Invasive Species Control Efforts or Change Control Method • Increase Scope of Weed Control to Include other Competitive Nonnative Weed Species • Determine if Native Seed Bank is Limited and Add Native Seed Propagules with Seeding in Selective Areas	• Increase Intensity and/or Extent of Invasive Species Control Efforts or Change Control Method • Increase Scope of Weed Control to Include other Competitive Nonnative Weed Species • Remedial Seeding in Areas with <5% Native Cover • Adjust Irrigation Application for Container Plantings • Replanting if <80% Survivorship of Container Plants after the First Season
Improve Health and Vigor of Island Endemic Populations (Plant and Wildlife)	Increase of 30% in Population Size and Distribution 10 Years after Mule Deer Removal Compared to Baseline Conditions	• Vegetation Plot Data • Vegetation Transect Data • Photo Point Monitoring • Wildlife Monitoring Stations • Wildlife Health Sampling	• Increase Intensity and/or Extent of Invasive Species Control Efforts or Change Control Method • Increase Scope of Weed Control to Include other Competitive Nonnative Weed Species • Determine if Native Seed Bank is Limited and Add Native Seed Propagules with Seeding in Selective Areas	• Increase Intensity and/or Extent of Invasive Species Control Efforts or Change Control Method • Increase Scope of Weed Control to Include other Competitive Nonnative Weed Species • Remedial Seeding in Areas with <5% Native Cover • Adjust Irrigation Application for Container Plantings • Replanting if <80% Survivorship of Container Plants after the First Season

Project Goal	Objective and Target Threshold	Monitoring Methods	Management Actions Passive Restoration Areas	Management Actions Active Restoration Areas
Soil Stabilization in Highly Erosive Areas	Soil Stability Increased to 10% of Baseline Conditions	• Soil Stability Test (e.g., Herrick et al. 2017) • Remote Sensing Data, e.g., Landscape Change Monitoring System (LCMS) • Vegetation Plot Data • Vegetation Transect Data • Photo Point Monitoring		• Determine BMP and Install Erosion Control Measures • Increase Invasive Plant Species Control Efforts to Improve Native Plant Establishment • Remedial Seeding in Areas with <5% Native Cover • Adjust Irrigation Application for Container Plantings • Replanting if <80% Survivorship of Container Plants after the First Season Remedial Seeding in
Increase Water Retention in the Soil	Soil Infiltration Rate Improved by 10% of Baseline Conditions	• Soil Infiltration Test (e.g., Herrick et al. 2005) • Remote Sensing Data, e.g., Landscape Change Monitoring System (LCMS) • Vegetation Plot Data • Vegetation Transect Data • Photo Point Monitoring	• Increase Invasive Plant Species Control Efforts to Improve Native Plant Establishment	• Increase Invasive Plant Species Control Efforts to Improve Native Plant Establishment • Remedial Seeding in Areas with <5% Native Cover • Adjust Irrigation Application for Container Plantings • Replanting if <80% Survivorship of Container Plants after the First Season Remedial Seeding in
Control, Reduce, and Eradicate Invasive Species Populations	Invasive Species Populations Decreasing and no New Populations Detected	• CIPP Monitoring • Vegetation Plots • Vegetation Transects • Photo Monitoring	• Increase Intensity of Invasive Species Control • Investigate and Implement Alternative Control Methods to Improve Efficacy of Treatments	• Increase Intensity of Invasive Species Control • Investigate and Implement Alternative Control Methods to Improve Efficacy of Treatments

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Project Goal	Objective and Target Threshold	Monitoring Methods	Management Actions Passive Restoration Areas	Management Actions Active Restoration Areas
			• Modify Goals on a Species-by-Species Basis, e.g., Change from Island Wide Eradication to Eradication from Specific Watershed Management Unit(s)	• Modify Goals on a Species-by-Species Basis, e.g., Change from Island Wide Eradication to Eradication from Specific Watershed Management Unit(s)

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

5.3.2 Vegetation Structure and Composition Monitoring Methods

Vegetation monitoring will be done through remote sensing techniques and field sampling using qualitative and quantitative sampling methods.

Remote Sensing (Satellite-Based Data Collection)

Remote sensing techniques can give a broad overview of changes in vegetation structure, for example detecting increases and decreases in shrubland/woodland habitats. Following the vegetation change approach used to assess land cover change since 1985 for this HRMP (see Appendix C), the Conservancy can periodically measure whole island change in vegetation life-form change. The Landscape Change Monitoring System (LCMS) is a remote sensing-based system developed by the USFS to map and monitor landscape change across the United States. The system uses satellite imagery and other remote sensing data to map changes in land cover, land use, and other landscape characteristics. The data is made publicly available through the Forest Service's Geodata Clearinghouse, allowing researchers, land managers, and policymakers to access and analyze the information.
It is recommended to obtain the vegetation classification data in the same year the qualitative and quantitative vegetation sampling is occurring and compare it to the previous monitoring year to detect changes. If needed, vegetation classification data is produced every year if a significant event such as a fire occurs to see changes on shorter time scale.

High-Resolution Remote Sensing (Unoccupied Aircraft Systems, UAS)

Recent advancements in commercially available Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) and Structure from Motion (SfM) technology offer potential enhancements for monitoring vegetation characteristics over larger areas or detecting changes that may be impractical to observe using traditional ground-based methods. The Conservancy should consider combining UAS-derived SfM vegetation classifications and vegetation structure data with line transect data.

This integrated approach can provide valuable insights into the condition and dynamics of various vegetation types, including ironwood groves and avian habitat. By leveraging these cutting-edge technologies, the Conservancy can optimize its monitoring efforts, detect subtle changes in vegetation structure and composition, and ultimately make more informed decisions regarding habitat restoration and management strategies.

Field Transect Sampling

The Conservancy will establish long-term permanent monitoring plots stratified randomly across the island. The primary quantified method for monitoring vegetation will be a series of point-intercept transects. This quantitative method gives more accurate precision than other ocular methods to measure percent coverage, diversity, species richness, and composition. The vegetation monitoring transects protocol is aligned with the National Park Service and The Nature Conservancy's strategies to allow for cohesive long-term monitoring of island flora across the archipelago.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

A total of approximately 50 permanent vegetation monitoring samples are planned, which equates to about one transect per 350 hectares of the Conservancy-managed land, which totals about 17,000 hectares (Figure 5-1). These transects were randomly selected from a combination of pre-existing datasets of Airport Burn, Goat Harbor, Wild Boar Gully, the West End, and Land Bird Monitoring. Randomly selected transects were drawn from each habitat type within these datasets to maximize observations across various plant communities.

Baseline vegetation monitoring will be conducted prior to the implementation of this HRMP to establish a comparative dataset for assessing changes in vegetation over time. This initial monitoring will serve as a reference point against which the Conservancy can evaluate the effectiveness of restoration efforts and track progress toward island restoration goals. Additionally, this dataset will allow comparison of the responses of vegetation to the eradication of pigs, sheep, and goats from the island with the datasets collected in the early 2000s. This will provide valuable insights into the long-term effects of these conservation measures.

After the baseline monitoring, the Conservancy will conduct LTMP surveys approximately every 5 to 10 years. The Conservancy will adjust the frequency of monitoring surveys as needed, based on the specific restoration efforts being implemented and the resources available. These surveys will help assess changes in vegetation after the removal of mule deer and the effectiveness of active habitat restoration projects over time.

An additional 10 new transects will be established to track vegetation recovery from the 2007 Island Fire and the 2021 Middle Ranch Fire. The Conservancy plans to begin monitoring 30 core vegetation sample sites to establish a baseline, pre-project condition for this Plan (Table 5-2). Thirty additional transects have been identified (Table 5-3) that will be monitored along with the core 30 sites on a schedule of at least every 5 to 10 years to document changes in the composition, diversity and structure of Catalina's natural communities as they recovery from fire and the removal of invasive mule deer. Care should be taken to avoid disturbance from repeated measures of the sample locations, and sampling should be a minimum of five years apart to allow for vegetation recovery from trampling for access to and sampling of transect locations.

The point-intercept transects are thirty meters long and established using vinyl measuring tape stretched in a straight line with two rebar posts securely pounded into the ground at each end of the transect. Metal tags are secured to the rebar with the transect ID noted and protected with PVC pipe to preserve the rebar and tags from the elements.

During the transect monitoring effort, monitors will stretch the vinyl measuring tape to each rebar post in a straight thirty-meter line above ground level. Monitors will place a measuring rod downward to the ground every thirty centimeters along the 30-meter tape for a total of one hundred points. A photo will be taken at either side of the transect showing the location and line being recorded.



Figure 5-1 Long-Term Vegetation Monitoring Sites

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 5-2 Long-Term Vegetation Monitoring—Primary Sites

Transect ID	Location	Plant Community Type
AB02	Airport Burn	Island chaparral & Coastal sage scrub
AB11	Airport Burn	Island chaparral & Coastal sage scrub
GH06	Goat Harbor	Scrub oak chaparral
GH12	Goat Harbor	Coastal Sage Scrub
GH20	Goat Harbor	Grassland
GH22	Goat Harbor	Catalina cherry stand
GH25	Goat Harbor	Ironwood groves
GH27	Goat Harbor	Ironwood groves
LB03	Land Bird	Grassland
LB11	Land Bird	Grassland
LB22	Land Bird	Coastal Sage Scrub/Grassland
LB36	Land Bird	Southern Oak Woodland
LB39	Land Bird	Grassland
LB49	Land Bird	Island Chaparral/Coastal Sage Scrub
LB56	Land Bird	Grassland
LB60	Land Bird	IW/Island Chaparral
LB79	Land Bird	Southern Oak Woodland
LB80	Land Bird	Coastal Sage Scrub/Grassland
WB01	Wild Boar Gully	Grassland
WB05	Wild Boar Gully	Coastal sage scrub
WB07	Wild Boar Gully	Scrub oak chaparral
WB13	Wild Boar Gully	Grassland
WB14	Wild Boar Gully	Grassland
WB17	Wild Boar Gully	Coastal sage scrub
WE02	West End	Island woodland - *Lyonothamnus floribundus*
WE05	West End	Island woodland - *Prunus ilicifolia*
WE08	West End	Island chaparral - *Adenostoma fasciculatum*
WE09	West End	Coastal Sage Scrub
WE10	West End	Island chaparral - *Quercus pacifica*
WE14	West End	Grassland

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 5-3 Long-Term Vegetation Monitoring—Secondary Sites

Transect ID	Location	Plant Community Type	Sampling Cycle Group
MF01	Middle Fire	Coastal Sage Scrub - Burn site	1
MF02	Middle Fire	Coastal Sage Scrub - Burn site	1
MF03	Middle Fire	Coastal Sage Scrub - Burn site	1
MF04	Middle Fire	Coastal Sage Scrub - Burn site	1
MF05	Middle Fire	Coastal Sage Scrub - Burn site	1
AB04	Airport Burn	Island chaparral & Coastal sage scrub	1
FH18	Goat Harbor	Grassland	1
GH13	Goat Harbor	Coastal Sage Scrub	1
GH14	Goat Harbor	Scrub oak chaparral	1
GH7	Goat Harbor	Scrub oak chaparral	1
B/IC12	Island Fire	Bare/Island chaparral	2
GR/IC5	Island Fire	Grassland/ Island chaparral	2
GR/IC9	Island Fire	Grassland/ Island chaparral	2
IW5	Island Fire	Island woodland	2
NNS/IC1	Island Fire	Non-native scrub/ Island chaparal	2
29	Land Bird	Grassland	2
LB16	Land Bird	Island Chaparral/Grassland	2
LB21	Land Bird	NNH/Grassland	2
LB34	Land Bird	Southern Oak Woodland/Grassland	2
LB44	Land Bird	Island Chaparral/Coastal Sage Scrub/Grassland	2
LB48	Land Bird	Coastal Sage Scrub	3
LB71	Land Bird	Grassland	3
WE03	West End	Island woodland - Lyonothamnus floribundus	3
WE07	West End	Island chaparral - Adenostoma fasciculatum	3
WE13	West End	Grassland	3
WE17	West End	Coastal Sage Scrub	3
WB03	Wild Boar Gully	Grassland	3
WB06	Wild Boar Gully	Coastal sage scrub	3
WB11	Wild Boar Gully	Grassland	3
WB12	Wild Boar Gully	Scrub oak chaparral	3

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

At each point, monitors will identify each plant that touches the measuring rod, and for woody vegetation, the height and age class. The substrate of each transect will be recorded.

In addition to the point-intercept data, a list of all plant species observed within a one-meter buffer on the uphill slope of the 30-meter tapeline and any additional species within a five-meter buffer on either side will be recorded. For all rooted shrubs within one meter of the tapeline on the uphill side, the number of individuals will be recorded with notes on their various life stages. The same notes will be taken for rooted trees within five- meters on either side of the tapeline while also measuring the diameter-at-breast-height (DBH) of the largest size class trees in the established boundary. From this combined data, the Conservancy can accurately calculate and assess changes in the percent coverage of species, native and non-native plant species richness, plant community structure and composition, diversity, etc.

The selected sampling sites will be stratified by slope, elevation, vegetation type, distance from roads, and distance from other points. Samples will be divided between low elevation areas in drainages as well as ridge lines and hillsides. Additional sample points may be added as needed in areas with active restoration or if a particular habitat is underrepresented. It is recommended that each of the key vegetation habitat types is represented in the sample points, which include island chaparral, island scrub oak chaparral, coastal sage scrub, maritime cactus scrub and grassland.

Monitoring will be conducted in late winter to early summer depending on weather variables and plant phenology to capture the vegetation characteristics at the height of the growing season. The vegetation transect sampling techniques will align with the transect monitoring protocol used by the National Park Service and The Nature Conservancy on the Channel Islands to allow for a larger comparison among California Pacific Islands. Where appropriate, vegetation rapid assessments will be conducted in addition to transects and will follow the current California Native Plant Society – California Department of Fish and Wildlife Protocol for Combined Vegetation Rapid Assessment and Relevé, which was last updated April 2016.

5.3.3 PHOTO MONITORING

Like the vegetation transect data, a historical collection of photo monitoring sites have been established throughout the island. These sites were established in previous decades to visually interpret physical and biological aspects of the landscape over time. The Conservancy plan to use a subset of these photo monitoring points that will be used for the long-term monitoring by capturing repeated photos after removal of mule deer.

Three-foot metal rebars were pounded one foot into the ground and marked with metal identification tags at each photo monitoring sight. Photos will be taken digitally (e.g., using smartphones). A digital application may be used to transpose previously recorded photos with a transparent overlay feature to accurately match previous landscape photos of the same location.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Twenty-one photo monitoring sites were selected from a collection of sites previously established in 2005-2007 (Figure 5-2). The Conservancy plans to continue capturing photos from these sites every five years to visually monitor and assess changes and trends to the landscape over time. Imagery captured using unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) can also augments photo monitoring documentation.

5.3.4 WILDLIFE MONITORING

As part of the Island-wide restoration project, the Conservancy has developed a long-term monitoring strategy for measuring the response of bird and bat species to deer removal and active restoration activities. The negative impact of high deer densities on bird species, particularly ground and mid-story nesting songbirds, is well documented (Crystal-Ornelas et al. 2021, Phillips and Cristol 2024). Deer can have an outsized effect on these bird species through reducing habitat structural diversity and foraging habitat quality, as well as directly through nest depredations (Phillips and Cristol 2024). The impact on bat species is less direct, but the reduction in vegetation diversity and structure can reduce insect availability, the primary prey of most bat species on Catalina (Stewart 2001, Allombert et al. 2005). To monitor the response of bird and bat species to the removal of deer and vegetation restoration initiatives, the Conservancy will use non-invasive acoustic recorders to look at species richness and occurrence across the island for both taxa.

The Conservancy will monitor birds with acoustic recorders set up at 30 to 35 locations annually for 8 weeks between May and June. In addition, the Conservancy will deploy an additional 10 to 15 acoustic recorders in areas with current or planned habitat restoration activities. The Conservancy will choose locations through a stratified random sampling of sites from a pool of locations with prior or future vegetation monitoring and may alter or add locations as needed based on access and habitat type. The Conservancy will also collect additional habitat data on vegetation structure and cover each year at each acoustic site. The Conservancy chose to collect data in late spring/early summer to coincide with vegetation sampling and to capture primarily breeding bird activity. The acoustic stations will include one AudioMoth (low-cost, full-spectrum acoustic logger designed to record a wide range of audible and ultrasonic frequencies) attached to the top of a pole approximately 6 ft high. The recorders will be set away from trees to avoid picking up rustling leaves and pointed to the most open area. These methodologies follow the protocol set up by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) for their biodiversity and climate sentinel monitoring sites.

The Conservancy will use the acoustic records to look at species richness throughout the island, as well as changes in specific species occurrence over time. The Conservancy will monitor 4 to 6 species for each nesting category: ground, midstory, and upper story/canopy. Possible species of interest include the San Clemente spotted towhee (ground nesting), chipping sparrow (mid-story nesting), and the Hutton's vireo (upper story/canopy nesting). The Conservancy predicts ground and mid-story nesters are impacted more by deer presence and will respond more quickly while canopy nesters are less affected and will respond more slowly or not at all (Chollet et al. 2014).



Figure 5-2 Long-Term Photo-Monitoring Sites

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

The bird acoustic data will be processed using the machine learning program BirdNET through Cornell University (Kahl et al. 2021).

The Conservancy will be monitoring bat species at 10 locations around the island. Two of the locations have had a permanent recording station deployed on site since 2019. The Conservancy will monitor an additional 8 sites for one month in the spring and one month in the fall. Because the Conservancy only has 4 acoustic devices, they will split up the monitoring so 4 sites will be monitored in May/September, and 4 sites will be monitored in June/October. This period will coincide with spring pupping activity and with fall migration. The additional 8 sites will be selected for high quality bat habitat to increase the chances of monitoring all 10 bat species on island. The acoustic records will be processed using the program SonoBat.

By monitoring bird and bat species from the initial stages of deer removal throughout the subsequent stages of the Project, they will be able to determine if the project goals and objectives are being met (Table 5-1). If the Conservancy are not seeing predicted species recovery that will be an indication for a review of the environmental and anthropogenic threats our island flora and fauna species are facing, then they can then address any shortcoming of the current habitat restoration efforts and implement appropriate changes to better address those threats.

5.3.5 Insect Monitoring

As part of the long-term monitoring strategy, the Conservancy will track insects in addition to vegetation on the island. With this data, the Conservancy will incorporate insect relative abundance and diversity to assess the ecosystem health island wide. The Conservancy will collaborate with the California Insect Barcoding Initiative (CIBI) to collect and process genetic samples of insects on the island. The Conservancy plan to collect these samples every five to ten years to monitor changes beginning in 2024 as a baseline dataset.

To make these insect collections, the Conservancy will establish three insect monitoring sites using Townes' style malaise traps for six months (April to September) during the peak insect collecting months. The Conservancy will establish these three sites in areas with the greatest concentration of vegetation transects on the West End, Goat Harbor, and Wild Boar Gully. These traps are a netted system that funnels insects into pre-labeled collection bottles filled with 95% ethanol. The bottles capturing samples will be retrieved once per month for analysis using eDNA to genetically barcoded using eDNA. These samples will allow the Conservancy to collect and interpret insect diversity, species richness, biomass and relative abundance. All samples will be intact after sequencing, allowing for morphological and taxonomic data to be available for further entomological studies if desired.

5.3.6 Soil Monitoring

Soil monitoring will consist of looking at key characteristics to determine if soil conditions are improving to provide for more stable and healthier native habitat. Soil characteristics will include monitoring soil stability and soil water retention. A key

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

component for restoration in steep areas is to improve upon soil stability and reduce the chances of soil erosion including rilling, landslides, and deposition of soil material at the toe of slopes or in drainages. Soil water retention is expected to improve with the conversion of degraded areas that were once dominated by nonnative weed species to native habitat and vegetation communities. UAVs can also be incorporated to monitor soil condition at landscape level.

SOIL STABILITY IN HIGHLY EROSIVE AREAS

Soil stability is critical for native habitat establishment and resilience. Disturbance from erosive actions generally decreases native vegetation thereby allowing for the increase in nonnative weed species that thrive and can outcompete natives through early and rapid establishment following disturbances.

Several applicable methods may be used to monitor soil stability in highly erosive areas. One method may be the Soil Stability Test (Herrick et al. 2017) that involves sampling surface and, in some cases, subsurface samples to determine the soil stability class ranking. Ideally sampling should occur at the vegetation sampling locations at the same time to provide a more robust data set. Sampling protocol including methods for sampling in conjunction with vegetation monitoring are described in the Monitoring Manual for Grassland, Shrubland, and Savanna Ecosystems Volume I by Herrick et al. (2017).

SOIL WATER RETENTION

Soil water retention and infiltration capacity are expected to improve through passive and active restoration activities with the increase in native perennial vegetation and lessening of nonnative vegetation cover. Improvement will help to reduce stormwater runoff, decrease erosion, and increase groundwater recharge, ultimately benefitting the island's freshwater supply. The deep-rooted nature of perennial species will allow for more water capture and storage deep in the soil thereby making it available for plants during times of drought and will increase soil stabilization making steep hillsides less prone to erosion. The reduction in runoff and erosion will decrease the amount of nitrogen and suspended sediments in stormwater runoff and into open water areas. Several methods may be used for monitoring soil water retention with one method being described in Monitoring Manual for Grassland, Shrubland, and Savanna Ecosystems Volume II by Herrick et al. (2005). The monitoring method includes field tests to determine the soil infiltration rate, or the measure of how fast water enters the soil. The method includes using a single-ring infiltrometer in the field under saturated conditions to determine the relative infiltration capacity. As with the soil stability test, for a more rigorous sampling effort the soil infiltration rate can be sampled in the same locations and coincident with the vegetation sampling points and transects.

5.3.7 INVASIVE SPECIES CONTROL MONITORING

Invasive species control has been a key component of island management for several decades and is incorporated as a key restoration action of this plan. The CIPP program has been implemented since 2004 with the mission of the program being to "ensure the

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

continued domination of the ecosystems of Catalina Island by native plants for the immediate and long-term future" (Appendix A). Since complete eradication is not possible for all invasive species a three-tiered approach is implemented that includes targeted invasive species control, (e.g., along roadsides or high value watershed management units), education of the public to stop the spread of invasive species on the island, and complete eradication from the island for long-term habitat benefits. Monitoring efforts for invasive species will follow the monitoring currently implemented for the Conservancy's CIPP program. Ad hoc surveys while en route or while conducting other monitoring activities can be done to increase chances of early detection of new invasive species or expansion of known invasive populations on the island. A mapping protocol has been developed for the island and is presented in the Appendix A. It is also a key component of the CIPP program to diligently monitor after weed treatment events to track the efficacy of control methods.

5.3.8 Other Monitoring Methods

The Conservancy is considering innovative monitoring approaches, including a collaboration with CALeDNA to conduct an eDNA study in conjunction with other vegetation and sampling at the same monitoring sites. This sampling would involve collecting approximately 5 to 10 small vials of soil from each monitoring site to test for DNA. This would assist the Conservancy in understanding the changes in the invertebrate and microbial communities at these locations and could provide valuable additional indicators for successful versus failed restoration efforts.

5.4 Assess and Adapt

Monitoring results will be used to compare against the decision support tool values, which are thresholds for when management actions are necessary to achieve the defined goals in the LTMP and the HRMP. The decision support tools, and management actions are different for passive and active restoration areas because of the level of effort and time scale of change for both methods.

5.4.1 Passive Restoration Areas

For passive restoration, the time span for reaching the Project goals will be longer since it will take some time for natural recovery to occur after releasing the areas from the browsing pressure of the mule deer and for vegetation recovery after a fire. The anticipated time frame is 5 to 10 years before monitoring should begin in passive restoration areas and every 5 to 10 years thereafter. If no detectable change is observed or native cover and/or species richness declines after 5 to 10 years, then management actions should be implemented based on the decision support tools to achieve the LTMP goals. The following are recommended remedial management actions that could be implemented to achieve native cover and species richness goals in passive restoration areas:

1. Changes in invasive species control intensity, extent, and/or methods

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2. Implement weed control of other target competitive nonnative plant species that are inhibiting native plant establishment
3. Remedial seeding in areas where the native seed bank is lacking

5.4.2 ACTIVE RESTORATION AREAS

In active restoration areas, monitoring should occur annually during site-specific habitat restoration project implementation to prescribe management actions in a timely manner if goals are not being achieved to ensure more successful restoration outcomes and to not backslide on the amount of effort that has already been input into the restoration area. The following are recommended remedial management actions that could be implemented to achieve native cover and species richness goals in active restoration areas:

1. Changes in invasive species control intensity, extent, and/or methods
2. Implement weed control of other target competitive nonnative plant species
3. Remedial seeding in large areas that failed to establish after one season
4. In areas with failing container plants, modify irrigation application as needed
5. Remedial planting in areas with less than 80 percent survivorship of container plantings

5.5 REPORTING

Reports detailing monitoring methodology and results are essential as reference documents for future staff to be able to conduct monitoring using the same methodology and to document vegetation, wildlife, and soil changes on the island. It is vital to fully understand what has been done in the past to be able to manage adaptively in the future. Adaptive management is near impossible if it is unknown or unclear what was done in the past for management and what the outcomes were after implementing management actions.

The recommended minimum reporting requirements would include the following:

1. Documenting what, how, when, and where monitoring occurred
2. Raw data, data analysis procedures, data analysis results
3. Documentation of any changes or variations to the monitoring procedure
4. Management actions that were implemented if goals were not achieved
5. Recommendations for future monitoring and management actions

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

6 REFERENCES

Adams, N. E., and Edmands, S. 2023. Genomic recovery lags behind demographic recovery in bottlenecked populations of the Channel Island fox, Urocyon littoralis. *Molecular Ecology*, *32*(15), 4151-4164.

Ashcraft, G. C. 1979. Effects of fire on deer in chaparral. California-Nevada Wildlife Transactions 1979:177-184.

Alexander B. A. 1994. Species-groups and cladistic analysis of the cleptoparastic bee genus Nomada (Hymenoptera: Apoidea). The University of Kansas Science Bulletin 55: 175–238. https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.776

Allen, E.B., Williams, K., Beyers, J.L., Phillips, M., Ma, S., D'Antonio, C.M. 2018. Chaparral Restoration. In: Underwood, E., Safford, H., Molinari, N., Keeley, J. (eds) Valuing Chaparral. Springer Series on Environmental Management. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-68303-4_13

Allombert, S., S. Stockton, and J. Martin. 2005. A Natural Experiment on the Impact of Overabundant Deer on Forest Invertebrates. *Conservation Biology* 19:1917–1929. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2005.00280.x>.

Anderson, K. 2007. Tending the wild: Native American knowledge and the management of California's natural resources. University of California Press, Berkeley, California.

Anderson, S. B. 2003. "Introduced axis deer (*Axis axis*) on Maui, Hawaii: History, current status, home range, grouping patterns, and a species account." 24.

Anthony, L. 2019. "Deer Wars: The Forest Awakens." *Hakai Magazine*, January 22.

Backlin, A. R., S. L. Compton, Z. B. Kahancza, and R. N. Fisher. 2004. Baseline biodiversity survey for Santa Catalina Island: Herpetofauna and ants with remarks on small mammals and others. U.S. Geological Survey final report submitted to Catalina Island Conservancy, Avalon, CA. 45 pp.

Bartel, S. L., Schamel, J. T., Parrino, B. A., Marshall, M. K., and Orrock, J. L. 2023. Channel Island foxes (*Urocyon littoralis*) are viable seed dispersal agents of toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*). *Western North American Naturalist*, *83*(1), 23-22.

Brumbaugh, R. W. 1980. Recent geomorphic and vegetal dynamics on Santa Cruz Island, California. In *The California Islands: proceedings of a multidisciplinary symposium. Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History, Santa Barbara, CA* (pp. 139-158).

Bean, L.J. and C.R .Smith. 1978. Gabrielino. Handbook of North American Indians California Volume 8. Robert F. Heizer, Editor, pp. 538-549. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Bean, L.J., H.F. Dobyns, M.K. Martin, R.W. Stoffle, S.B. Vane, and D.R.M. White. 1978. Persistence and Power: A Study of Native American Peoples in the Sonoran

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Desert and the Devers-Palo Verde High Voltage Transmission Line. Report Submitted by Cultural Systems Research, Inc. to Southern California Edison Company.

Beatty, S. W. and D. L. Licari. 1992. Invasion of fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*) into shrub communities on Santa Cruz Island, CA. *Madroño* 39:54-66.

Bell, C. E., J. Ekhoff, and M. Witter. 2013. Herbicides as a Tool for Rescuing the California State Grass, *Stipa pulchra*. Grasslands, Vol. 23, No. 4, Fall 2013. California Native Grasslands Association.

Berg, N., A. Hall, F. Sun, S. Capps, D. Walton, B. Langenbrunner, and D. Neelin. 2015. Twenty-first-century precipitation changes over the Los Angeles region. *Journal of Climate* 28:401-421.

Bernhardt, E. A., and T. J. Swiecki. 1991. Minimum input techniques for valley oak restocking. Pages 2-8 in U.S. Forest Service General Technical Report PSW-126, Albany, California, USA.

Beven, K.J. and M. J. Kirkby. 1979. A physically based, variable contributing area model of basin hydrology, Hydrological Sciences Bulletin, 24:1, 43-69.

Brady, N. C. and R.R. Weil. 2002. *The Nature and Properties of Soils.* Upper Saddle, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Blumler, M. A. 2018. What is the 'true' Mediterranean-type vegetation? Pages 117–139 in A. M. Greller, K. Fujiwara, and F. Pedrotti, editors. Geographical Changes in Vegetation and Plant Functional Types. Springer International Publishing.

Bohannon, R.G., and C. Reiss. 2004. Preliminary Geologic Map of Santa Catalina Island. General geology mapped by J.G. Vedder, S.Q. Boundy-Sanders, H. McClean, and R.G. Bohannon. The schist facies in the central part of the island after Platt (1975). Digitized and modified by B. Coleman and P. Rebl. Provided by the Catalina Island Conservancy.

Bowen, L., and D. Van Vuren. 1997. Insular endemic plants lack defenses against herbivores. *Conservation Biology*, *11*(5), 1249-1254.

Brennan, S., Laris, P. S., & Rodrigue, C. M. 2018. Coyote brush as facilitator of native California plant recovery in the Santa Monica Mountains. *Madroño*, *65*(1), 47-59.

Brooks, T., M. Griswold, T. Longcore, M. Riedel-Lehrke. 2019. Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Plan Update. For the Natural Communities Coalition. County of Orange Central and Coastal Subregion, Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan. March 14, 2019.

Butterworth, J. P., J. A. Jones, and S. Jones. 1993. Soil Form- ing Factors, Morphology, and Classification – Santa Cruz Island, California. Pages 39-44 *in* Hochberg, F. G. (ed.), Third California Islands Symposium – Recent Advances in Research on the California Islands. Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History, Santa Barbara, CA.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife. 2016. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Aquatic Invasive Species Disinfection/Decontamination Protocols. February. https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=92821&inline.

California Native Plant Society (CNPS). 2024. A Manual of California Vegetation, Online Edition. http://www.cnps.org/cnps/vegetation/; searched on June 30, 2024. CNPS, Sacramento, CA.

California Natural Diversity Database. 2024a. Special Vascular Plants, Bryophytes, and Lichens List. Current list of vegetative taxa considered to be rare, threatened, endangered, or otherwise "sensitive" by the State of California. List dated January 2024.

California Natural Diversity Database. 2023b. Special Animals List. Current list of wildlife taxa considered to be rare, threatened, endangered, or otherwise "sensitive" by the State of California. List dated January 2024.

California Natural Diversity Data Base. 2024c. Rarefind data and BIOS for U.S. Geologic Survey's Santa Catalina Island North, Santa Catalina Island South, Santa Catalina Island East, Santa Catalina Island West 7.5' topographic quadrangles; accessed online on February 23, 2024, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Biogeographic Data Branch.

California Soil Resources Lab. 2024. SoilWeb. California Soil Resources Lab in the Department of Air and Water Resources at the University of California, Davis, http://casoilresource.lawr. ucdavis.edu/soilweb-apps/

Catalina Island Conservancy. 2022. Information sheet: Catalina Island Endemic Species. https://catalinaconservancy.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/N1T-Endemic-species-guide_6_21_22.pdf

Carroll, M.C., L.L. Laughrin, and A.C. Bromfield. 1993. Fire on the California islands: does it play a role in chaparral and closed cone pine forest habitats? Pages 73–88 *in* F.G. Hochberg, editor, Third California Islands Symposium: recent advances in research on the California islands.

Chaney, S., and McEachern, K. 2000. Erosion control and revegetation on Santa Barbara Island in Channel Islands National Park. In Proceedings of the fifth California islands symposium (DH Browne, H. Chaney, and K. Mitchell, editors). Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History, Santa Barbara, California (p. 520).

Chavez, Y. 2017. Indigenous Artists, Ingenuity, and Resistance at the California Missions After 1769. *UCLA*. ProQuest ID: Chavez_ucla_0031D_15620. Merritt ID: ark:/13030/m54z035r. Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/355609rf

Cherny, Robert W.; Lemke-Santangelo, Gretchen; and de Castillo, Richard Griswold, "Competing Visions: A History of California" (2021). SMC Book Gallery 1. https://digitalcommons.stmarys-ca.edu/book-gallery/1

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Choi, Y. D., V. M. Temperton, E. B. Allen, A. P. Grootjans, M. Halassy, R. J. Hobbs, M. A. Naeth, and K. Torok. 2008. Ecological restoration for future sustainability in a changing environment. Ecoscience 15:53-64.

Chollet, S., C. Bergman, A. J. Gaston, and J.-L. Martin. 2014. Long-term consequences of invasive deer on songbird communities: Going from bad to worse? *Biological Invasions* 17:777–790. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10530-014-0768-0>.

Clark, R. A., Halvorson, W. L., Sawdo, A. A., & Danielsen, K. C. 1990. *Plant communities of Santa Rosa Island, Channel Islands National Park* (No. 42). University of California, NPS Cooperative Park Studies Unit.

Clemesha, R.E., Gershunov, A., Lawson, D.M., Longcore, T., MacDonald, B., Booker, M., Munson, B. and O'Connor, K., 2021. A high-resolution record of coastal clouds and fog and their role in plant distributions over San Clemente Island, California. *Environmental Research Communications*, *3*(10), p.105003.

Cockerell, T. D. A. 1939. The bees of the southern California islands. Proceedings of the California Academy of Sciences, 4th Series, Vol. 23, No. 28.

Collins, W.B. and Urness, P.J., 1983. Feeding behavior and habitat selection of mule deer and elk on northern Utah summer range. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, pp.646-663.

Cook, E.R., Woodhouse, C.A., Eakin, C.M., Meko, D.M. and Stahle, D.W., 2004. Long-term aridity changes in the western United States. *Science*, *306*(5698), pp.1015-1018.

Cook, B. I., T. R. Ault, and J. E. Smerdon. 2015. Unprecedented 21st century drought risk in the American Southwest and Central Plains. *Science Advances* 1:e1400082.

Cooper, K. 2011. Evaluation of the relationships between the RUSLE R-factor and mean annual precipitation. Unpublished Thesis Project, Colorado State University.

Côté, S. D., Rooney, T. P., Tremblay, J.-P., Dussault, C., and Waller, D. M. 2004. "Ecological Impacts of Deer Overabundance." *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* 113-147.

Cronemiller, F. P., and P. S. Bartholomew. 1950. The California mule deer in chaparral forests. California Fish and Game 36:343-365.

Cronk, Q. C. 1997. Islands: stability, diversity, conservation. *Biodiversity & Conservation*, *6*, 477-493.

Crystal-Ornelas, R., J. A. Brown, R. E. Valentin, C. Beardsley, and J. L. Lockwood. 2021. Meta-analysis shows that overabundant deer (Cervidae) populations consistently decrease average population abundance and species richness of forest birds. *Ornithological Applications* 123. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ornithapp/duab040>.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Danielson, K. C., and W. L. Halvorson. 1991. Valley oak seedling growth associated with selected grass species. Pages 9-11 in U.S. Forest Service General Technical Report PSW-126, Albany, California, USA.

Davis, A. S., J. Cardina, F. Forcella, G. A. Johnson, G. Kegode, J. L. Lindquist, E. C. Luschei, K. A. Renner, C. L. Sprague, and M. M. Williams. 2005. Environmental factors affecting seed persistence of annual weeds across the US corn belt. Weed Science 53:860–868.

Davis N. N., J. Badger, A. N. Hahmann, B. O. Hansen, N. G. Mortensen, M. Kelly, X. G. Larsén, B. T. Olsen, R. Floors, G. Lizcano, P. Casso, O. Lacave, A. Bosch, I. Bauwens, O. J. Knight, A. P. van Loon, R. Fox, T. Parvanyan, S. B. K. Hansen, D. Heathfield, M. Onninen, and R. Drummond. 2023. The Global Wind Atlas: A high-resolution dataset of climatologies and associated web-based application; *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, Volume 104: Issue 8, Pages E1507-E1525, August 2023, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-21-0075.1

Dennison, P. E., M. A. Moritz, and R. S. Taylor. 2008. Evaluating predictive models of critical live fuel moisture in the Santa Monica Mountains, California. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* 17:18-27.

Diffenbaugh, N. S., D. L. Swain, and D. Touma. 2015. Anthropogenic warming has increased drought risk in California. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112:3931-3936.

Ditzler, C.A., Ahrens, R.J. 2006. Development of Soil Taxonomy in the United States of America. *Eurasian Soil Science*. 39, 141–146. https://doi.org/10.1134/S1064229306020049

Dion, B. 2018. Flax-leaf broom on Catalina Island. Dispatch, Volume 26, Number 2. Cal-IPC.

Dobrowski, S. Z. et al. 2011. Modeling plant ranges over 75 years of climate change in California, USA: Temporal transferability and species traits. Ecol. Monogr. 81, 241–257.

Dong, C., Williams, A.P., Abatzoglou, J.T. et al. The season for large fires in Southern California is projected to lengthen in a changing climate. *Commun Earth Environ* 3, 22 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-022-00344-6

Duncan, C. L., King, J. L., & Kirkpatrick, J. F. 2013. Romance without responsibilities: the use of the immunocontraceptive porcine zona pellucida to manage free-ranging bison (Bison bison) on Catalina Island, California, USA. *Journal of Zoo and Wildlife Medicine*, S123-S131.

Duncan, C. L., J. L. King, and P. Stapp. 2017. Effects of prolonged immunocontraception on the breeding behavior of American bison. Journal of Mammalogy 98:1272–1287.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Dvorak, T. M. 2015. Checklist of the avifauna of Santa Catalina Island. Draft checklist dated November 12, 2015, prepared for the Catalina Island Conservancy. https://catalinaconservancy.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/Checklist_Santa-Catalina-IslandDraft_12Nov2015_TMD.pdf

Dvorak, T. M. and Catalano, A. E. 2016. "Exclusion of introduced deer increases size and seed production success in an island-endemic plant species." *Ecology and Evolution* 6(2): 544-551.

Eliason, S. A., and E. B. Allen. 1997. Exotic grass competition in suppressing native shrubland re-establishment. *Restoration Ecology* 5:245–255.

Espeland, E. K., and K. J. Rice. 2007. Facilitation across stress gradients: The importance of local adaptation. *Ecology* 88:2404-2409.

Fairchild Aerial Surveys, 1943. Historic Aerial Photographs. Flight C-8335, Frames 5-2 to 5-17 (total of 14 frames), Accessed May 13, 2023. Flown May 1943. Courtesy of UCSB Library Geospatial Collection.

Fick, S.E., Decker, C., Duniway, M.C., & Miller, M.E. (2016). Small-scale barriers mitigate desertification processes and enhance plant recruitment in a degraded semiarid grassland. *Ecosphere, 7*, e01354-n/a

Fortini, L. et al. 2013. A landscape-based assessment of climate change vulnerability for all native Hawaiian plants. In Technical Report HCSU-044, Hawai‘i Cooperative Studies Unit, University of Hawai‘i at Hilo.

Franklin, J., and D. A. Knapp. 2007. Habitat relationships and potential restoration sites for *Quercus pacifica* and *Q. tomentella* on Catalina Island. Pages 69—94 in D. A. Knapp, editor. Oak ecosystem restoration on Santa Catalina Island, California: Proceedings of an on-island workshop, February 2-7, 2007. Catalina Island Conservancy, Avalon, CA.

Fu, P., and P. M. Rich. 2000. The Solar Analyst 1.0 Manual. Helios Environmental Modeling Institute (HEMI), USA.

Fu, P., and P. M. Rich. 2002. "A Geometric Solar Radiation Model with Applications in Agriculture and Forestry." Computers and Electronics in Agriculture 37:25–35.

Gabet, E. and Dunne, T. 2002. Landslides on coastal sage-scrub and grassland hillslopes in a severe El Niño winter: The effects of vegetation conversion on sediment delivery. *Geological Society of America Bulletin* - 114. 983-990.

Garrambone, M. and S. Saroa. 2020. Seed-based Restoration: Scaling up for the Future. *Fremontia*, Vol. 48: 1.

Gelviz-Gelvez, S. M., N. P. Pavón, P. Illoldi-Rangel, and C. Ballesteros-Barrera. 2015. Ecological niche modeling under climate change to select shrubs for ecological restoration in Central Mexico. *Ecological Engineering* 74:302-309.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Gillespie, T. W., S. Ostermann-Kelm, C. Dong, K. S. Willis, G. S. Okin, and G. M. MacDonald. 2018. Monitoring changes of NDVI in protected areas of southern California. *Ecological Indicators* 88:485-494.

Gimmel, M. L., Johnston, M. A., Caterino, M .S. 2023. Annotated checklist of the beetles (Coleoptera) of the California Channel Islands. PeerJ. Mar 8;11:e14793. doi: 10.7717/peerj.14793. PMID: 36915664; PMCID: PMC10007975.

Golla, V. 2011. California Indian Languages. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Gordo, O., and J. J. Sanz. 2010. Impact of climate change on plant phenology in Mediterranean ecosystems. Global Change Biology 16:1082-1106.

Griffin, J. R. 1973. Valley oaks: the end of an era? Fremontia 1:5-9.

Gusick, A. E., J. Perry, K. Gill, and W. Teeter. 2021. A trans-holocene approach to assess maritime development on the California Channel Islands archipelago: A case study from Eel Point, San Clemente island. *Quaternary International* 597:37–49.

Guzman-Morales, J., & Gershunov, A. 2019. Climate change suppresses Santa Ana winds of Southern Californiaand sharpens their seasonality. Geophysical Research Letters,46,2772–2780. https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL080261

Hamilton Biological, Inc. 2021. Nesting Bird Management Plan, Huntington Beach Channel and Talbert Channel Sheet Pile Repair Project, Orange County, California. Report dated August 9, 2021, prepared for Reyes Construction, Inc., Pomona, CA.

Hardiman, M., A. C. Scott, N. Pinter, R. S. Anderson, A. Ejarque, A. Carter-Champion, and R. A. Staff. 2016. Fire history on the California Channel Islands spanning human arrival in the Americas. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 371:20150167.

Harlow, R. F., J. B. Whelan, H. S. Crawford, and J. E. Steen. 1975. Deer foods during years of oak mast abundance and scarcity. Journal of Wildlife Management 39:330-336.

Heady, H.F. 1988. "Valley grassland." In *Terrestrial Vegetation of California,* M.G. Barbour and J. Major, eds., 491–514. New York: Wiley Interscience, John Wiley and Sons.

Hendricks SA, King JL, Duncan CL, Vickers W, Hohenlohe PA, and Davis BW. 2022. Genomic Assessment of Cancer Susceptibility in the Threatened Catalina Island Fox (*Urocyon littoralis catalinae*). *Genes* 13(8):1496. https://doi.org/10.3390/genes13081496

Herrick, J.E., J.W. Van Zee, K.M. Havstad, L.M. Burkett, and W.G. Whitford. 2005. Monitoring Manual for Grassland, Shrubland and Savanna Ecosystems, Volume II: Design, supplementary methods and interpretation. USDA-ARS Jornada Experimental Range, NMSU, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Herrick, J.E., J.W. Van Zee, S.E. McCord, E.M. Courtright, J.W. Karl, and L.M. Burkett. 2017. Monitoring Manual for Grassland, Shrubland, and Savanna Ecosystems, Volume I: Core Methods. Second Edition. USDA-ARS Jornada Experimental Range, NMSU, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

Hochberg, F. G. Jr., Roth, B., and Miller, W. B. 1987. Rediscovery of *Radiocentrum avalonense* (Hemphill in Pilsbry, 1905) (Gastropoda: Pulmonata). Bulletin of the Southern California Academy of Sciences 86:1–12.

Housman, I.W.; Heyer, J.P.; Woodruff, C.; Lecker, J.; Megown, K.; Ross, J.; Pugh, N. 2023. US Forest Service Landscape Change Monitoring System Methods Version 2022.8. GTAC-10252-RPT3. Salt Lake City, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Geospatial Technology and Applications Center. 27 p.

Howard, V. 2000. Santa Catalina's soapstone vessels: Production dynamics. Pages 598–606 *in* D. R. Browne, K. L. Mitchell, and H. W. Chaney, editors. Proceedings of the fifth California Islands Symposium. Minerals Management Service, Camarillo, CA.

ICF International and Bloom Biological, Inc. 2011. Southern California Edison Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project, Segments 4–11, Nesting Bird Management Plan. Revised report dated August 2011 prepared for Southern California Edison, Brea, CA.

Jackson, L.E. 1985. Ecological origins of California's Mediterranean grasses. *Journal of Biogeography* 12: 349–361

Jacobs, D. K., Haney, T. A., & Louie, K. D. 2004. Genes, diversity, and geologic process on the Pacific coast. *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.*, *32*, 601-652.

Jacobsen, A.L., R.B. Pratt, and Alleman. 2018. "Post-fire ecophysiology of endemic chaparral shrub seedlings from Santa Catalina Island, southern California." *Madrono* 65(3): 106-116.

Jacobsen, A. L., and R.B. Pratt. 2018. Extensive drought-associated plant mortality as an agent of type-conversion in chaparral shrublands. New Phytologist. 219(2), 498-504.

Johnson, D. L. 1980. Episodic vegetation stripping, soil erosion, and landscape modification in prehistoric and recent time, San Miguel Island, California. Pages 103-123 *in* Power, D. M. (ed.), The California Islands – Proceedings of a Multidisciplinary Symposium. Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History, Santa Barbara, CA.

Junak, S., D. A. Knapp, J. R. Haller, R. Philbrick, A. Schoenherr, T. Keeler-Wolf. 2012. 'The California Channel Islands', in Michael Barbour (ed.), *Terrestrial Vegetation of California*, 3rd edn (Oakland, CA, 2007; online edition, California Scholarship Online, 22 Mar. 2012).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Kahl, S., C. M. Wood, M. Eibl, and H. Klinck. 2021. BirdNET: A deep learning solution for avian diversity monitoring. *Ecological Informatics* 61:101236. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoinf.2021.101236>.

Keeley, J. E., 1982. Distribution of lightning and man-caused wildfires in California. Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-58, Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, U.S. Forest Service, pp. 431-437.

Keeley, J.E. 2002. Native American impacts on fire regimes in California coastal ranges. *Journal of Biogeography* 29: 303–320.

Keeley, J.E., M. Baer–Keeley, and C.J. Fotheringham. 2005. Alien plant dynamics following fire in mediterranean–climate California shrublands. *Ecological Applications* 15: 2109–2125.

Keeley, J. E., and P. H. Zedler. 2009. Large, high intensity fire events in southern California shrublands: debunking the fine-grained age-patch model. *Ecological Applications* 19:69–94.

Keeley, J. E., J. Franklin, and C. D'Antonio. 2010. Fire and invasive plants on California landscapes. In *The landscape ecology of fire* (pp. 193-221). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Keeley, J. E., and A. D. Syphard. 2017. Different historical fire-climate patterns in California. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* 26:253–268.

Keeley, J.E., Guzman-Morales, J., Gershunov, A., Syphard, A.D., Cayan, D., Pierce, D.W., Flannigan, M., Brown, J. 2021. Ignitions explain more than temperature or precipitation in driving Santa Ana wind fires. *Science Advances* 7 (30). https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abh2262

Keir, G., Kreft H, Lee TM, Jetz W, Ibisch PL, Nowicki C, Mutke J, and Barthlott W. 2009. A global assessment of endemism and species richness across island and mainland regions. *PNAS* 106(23): 9322-9327.

Knapp, D.A. 2002. The Status of Island Scrub Oak (*Quercus pacifica*) on Catalina Island, California. USDA Forest Service Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-184.

Knapp, D. A. 2005a. Vegetation community mapping on Santa Catalina Island using orthorectification and GIS. Pages 193–203 Proceedings of the Sixth California Islands Symposium (DK Garcelon and CA Schwemm, eds.). National Park Service Technical Publication CHIS-05-01. Institute for Wildlife Studies, Arcata, California.

Knapp, D.A. 2005b. "Rare Plants in the Goat Harbor Burn Area." *Proceedings of the Sixth California Islands Symposium.* Ventura: Institute for Wildlife Studies and National Park Service. 205-211.

Knapp, D.A. and J.J. Knapp. 2005. Ecosystem protection through watershed-level prioritization on Catalina Island. Pp. 39-46 *in*: G. Skurka, ed. Proceedings of the California Invasive Plant Council symposium, Volume 9.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Knapp, D.A. 2007a. Changes in oak distribution and density by decade on Santa Catalina Island, 1943 to 2005. In *Oak ecosystem restoration on Santa Catalina Island, California. Proceedings of an on-island workshop* (pp. 47-52).

Knapp, J. 2007b. Catalina Island Invasive Plant Management Plan. Unpublished Report submitted to the Catalina Island Conservancy, Avalon, California. 30 Pp.

Knapp, D.A. 2009. "Oak Ecosystem Restoration on Santa Catalina Island, California: Resources, Threats, and Management Recommendations." Avalon: Catalina Island Conservancy.

Knapp, D.A. 2010a. Oak ecosystem restoration on Santa Catalina Island, California: a synthesis of resources and threats. Pages 135–215 *in* D. Knapp, editor, Oak ecosystem restoration on Catalina Island, California. Catalina Island Conservancy, Avalon, CA.

Knapp, J. 2010b. Catalina Island's invasive plant management program, with an emphasis on invasion and protection of oak ecosystems. Pages 35–46 *in* D. Knapp, editor, Oak ecosystem restoration on Catalina Island, California. Catalina Island Conservancy, Avalon, CA.

Knapp, D. 2014. Ecosystem Restoration on Santa Catalina Island: A Review of Potential Approaches and the Promise of Bottom-Up Invader Management. *Monographs of the Western North American Naturalist*, 7(1), 421-434. https://doi.org/10.3398/042.007.0132

Knapp, D., Brown, B. V., Etter, K., and Richart, C. 2021. Channel Islands invertebrates: a gap analysis of specimen and observation data. Unpublished final report prepared for The Nature Conservancy by the Santa Barbara Botanic Garden, Santa Barbara, California.

Knapp, J. and J. M. Randall. 2017. Introduction to this Special Issue on the Flora and Vegetation of the Islands of the Californias. *Fremontia* 45(3):3-4.

Koteen, L. E., D. D. Baldocchi, and J. Harte. 2011. Invasion of non-native grasses causes a drop in soil carbon storage in California grasslands. *Environmental Research Letters* 6:044001.

Krushelnycky, P., L. Fortini, J. Mallinson, and J. Felts. 2023. Empirical estimation of habitat suitability for rare plant restoration in an era of ongoing climatic shifts. Scientific Reports. 13. 10.1038/s41598-023-46793-7.

Kucera, T. E., and K. E. Mayer. 1999. A sportsman's guide to improving deer habitat in California. State of California, the Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, USA.

Lancaster, L. T., & Kay, K. M. 2013. Origin and diversification of the California flora: re-examining classic hypotheses with molecular phylogenies. *Evolution*, *67*(4), 1041-1054.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Landis, F. C. 1997. Composition, structure, and dynamics of chaparral on Santa Catalina Island, California. Master's thesis. Biology Department. Humboldt State University, Arcata. 86 pp.

Laughrin, L., M. Carroll, A. Bromfield, and J. Carroll. 1994. "Trends in Vegetation Changes with Rellloval of Feral Animal." *The Fourth California Islallds Syl/lposiul/l: Update Oil tile Status ofResources* 523-530.

Liebman, M., C. L. Mohler, and C. P. Staver. 2001. Ecological management of agricultural weeds. Cambridge University Press.

Long, J.W., Goode, R.W., & Lake, F.K. 2020. Recentering ecological restoration with tribal perspectives. *Fremontia*, Vol. 48: 1.

Legg, M., P. Davis, and E. Gath, editors. 2004. Geology and tectonics of Santa Catalina Island and the California continental borderland: South Coast Geological Society annual field trip guidebook no. 32. South Coast Geological Society, Santa Ana, California.

Lombardo, K. J., Swetnam, T. W., Baisan, C. H., and M.I. Borchert. 2009. Using bigcone Douglasfir fire scars and tree rings to reconstruct interior chaparral fire history. Fire *Ecology*. 5(3), 35-56.

Longcore, T., N. Noujdina, and P. Dixon. 2018. Landscape modeling of the potential natural vegetation of Santa Catalina Island (California). Western North American Naturalist 78(4):617-632.

Longcore, T., and P. J. Ethington, eds. 2023. Mapping Los Angeles Landscape History: The Indigenous Landscape. Report to the John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation. Spatial Sciences Institute, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Longhurst, W. M., A. S. Leopold, and R. F. Dasmann. 1952. A survey of California deer herds: their ranges and management problems. Game Bulletin Number 6. Sacramento, California, USA.

Mack, R. N., Simberloff, D., Mark Lonsdale, W., Evans, H., Clout, M., and Bazzaz, F. A. 2000. Biotic invasions: causes, epidemiology, global consequences, and control. *Ecological applications*, *10*(3), 689-710.

Magnoli SM, Kleinhesselink AR, Cushman JH. 2013. Responses to invasion and invader removal differ between native and exotic plant groups in a coastal dune. Oecologia 173(4):1521–1530.

Mahony, C.R., T. Wang, A. Hamann, and AJ Cannon. 2022. A CMIP6 ensemble for downscaled monthly climate normals over North America. International Journal of Climatology 42 (11), 5871-5891 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.7566

Manuwal, T. A., and R. A. Sweitzer. 2010. "Browse impacts of introduced mule deer to island scrub oak."

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Mattoni, R., and T. R. Longcore. 1997. The Los Angeles coastal prairie, a vanished community. Crossosoma 23:71–102.

Maxwell, P., B. Rhein, and J. Roberts. 2014. *Catalina A to Z: A Glossary Guide to California's Island Jewel*. Arcadia Publishing.

McCawley, W. 1996. *The First Angelinos: The Gabrielino Indians of Los Angeles*. Banning, CA: Malki Museum Press.

McCawley, W. 2002. "Tale of Two Cultures: The Chumash and the Gabrielino." In *Islanders and Mainlanders: Prehistoric Context for the Southern California Bight*, edited by Jeffrey H. Altschul and Donn R. Grenda, 41–67. Tucson, AZ: SRI Press.

McGuire KDF, Schmidt KT, Ta P, Long JJ, Yurko M, Kimball S. 2022. Is it best to add native shrubs to a coastal sage scrub restoration project as seeds or as seedlings? PLoS ONE 17(2): e0262410. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal. pone.0262410

Mead, J. R. 1899. Archaeology of Catalina Island. Transactions of the Annual Meetings of the Kansas Academy of Science 17:215–216.

Meinke, C. W., S. T. Knick, and D. A. Pyke. 2009. A spatial model to prioritize sagebrush landscapes in the Intermountain West (USA) for restoration. *Restoration Ecology* 17:652-659.

Menalled, F., and M. Schonbeck. 2011. Manage the weed seed bank—minimize ''deposits'' and maximize ''withdrawals.''.

Menke, A. S., and Miller, D. R. 1985. Entomology of the California Channel Islands: proceedings of the first symposium. Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History, Santa Barbara, CA. 178 pp., 8 maps. https://repository.si.edu/bitstream/handle/10088/3516/Miller_1985_Channel_Is_intro.pdf?sequence=1

Mertes, L. A. K., M. Ruocco, K. Martella and W. W. Bushing. 2000. Watershed analysis for runoff and erosion potential on Santa Catalina, Santa Cruz, and Santa Rosa Islands. In Proceedings of the Fourth California Islands Symposium: Update on the Status of Resources, March 29- April 1, 1999. OCS Study MMS 99-0038. Minerals Management Service (Camarillo, CA). pp. 461-68.

Mills, M., Larios, L. and Franklin, J. "Enhancing the Long-Term Ecological Management and Monitoring of Landscapes: The L-Team Framework" 2023. Land 2023, 12, 1942. https://doi.org/10.3390/land12101942.

Minnich, R. A. 1980. Vegetation of Santa Cruz and Santa Catalina Islands. Pages 123-138 *in* Power, D. M. (ed.), The California Islands – Proceedings of a Multidisciplinary Symposium. Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History, Santa Barbara, CA.

Minnich, R.A. 1982. "Grazing, fire, and management of vegetation on Santa Catalina Island, California." In *Proceedings of the symposium on the dynamics and management of Mediterranean-type ecosystems.*, by Conrad and Oechel, 444-449.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Moore, ID., P.E. Gessler, G.A. Nielsen, and G.A. Petersen. 1993. Terrain attributes: estimation methods and scale effects. In *Modeling Change in Environmental Systems*, edited by A.J. Jakeman M.B. Beck and M. McAleer Wiley, London, pp. 189-214.

Moritz, M. A., T. J. Moody, M. A. Krawchuk, M. Huges, and A. Hall. 2010. Spatial variation in extreme winds predicts large wildfire locations in chaparral ecosystems. *Geophysical Research Letters* 37:L04801.

Morzaria-Luna, H., J. C. Callaway, G. Sullivan, and J. B. Zedler. 2004. Relationship between topographic heterogeneity and vegetation patterns in a Californian salt marsh. Journal of Vegetation Science 15:523-530.

Muhs, D.R., J. Budahn, M. Reheis, J. Beann, G. Skipp, and E. Fisher. 2007. Airborne dust transport to the eastern Pacific Ocean off southern California: Evidence from San Clemente Island. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 112, D13203, doi:1029/ 2006JD007577.

Myers, N., Mittermeier, R. A., Mittermeier, C. G., Da Fonseca, G. A., & Kent, J. 2000. Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. *Nature*, *403*(6772), 853-858.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 2023. "NOAA Historical Surveys (T-Sheets)." NOAA Shoreline Website, https://shoreline.noaa.gov/data/datasheets/t-sheets.html. Accessed 13 July 2023.

Odanaka, K. A., Branstetter, M. G., Tobin, K. B., Rehan, S. M. 2022. Phylogenomics and historical biogeography of the cleptoparasitic bee genus Nomada (Hymenoptera: Apidae) using ultraconserved elements. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution 170. ISSN 1055-7903, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2022.107453

Okin, G. S., Dong, C., Willis, K. S., Gillespie, T. W., & MacDonald, G. M. 2018. The impact of drought on native Southern California vegetation: Remote sensing analysis using MODIS-derived time series. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, 123, 1927–1939. https://doi.org/10.1029/ 2018JG004485

Olson, D and L.S. Farley. 2013. *A conservation strategy for Catalina Island wildlands: A proposed framework for a conservation strategy & adaptive management plan*. Submitted to the Catalina Island Conservancy, Avalon, California. Pp. 181

Orians, C., and D. Ward. 2010. "Evolution of plant defenses in nonindigenous environments." *Annual Review of Entomology* 55:439-459.

Pacific Air Industries, 1953. Historic Aerial Photographs. Flight AXJ-1952, Frames 13k-116 to 132 and 16k-129 to 185 (total of 67 frames), Accessed May 13, 2023. Flown August to October 1953. Courtesy of UCSB Library Geospatial Collection.

Palik, B. J., P. C. Goebel, L. K. Kirkman, and L. West. 2000. Using landscape hierarchies to guide restoration of disturbed ecosystems. Ecological Applications 10:189-202.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Parmesan, C., and G. Yohe. 2003. A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across natural systems. *Nature* 421:37–42.

Paudel, S., G. W. T. Wilson, B. MacDonald, T. Longcore, and S. R. Loss. 2016. Predicting spatial extent of invasive earthworms on an oceanic island. *Diversity and Distributions* 22.

Pavlik, B. M., P. C. Muick, S. Johnson, and M. Popper. 1991. Oaks of California. Cachuma Press, Los Olivos, California, USA.

Pearson DE, Ortega YK, Runyon J, Butler J. 2016. Secondary invasion: the bane of weed management. Biol Conserv 197:8–17

Peters, D.P.C., Okin, G.S., Herrick, J.E., Savoy, H.M., Anderson, J.P., Scroggs, S.L.P., & Zhang, J. (2020). Modifying connectivity to promote state change reversal: the importance of geomorphic context and plant–soil feedbacks. *Ecology, 101*, e03069

Pfieffer, E. 2013. Weeds & What They Tell Us, 3rd Edition. Floris Books.

Phillips, G. E., and D. A. Cristol. 2024. Mechanisms of deer (Cervidae) impacts on birds: A comprehensive review. *Biological Conservation* 290:110454. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2024.110454>.

Pine, D. S., and T. M. Mansfield. 1980. Competition between deer and livestock in central coastal California. California Department of Fish and Game Report, June 1980, Sacramento, USA.

Pinson A.O. and J. S. AuBuchon. 2023. A new method for calculating C factor when projecting future soil loss using the Revised Universal soil loss equation (RUSLE) in semi-arid environments. CATENA, Volume 226, 2023, 107067, ISSN 0341-8162, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2023.107067.

Platt, J. P. 1975. Metamorphic and deformational processes in the Franciscan Complex, California: Some insights from the Catalina Schist terrane. *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, *86*(10), 1337-1347.

Porcasi, P., J. F. Porcasi, and C. O'Neill. 1999. Early Holocene coastlines of the California Bight: the Channel Islands as first visited by humans. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 35:1–24.

Porcasi, J. F., and H. Fujita. 2000. The Dolphin Hunters: A Specialized Prehistoric Maritime Adaptation in the Southern California Channel Islands and Baja California. *American Antiquity*, *65*(3), 543–566. https://doi.org/10.2307/2694535

Pratt, R. B., Jacobsen, A. L., Ramirez, A. R., Helms, A. M., Traugh, C. A., Tobin, M. F., and S. D. Davis. 2014. Mortality of resprouting chaparral shrubs after a fire and during a record drought: physiological mechanisms and demographic consequences. *Global Change Biology*. 20(3), 893-907.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Preston, W. 1997. Serpent in the Garden: Environmental Change in Colonial California. *California History*, *76*(2/3), 260–298. https://doi.org/10.2307/25161669

Principe, Z., J. B. MacKenzie, B. Cohen, J. M. Randall, W. Wippets, T. M. Smith, and S. A. Morrison. 2013. 50-Year Climate Scenarios and Plant Species Distribution Forecasts for Setting Conservation Priorities in Southwestern California v.1. Pages 1–36. The Nature Conservancy of California, San Francisco.

Raab, L. M., K. Bradford, and A. Yatsko. 1994. Advances in Southern Channel Islands Archaeology: 1983 to 1993. Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology, 16(2), 243–270. http://www.jstor.org/stable/27825553

Radde, H. D., W. G. Teeter, D. R. Martinez, and K. O. Kennedy-Richardson. 2024. A critical evaluation of radiocarbon dates and Indigenous settlement patterns on Santa Catalina Island, California. *The Journal of Island and Coastal Archaeology* 0:1–25.

Ramalho, C.E., M. Byrne and C.J. Yates. 2017. A climate-oriented approach to support decision-making for seed provenance in ecological restoration. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*. Vol 5, Article 95.

Ramirez, Aaron R., R. B. Pratt, A. L. Jacobsen, and S. D. Davis. 2012. "Exotic Deer Diminish Post-fire Resilience of Native Shrub Communities on Santa Catalina Island, southern California." Plant Ecology 1037-1047.

Rasul, A.; Balzter, H.; Ibrahim, G.R.F.; Hameed, H.M.; Wheeler, J.; Adamu, B.; Ibrahim, S.; Najmaddin, P.M. 2018. Applying built-up and bare-soil indices from Landsat 8 to cities in dry climates. *Land*, 7, 81.

Ratay, S. E., Vanderplank, S. E., & Wilder, B. T. 2014. Island specialists: shared flora of the Alta and Baja California Pacific Islands. *Monographs of the Western North American Naturalist*, *7*(1), 161-220.

Renard KG, Foster GR, Weesies GA, et al. 1997. Predicting Soil Erosion by Water: A Guide to Conservation Planning with the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE). p.404. Agriculture Handbook No. 703. USDA ARS.

Rich, P. M., R. Dubayah, W. A. Hetrick, and S. C. Saving. 1994. "Using Viewshed Models to Calculate Intercepted Solar Radiation: Applications in Ecology. American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing Technical Papers, 524–529.

Rick, T. C., J. M. Erlandson, R. L. Vellanoweth, and T. J. Braje. 2005. From Pleistocene Mariners to Complex Hunter-Gatherers: The Archaeology of the California Channel Islands. *Journal of World Prehistory* 19:169–228.

Rick, T. C., C. A. Hofman, T. J. Braje, J. E. Maldonado, T. S. Sillett, K. Danchisko, and J. M. Erlandson. 2012. Flightless ducks, giant mice and pygmy mammoths: Late Quaternary extinctions on California's Channel Islands. World Archaeology 44:3–20.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Riley, S., S. Degloria, Stephen and S.D. Elliot. 1999. A Terrain Ruggedness Index that Quantifies Topographic Heterogeneity. *International Journal of Science*. 5. 23-27.

Riordan, E. C., and P. W. Rundel. 2014. Land use compounds habitat losses under projected climate change in a threatened California ecosystem. PLoS ONE 9:e86487.

Riordan, Erin C.; Montalvo, Arlee M.; Beyers, Jan L. 2018. Using species distribution models with climate change scenarios to aid ecological restoration decisionmaking for southern California shrublands. Res. Rep. PSW-RP-270. Albany, CA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station. 130 p.

Roemer, G. W., Donlan, C. J., & Courchamp, F. 2002. Golden eagles, feral pigs, and insular carnivores: how exotic species turn native predators into prey. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *99*(2), 791-796.

Rowland, S.M. 1984. Geology of Santa Catalina Island. *California Geology* 37:239–251.

Rozos, Dimitrios & Skilodimou, Hariklia & Loupasakis, Constantinos & Bathrellos, George. 2013. Application of the revised universal soil loss equation model on landslide prevention. An example from N. Euboea (Evia) Island, Greece. Environmental earth sciences. 70. 10.1007/s12665-013-2390-3.

Sacks, B. N., M. J. Statham, L. E. K. Serieys, and S. P. D. Riley. 2022. Population Genetics of California Gray Foxes Clarify Origins of the Island Fox. Genes 13:1859.

Salladay, Ryan A, and Aaron R. Ramirez. 2018. "Reduced Defenses and Increased Herbivore Preference of Island Chaparral Shrubs Compared to Mainland Relatives." *Western North American Naturalist* 768-776.

Salls, R. A. 1988. *Prehistoric fisheries of the California Bight*. University of California, Los Angeles.

Schumann, R.R., S.A. Minor, D.R. Muhs, L.T. Groves, and J.P. McGeehan. 2012. Tectonic influences on the preservation of marine terraces: Old and new evidence from Santa Catalina Island, California. *Geomorphology*. 179. 208–224. 10.1016/j.geomorph.2012.08.012.

Schuyler, P.T., D.K. Garcelon, and S. Escover. 2002a. Eradication of feral pigs (Sus scrofa) on Santa Catalina Island, California, USA. In: Veitch, C.R., and M.N. Clout (eds.), Turning the Tide: The Eradication of Invasive Species (Proceedings of the International Conference on Eradication of Island Invasives; Occasional Paper of the IUCN Species Survival Commission No. 27.) pp. 274–287.

Schuyler, P.T., D.K. Garcelon, and S. Escover. 2002b. Control of feral goats (Capra hircus) on Santa Catalina Island, California, USA. In: Veitch, C.R., and M.N. Clout (eds.), Turning the Tide: The Eradication of Invasive Species (Proceedings of the International Conference on Eradication of Island Invasives; Occasional Paper of the IUCN Species Survival Commission No. 27) p. 412.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Seabloom EW, Borer ET, Boucher VL et al. 2003. Competition, seed limitation, disturbance, and reestablishment of California native annual forbs. Ecol. Appl. 13(3):575–592.

Sharpe, P. 2022. Peregrine Falcon monitoring on the California Channel Islands, California, 2022. Report dated December 2022 prepared for California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife.

Sniderman, J. K., Jordan, G. J., & Cowling, R. M. 2013. Fossil evidence for a hyperdiverse sclerophyll flora under a non–Mediterranean-type climate. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(9), 3423-3428.

Soil Conservation Service. 1955. Soil Data and Map for Santa Catalina Island, Unpublished Data. W. Bushing. Map digitized by ESRI (Redlands, CA) for the Catalina Island Conservancy. Raster data provided by the Conservancy, as used in Franklin and Knapp (2007).

Soil Survey Staff. 1999. Soil taxonomy: A basic system of soil classification for making and interpreting soil surveys. 2nd edition. Natural Resources Conservation Service. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 436.

Stapp, P., Hamblen, E., Duncan, C. L, and King, J. L. 2022. Status of the Introduced Mule Deer Population on Catalina Island, California, Based on Annual Spotlight Counts. *Proceedings of the Vertebrate Pest Conference*, 30. Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/847923z8

Stein, E. D., S. Dark, T. Longcore, R. Grossinger, N. Hall, and M. Beland. 2010. Historical ecology as a tool for assessing landscape change and informing wetland restoration priorities. *Wetlands* 30:589–601.

Steuter, Allen and Hidinger, Lori, "Comparative Ecology of Bison and Cattle on Mixed-Grass Prairie" (1999). Great Plains Research: A Journal of Natural and Social Sciences. Paper 467.

Stewart, A. J. A. 2001. The impact of deer on lowland woodland invertebrates: a review of the evidence and priorities for future research. *Forestry* 74:259–270. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/forestry/74.3.259>.

Stratton, L.C. 2005. Santa Catalina Island experimental restoration trials: developing appropriate techniques. Pp. 213 to 227 *In*: D. K. Garcelon and C.A. Schwemm (eds.). Proceedings of the 6th California Islands Symposium. National Park Service Technical Publication CHIS-05-01. Institute for Wildlife Studies, Arcata, CA.

Stratton, L. 2009. Restoration strategies for overcoming limitations to scrub oak regeneration on Catalina Island. In *Oak ecosystem restoration on Santa Catalina Island, California. Proceedings of an on-island workshop* (pp. 1-17).

Stylinski, C.D., and E.B. Allen. 1999. Lack of native species recovery following severe exotic disturbance in southern California shrublands. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 36: 544–554.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Syphard, A. D., and J. E. Keeley. 2015. Location, timing and extent of wildfire vary by cause of ignition. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* 24:37–47.

Sweitzer, R.A., J.M. Constible, D.H. Van Vuren, P.T. Schuyler, and F.R. Starkey. 2005. History, habitat use and management of bison on Catalina Island, California. In Proceedings of the Sixth California Islands Symposium, David K. Garcelon and Catherin A. Schwemm, editors, pp. 231-248. National Park Service Technical Publication CHIS-05-01.

The Huntington Library. 2006. Early California Population Project, Database. https://huntington.org/early-california-population-project

Thorne, R. F. 1967. A flora of Santa Catalina Island, California. *Aliso: A Journal of Systematic and Floristic Botany*, 6(3), 1-77.

Thorne, J. H., R. M. Boynton, A. J. Holguin, J. A. Stewart, and J. Bjorkman. 2016. A climate change vulnerability assessment of California's terrestrial vegetation. California.

Timbrook, J., Johnson, J. R, & Earle, D. D. 1982. Vegetation Burning by the Chumash. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology*, 4(2). Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1rv936jq

Timm, S. F., Munson, L., Summers, B. A., Terio, K. A., Dubovi, E. J., Rupprecht, C. E., Kapil, S., and Garcelon, D. K. 2009. A suspected canine distemper epidemic as the cause of a catastrophic decline in Santa Catalina Island foxes (Urocyon littoralis catalinae). *Journal of wildlife diseases*, *45*(2), 333-343.

Tyler, C.M., F.W. Davis, and B.E. Mahall. 2008. The relative importance of factors affecting age-specific seedling survival of two cooccurring oak species in southern California. *Forest Ecology and Management* 255:3063–3074.

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (USDA NRCS). 2008. Soil survey of Santa Catalina Island, California.

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2016. *Final Rule: Removing the San Miguel Island Fox, Santa Rosa Island Fox, and Santa Cruz Island Fox from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife, and Reclassifying the Santa Catalina Island Fox from Endangered to Threatened*; U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service: Washington, DC, USA, 2016.

Urness, P. J. 1981. Desert and chaparral habitats: Part 1. food habits and nutrition. Pages 347-365 in O. C. Wallmo, editor. Mule and black-tailed deer of North America. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, USA.

van der Knijff, J. M., R.J.A. Jones, and L. Montanarella. 1999. Soil Erosion Risk Assessment in Italy. 903 EUR 1902EN. Ispra, Italy: European Commission, Directorate General JRC, Joint Research 904 Centre Space, Applications Institute, European Soil Bureau.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

van der Knijff, J. M., R.J.A. Jones, and L. Montanarella. 2000. Soil Erosion Risk Assessment in Europe. 906 EUR 19044EN. Brussels, Belgium: European Commission, Directorate General JRC, Joint 907 Research Centre, Space Applications Institute, European Soil Bureau.

van der Wal, J. et al. 2012. Focus on poleward shifts in species' distribution underestimates the fingerprint of climate change. Nat. Clim. Change 3, 239–243.

Van Vuren, D., & Coblentz, B. E. 1987. Some ecological effects of feral sheep on Santa Cruz Island, California, USA. *Biological conservation*, *41*(4), 253-268.

Vedder, J. G., and D. G. Howell. 1980. Topographic evolution of the southern California borderland during late Cenozoic time. Pages 7–31 The California Islands: proceedings of a multidisciplinary symposium. Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History Santa Barbara, California.

Vinyeta, K. 2022. Under the guise of science: how the US Forest Service deployed settler colonial and racist logics to advance an unsubstantiated fire suppression agenda. *Environmental Sociology*, *8*(2), 134–148. https://doi.org/10.1080/23251042.2021.1987608

Vitt, P., J. Finch, R. S. Barak, A. Braum, S. Frischie, and I. Redlinski. 2022. Seed sourcing strategies for ecological restoration under climate change: A review of the current literature. *Frontiers in Conservation Science*, Vol. 3. doi: 10.3389/fcosc.2022.938110

von Bloeker, J. C., Jr. 1967. The land mammals of the Southern California Islands. Pp. 245–264 *in* R. N. Philbrick, ed. Proceedings of the symposium on the biology of the California Islands. Santa Barbara Botanic Garden, Santa Barbara, CA.

Wang T., A. Hamann, D. Spittlehouse, C. Carroll. 2016. Locally Downscaled and Spatially Customizable Climate Data for Historical and Future Periods for North America. PLoS ONE 11(6): e0156720. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0156720

Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC). 2024. Cooperative Climatological Data Summaries. Web. Accessed 18 Feb. 2024. http://wrcc.dri.edu/climatedata/climsum/

White, K.L. 1967. "Native bunchgrass (*Stipa pulchra*) on Hastings Reservation. *California Ecology* 48:949–955.

White, V.A. and J.S. Holt. 2005. "Competition of artichoke thistle (*Cynara cardunculus*) with native and exotic grassland species." *Weed Science* 53:826–833.

Williamson, M. B. 1903. History of Santa Catalina Island. Annual Publication of the Historical Society of Southern California and of the Pioneers of Los Angeles County 6:14–31.

Wolf, K. M., M. A. Whalen, R. P. Bourbour, and R. A. Baldwin. 2017. Rodent, snake and raptor use of restored native perennial grasslands is lower than use of

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

unrestored exotic annual grasslands. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 55: 1133–1144. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12990

Zedler, P.H., C.R. Gautier, and G.S. McMaster. 1983. Vegetation change in response to extreme events: the effect of a short interval between fires in California chaparral and coastal scrub. *Ecology* 64: 809–818

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Appendix A

Catalina Invasive Plant Program (CIPP) Guide

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

CATALINA ISLAND CONSERVANCY™

To be an exemplary steward of Island resources through a balance of conservation, education, and recreation.

Catalina Habitat Improvement and Restoration Program (CIPP) Guide

Updated March 2024

P. O. Box 2739, Avalon, CA 90704 – 310.510.2595 – www.CatalinaConservancy.org

320 Golden Shore, Suite 220, Long Beach, CA 90802 – 562.437.8555

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

CATALINA ISLAND CONSERVANCY

To be an exemplary steward of island resources through a balance of conservation, education, and recreation.

Table of Contents

1 Introduction 1

2 CIPP Goals 3

3 Invasive Plant Management Objectives 3

3.1 EDRR 4

3.2 Eradication 4

3.3 Control 4

3.4 Corridor Management 5

4 Invasive Plant Survey and Treatment Methods 10

4.1 Integrated Invasive Plant Management Toolbox 10

4.1.1 Cultural Control 10

4.1.2 Physical and Mechanical Control 10

4.1.3 Chemical Control 10

4.1.4 Invasive Plant Monitoring and Treatment Schedules 11

4.2 Geospatial Data Collection SOP 12

4.3 Invasive Plant Survey and Treatment SOP 17

4.4 Invasive Plant Database Data Entry SOP 22

5 References 25

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

1 Introduction

The mission of the Catalina Island Conservancy (Conservancy) is to be a responsible land steward through a balance of conservation, education, and recreation. The Conservancy owns and manages 88% (42,087 acres) of Catalina Island (about 48,000 acres). Invasive species are considered the second greatest threat to biodiversity worldwide and are the leading cause of species extinctions in island ecosystems (Kiehn 2011). Catalina Island, the third largest of the eight California Channel Islands off the coast of southern California, is no exception.

The Conservancy faces the challenge of managing invasive plants, which have thrived in novel habitats due to human-induced disturbances and the introduction of nonnative plants and animals (Baskin 2002). With over 700 plant species on Catalina Island, approximately 30% are nonnative. Over time, invasive plants have spread to varying degrees on the island, affecting flora, fauna, and ecosystem processes. Invasive plants are one of the greatest challenges facing the health of Catalina Island (Knapp 2007).

Invasive plants displace Catalina's native flora and do not provide suitable habitat for native wildlife, threatening the stability of the entire ecosystem. Invasive plants can form large stands dominated by one species, which lowers the biodiversity that ecosystems depend on. This is well displayed in areas such as Avalon Canyon with introduced flax-leaf broom (*Genista linifolia*). Almost half of the federally endangered and threatened species became listed due to the proliferation of invasive species (Babbit 1998). Invasive plants can interrupt the functioning of an ecosystem by competing with native vegetation for resources such as water, light, and nutrients, by altering soil chemistry and composition, flood patterns, and fire regimes, or by increasing soil erosion (Mullin et al. 2000, Colorado Natural Areas Program et al. 2000). Several invasive plants can also hybridize with native plant species, changing their descendants' genetic make-up. This is a particularly pronounced threat on Catalina Island. Hybrid descendants often become more invasive than the invasive parent plant because of a common phenomenon utilized by plant breeders called hybrid vigor (Randall and Hoshovsky 2000).

While the Conservancy has successfully eradicated some nonnative animals from the island to protect island biodiversity, such as the removal of invasive wild goats and pigs in the 1990s, the continued impact other invasive animals (e.g., mule deer and bison populations), existing established invasive plant populations, and ongoing human activities exacerbates plant invasions.

Catalina's proximity to southern California and high visitation rate elevates its vulnerability to new invasive species introductions or reintroduction of previously eradicated ones. To effectively halt and reverse the spread of invasive nonnative plants, the Conservancy must employ every appropriate tool and strategy, ensuring a comprehensive and adaptive approach to safeguarding the island's ecosystem (DiTomaso et al. 1999, Colorado Natural Areas Program 2000). The Conservancy’s multipronged approach to island restoration includes targeted control of existing invasive plants, monitoring for early detection of new invasions, active restoration of native plant communities, the development of biosecurity measures, and promoting public awareness to mitigate the risk of introducing new invasive species.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Invasive plant management with sufficient long-term funding is critical to the Conservancy's conservation mission. To meet this challenge, in 2003, the Conservancy developed an integrated science-based program to protect ecosystem health through monitoring and management of invasive plants, utilizing adaptive management techniques referred to as the Catalina Invasive Plant Program (CIPP) (Knapp 2007). Since the beginning of CIPP, 4 species have been functionally eradicated, over 1.4 million individual plants have been treated, nearly 30,000 acres have been surveyed, over 3,000 acres have been treated, over 200 species have been treated, and over 68,000 management hours have been invested (e.g., see Figure 1). Over the years, the Conservancy has contracted with conservation partners, such as American Conservation Experience (ACE), to help implement CIPP through conservation interns. Beginning in 2023, the Conservancy began contracting with the California Institute of Environmental Studies (CIES) for the majority of grant funded invasive plant management. CIES contractor crews come with experience and expertise in treating invasive plants across several of the California Channel Islands.

In 2023, the Conservancy and CIES surveyed 192 acres across 37 watershed management units. A total of 15 different species were treated, totaling 204,973 individual plants. Currently, the Conservancy targets over 40 invasive plant species for management (see Table 1).




Figure 1. Location of Invasive Plant Surveys and Treatments from 2016 to 2023.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2 CIPP Goals

The goals of CIPP are as follows (Knapp 2007):

1. Prevent the reduction or loss of native Catalina Island flora and fauna, due to the direct or indirect impact(s) caused by invasive plants, by actively managing invasives with the safest, most effective and economical methods available.
2. Increase the Conservancy's and partner agencies knowledge regarding invasive plant distribution, impacts and management strategies.
3. Stop invasive plant introductions, establishment and spread on Catalina Island by increasing invasive plant awareness in staff, contractors, residents, and visitors through education programs, and improving cultural practices and partnerships.

3 Invasive Plant Management Objectives

Effectively managing well-established invasive species populations through long-term programs requires substantial financial investment and resource allocation, underscoring the importance of strategic prioritization in selecting which species to target for control efforts. To allocate limited resources effectively, the Conservancy focuses on species that pose the most significant threats to native ecosystems and have the greatest potential for successful management (Mullin et al. 2000).

Efficient management of invasive plants relies on accurately predicting susceptible species and locations, while employing robust control tools. This strategic prioritization requires understanding each species' ecological impact, distribution, and control potential. By focusing on high-impact, rapidly expanding species, land managers can effectively allocate resources to protect native habitats. A well-informed, data-driven prioritization process ensures efficient use of limited conservation resources, enabling professionals to make targeted decisions that preserve native ecosystems and promote long-term environmental health (APRS Implementation Team 2000).

The goal of active invasive plant management species is currently achieved through four objectives:

1. **Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR)** to detect, monitor, and eradicate new invasive plant introductions before it can spread.
2. **Eradication** of all known populations on the island, or from natural areas, of species that have significant ecological impacts and are feasible to eliminate.
3. **Control** of species too widespread to be eradicated by reducing invasive plant populations in high priority watersheds, restoration areas, and high use areas.
4. **Corridor Management** of species too widespread to be eradicated and commonly found along corridors, such as the roadways, that serve to spread invasive plant propagules.

The management priorities and objectives for over forty invasive plant species are presented in Table 1.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.1 EDRR

The Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) management strategy harnesses our ability to effectively eradicate emerging invasive plant populations during their early stages. By detecting invasive plants before they can spread and establish substantial seed banks, managers can intervene early enough in the invasion process to successfully eliminate the species from a particular area while the population remains small. This proactive approach of early detection and rapid response enables well-informed monitoring, ultimately mitigating the need for expensive and extensive long-term control measures.

3.2 Eradication

Focusing on the complete removal of invasive species from islands or natural areas holds the most substantial promise for enduring habitat improvement. This approach prioritizes the eradication of invasive species that possess a documented potential to become widespread. Most often, species identified with this goal are limited in their current distributions with few small populations, such as giant cane (*Arundo donax).* They are also often ranked with high California Invasive Plant Council (Cal-IPC) scores, meaning they have shown significant ecological impacts.

3.3 Control

Control refers to the management of invasive plant populations in high priority watersheds, restoration areas, and high use areas. Species with this goal are also usually too widespread for eradication to be feasible. For these species, they are usually not commonly found in corridors, such as Mediterranean broom (*Genista linifolia*), or they are so widespread that controlling them in high priority areas is the only manageable action, such as fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*).

The Conservancy controls invasive plant populations in high priority areas with a strategic top-down approach. Starting at the top of watersheds, at the highest elevation, and working downwards reduces source populations and reintroduction. Twelve watersheds were identified by the Conservancy as priorities for invasive plant control to protect their high value biological and cultural resources (Knapp 2007). Corresponding Watershed Management Units (WMU) are identified and depicted in Figure 2.

1. Middle Canyon (WMUs 61b, 61e, and 61f)
2. Haypress (WMU 50b)
3. Cottonwood Canyon (WMUs 63a, 63c, and 63d)
4. Shark Harbor (WMU 64)
5. Little Harbor (WMU 66a)
6. White’s Landing (WMU 32a)
7. Coffeepot Canyon (WMU 51)
8. Emerald (WMU 6)
9. Parson’s Landing (WMU 4)
10. Goat Harbor (WMU 28)
11. Big Springs Canyon (WMU 65)
12. Empire Landing (WMU 20)

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 2. Catalina Island Watershed Management Units.

3.4 Corridor Management

Invasive plant management along corridors is crucial in controlling the spread of invasive plants. CIPP defines corridors as a 60-meter buffer along each side of a roadway (total management buffer of 120 meters) and a 10-meter buffer along each side of trails (total management buffer of 20 meters). Corridors are generally highly disturbed and highly trafficked areas which promote the establishment and spread of invasive plants (Cal-IPC 2012). It is understood that roadways are a major pathway in which invasive plant propagules spread. Vehicles can act as a secondary dispersal vector for many plant species which allows propagules to travel much further than their natural dispersal range (Lemke et al. 2019). For corridors, Conservancy staff concentrates on treating invasive plant species that are already degrading ecosystems and thrive in disturbed soils, such as castor bean (*Ricinus communis*). These species are often too widespread for eradication to be a feasible goal, so focusing on containing and stopping the spread is the best management action.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 1. Invasive Plant Management Priorities and Objectives.

Overall Priority Rank	2024 Priority Rank	Management Objectives	Scientific Name	Common Name	CAL-IPC Score	Notes
1	1	Control	*Genista linifolia*	Mediterranean broom	Watch	Red alert status
2	2	Control	*Foeniculum vulgare*	Fennel	Moderate	Threat with deer management
3	1	Eradication-Island Wide	*Pennisetum setaceum*	Fountain grass	Moderate	Watch pops by Hamilton and top of Wrigley
4	2	Eradication-Island Wide	*Cortaderia selloana*	Pampas grass	Moderate	New pop in Cottonwood Canyon
5	1	Eradication-Natural Areas	*Cynara cardunculus*	Artichoke thistle	Moderate	NRCS EQIP Target
6	3	Control	*Silybum marianum*	Milk thistle	Limited	NRCS EQIP Target
7	2	Eradication-Natural Areas	*Arundo donax*	Giant cane	High	Mostly Baker Dam, Palisades
8	3	Eradication-Natural Areas	*Spartium junceum*	Spanish broom	High	Only in Avalon right now, recently treated in Middle Canyon by pump house
9	4	Control	*Phalaris aquatica*	Harding grass	Moderate	NRCS EQIP Target
10	5	Control	*Carduus pycnocephalus*	Italian thistle	Moderate	Cottonwood Canyon, Garden to Sky, Bulrush
11	3	Eradication-Island Wide	*Tamarix ramosissima*	Tamarisk	High	Mostly Pacific side on West End, Palisades
12	4	Eradication-Island Wide	*Stipa tenuissima*	Mexican feathergrass	High	Removed from Avalon
13	5	Eradication-Island Wide	*Paspalum vaginatum*	Seashore Paspalum	Watch	Ben Weston Canyon, Two Harbors Dump

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Overall Priority Rank	2024 Priority Rank	Management Objectives	Scientific Name	Common Name	CAL-IPC Score	Notes
14	**6**	**Control**	*Cirsium vulgare*	Bull thistle	Moderate	
15	**6**	**Eradication-Island Wide**	*Eriogonum fasciculatum*	California buckwheat	N/A	May hybridize w/ island *Eriogonum* spp.
16	**4**	**Eradication-Natural Areas**	*Vinca major*	Periwinkle	Moderate	Ben Weston Canyon, near pumphouse in middle canyon
17	**1**	**Corridors**	*Salsola tragus*	Russian thistle	Limited	Also *S. australis*; unsure ID @ all pops
18	**5**	**Eradication-Natural Areas**	*Hedera helix*	English ivy	High	
19	**6**	**Eradication-Natural Areas**	*Genista monspessulana*	French broom	High	Not seen in natural areas, known in town
20	**7**	**Eradication-Natural Areas**	*Genista stenopetala*	Sweet broom	N/A	Not seen in natural areas, known in town
21	**8**	**Eradication-Natural Areas**	*Cotoneaster sp.*	Silverleaf Cotoneaster	Moderate	Probably *C. pannosus*, Descanso Canyon
22	**7**	**Control**	*Asparagus asparagoides*	Bridal creeper	Moderate	Red alert, Thompson's Reservoir, Isthmus rd
23	**9**	**Eradication-Natural Areas**	*Centranthus ruber*	Jupiter's beard	Alert	Stage Road, seems to be spreading
24	**9**	**Control**	*Ficus carica*	Common fig	Moderate	
25	**7**	**Eradication-Island Wide**	*Delairea odorata*	Cape Ivy	High	Mostly Avalon, Quail Valley
26	**8**	**Control**	*Brassica nigra*	Black Mustard	Moderate	Little Harbor, West End, Cottonwood
27	**10**	**Eradication-Natural Areas**	*Pittosporum undulatum*	Mock Orange	Limited	Middle Canyon population, Toyon

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Overall Priority Rank	2024 Priority Rank	Management Objectives	Scientific Name	Common Name	CAL-IPC Score	Notes
28	**11**	**Control**	*Phoenix canariensis*	Canary Island Date Palm	Limited	
29	**11**	**Eradication-Natural Areas**	*Caesalpinia spinosa*	Tara	N/A	Avalon
30	**2**	**Corridors**	*Ricinus communis*	Castor Bean	Limited	White's, Emerald
31	**12**	**Control**	*Washingtonia* species	Fan palm	Moderate	Score for W. robusta (CA non-native)
32	**13**	**Control**	*Pinus halepensis*	Aleppo pine	N/A	On CAL-IPC watchlist; not enough info
33	**8**	**Eradication-Island Wide**	*Asphodelus fistulosus*	Onionweed	Moderate	Alert; one pop at Hamilton
34	**14**	**Control**	*Eucalyptus* species	Eucalyptus	Limited	*E. globulus* naturalizes in coastal CA
35	**3**	**Corridors**	*Nicotiana glauca*	Tree tobacco	Moderate	
36	**13**	**Eradication-Natural Areas**	*Euphorbia lamarckii*	Milky spurge	N/A	Spreading in Avalon
38	**4**	**Corridors**	*Xanthium spinosum*	Spiny cocklebur	N/A	Consider other xanthium
39	**14**	**Eradication-Natural Areas**	*Carpobrotus* species	Iceplant	High	Empire, Avalon, Two Harbors
40	**10**	**Control**	*Cakile maritima*	Sea rocket	Limited	
41	**6**	**Corridors**	*Mesembryanthemum* species	Crystalline iceplant	Moderate	Mushroom flats, Pacific side
42	**5**	**Corridors**	*Marrubium vulgare*	Horehound	Limited	Widespread
43	**15**	**Control**	*Schinus molle*	Peruvian pepper tree	Limited	Camps (fox), Avalon
44	**12**	**Eradication-Natural Areas**	*Solanum elaegnifolium*	Silverleaf nightshade		Golf course

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Overall Priority Rank	2024 Priority Rank	Management Objectives	Scientific Name	Common Name	CAL-IPC Score	Notes
		EDRR	*Tribulus terrestris*	Puncture Vine	Limited	Not detected 2021-2022
		EDRR	*Osteospermum calendulaceum*	Stinking Roger	Watch	Detected in Orange County
		EDRR	*Hypercium androsaemum*	Sweet amber	Watch	
		EDRR	*Arctotheca calendula*	Capeweed	Moderate	Alert - fertile forms
		EDRR	*Brassica tounefortii*	Saharan Mustard	High	CIES reported some near Empire and Ben Weston overlook
		EDRR	*Centaurea solstitialis*	Yellow starthistle	High	Eradicated from Middle Cyn
		EDRR	*Cytisus scoparius, C. striatus*	Scotch & Portuguese broom	High	C. striatus - moderate
		EDRR	*Euphorbia terracina*	Carnation spurge	Moderate	
		EDRR	*Lepidium draba*	Whitetop	Moderate	
		EDRR	*Malephora crocea*	Coppery mesembryanthemum	N/A	On CAL-IPC watchlist
		EDRR	*Oenothera xenogaura*	Dummond's gaura	N/A	
		EDRR	*Tribulus terrestris*	Puncture Vine	N/A	White's Landing historic pop.
		Identify & Map Populations	*Lathyrus latifolius, L. odoratus*	Everlasting, Sweet pea	N/A	L. latifolius on CAL-IPC watchlist

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4 Invasive Plant Survey and Treatment Methods

4.1 Integrated Invasive Plant Management Toolbox

To effectively manage diverse invasive plant species, land managers must be equipped with a versatile range of tools and techniques to address the unique challenges posed by each species, site, or weather condition. A well-rounded "toolbox" enables professionals to adapt to an ever-changing environment, ensuring the successful control and eradication of invasive plants.

Documenting and monitoring management techniques is crucial in identifying the most efficient control methods and adapting or developing new strategies as needed. Utilizing the winter season, when fewer species require treatment, to evaluate the efficacy of past management efforts based on databased treatment records allows land managers to learn from past experiences, build on successes, and refine their approaches.

Innovative solutions can also be found by exploring techniques and tools from other disciplines and adapting them to the invasive plant management field. By embracing creativity and collaboration, conservationists can develop more effective methods for controlling invasive species, ultimately promoting the preservation and restoration of native habitats.

4.1.1 Cultural Control

Many troublesome invasive plants are highly dependent on ongoing disturbance, whether natural (e.g., fire, flood, or landslide) or artificial (e.g., browsing, grazing, mowing, disturbance by foot or vehicle traffic). Where appropriate, measures should be taken to protect areas with high biological values from further disturbance.

4.1.2 Physical and Mechanical Control

Physical and mechanical control methods such as pulling, grubbing, cutting, girdling, or mowing, can be used on species that do not resprout (e.g., annual grasses or brooms), or can be successfully killed without herbicide. For mechanical methods to be successful, treatments must occur prior to significant seed set in the population, or weed seed must be collected and disposed of properly. These methods utilize a wide array of hand and power tools, including weed wrenches, loppers, handsaws, cordless drills, brush cutters, chain saws, power hedgers, and tractors.

4.1.3 Chemical Control

Herbicide application is another tool that is utilized when mechanical or physical techniques are not effective alone or are not the best treatment option due to possible collateral damage, cost effectiveness, or weather conditions. Whenever feasible, techniques such as cut-stump, drill-and-squirt, hack-and-squirt, glove-of-death, and basal bark application will be used to reduce both drift and the amount of herbicide used in the environment. Herbicides with the lowest EPA rating, “caution” such as Glyphosate, will be preferred to minimize the recognized risks to the applicator. Selective herbicides will be used to treat populations of invasive dicots where native monocots are present. Similarly, herbicides selective for monocots only, will be used as appropriate where invasive grass species grow among desirable dicot plants. A selective

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

herbicide effective only on thistles (*Asteraceae*) and herbaceous taxa in the pea family *(Fabaceae)* can be used for such invasive plants as *Cynara cardunculus* (artichoke thistle) or *Lathyrus* spp. (sweet pea). Very low rates of a non-selective herbicide such as Glyphosate will be carefully applied to susceptible species found invading robust perennial native vegetation, which should not cause irreparable damage to the native species. Chemicals used to treat invasive plants include, but not limited to alkyl polyglycoside, ammonium sulfate, nitrate, aminopyralid, clopyralid, fluazifop-p-butyl, glyphosate, imazapyr, polydimethylsiloxane, and triclopyr. All herbicides are applied in accordance with the instructions on the product label to ensure safety, effectiveness, and regulatory compliance. All herbicide usage is tracked in an electronic database and reported to LA County on pesticide usage reports.

The three main herbicide delivery systems used by the Conservancy are truck-mounted spray rig, backpack sprayer, and spray or squeeze bottles. A truck-mounted sprayer (150 gallons) can be used when treating roadsides and other areas accessible to these vehicles. Small populations or those found further than the length of the spray-rig hose are usually treated with herbicide contained in a backpack sprayer (typically up to four gallons), lab-style squeeze bottles, or hand spray bottles, ranging in capacity from one-half ounce to one quart.

Handheld bottles are easy to carry and maneuver, especially in dense vegetation and on steep slopes, but they contain a very limited amount of herbicide. Backpack sprayers can carry considerably more herbicide than a spray bottle but are heavy and cumbersome when hiking over rough terrain and thick vegetation. A truck mounted spray rig can hold large amounts of herbicide to treat large infestations. The truck mounted spray rig hose is not as heavy as a backpack sprayer but has a limited range (< 600 feet) and is at times unwieldy. The best container will be selected based on a combination of terrain, vegetation, population size, and weather conditions to ensure safety and efficiency.

4.1.4 Invasive Plant Monitoring and Treatment Schedules

When working in a watershed that has known infestations of priority invasive plant species, weed workers should constantly conduct ad hoc surveys while en route to conduct a treatment. It is important to map all new invasive plant populations using the mapping protocol, and regularly monitor treated populations based on the reproductive life cycle and seasonality. Failing to monitor treated populations consistently will mostly likely result in wasted work if treated plants resprout or seedlings that have germinated from the soil seed bank are allowed to reach reproductive age. Soil seed banks for some species such as Mediterranean broom can remain viable for over 50 years. It is important to know how long each species' seed bank can last, and to monitor all treated populations for that duration of time or longer. Once all above-ground plants of a population have been completely removed, and the site yields no new seedlings, the monitoring schedule can be implemented for each species based on the time it would take a plant to reach reproductive maturity. For example, if it takes fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*) only six months to produce seed following germination, then a six-month monitoring schedule should be implemented for all treated fennel populations. And a two-year monitoring schedule should be implemented for all treated populations of French broom (*Genista monspessulana*) since it would take two years or more for seedlings to reach reproductive maturity.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

With each successive season as soil seed banks are depleted, monitoring of treated populations can be achieved in a shorter amount of time. Once all originally targeted sites have been monitored, new populations can then be addressed within the treatment schedule. It is important to note that consistently monitoring previously treated populations is a key component of an invasive plant management program. Unfortunately, it is often viewed as unnecessary or superfluous, especially when funding is tight, and as such, is usually the first program element to be eliminated. Without monitoring and follow-up treatment, all previous work can be wasted if propagules are allowed to grow and produce more seeds. This resets the "seed bank viability clock" back to zero.

4.2 Geospatial Data Collection SOP

Purpose

This standard operating procedure (SOP) describers how to properly use the Conservancy field smart phones to collect geospatial data in project related web maps using the ESRI ArcGIS Field Maps program.

Responsibilities

- GIS Program Manager: Writes and records data management related SOPS and training videos, notifies field phone users of when to re-download offline areas of web maps, manages web maps and data for QA/QC, provide technical support
- Plant Conservation Manager: Sets goals for plant program field work, distributes data management related SOPs and video trainings
- Plant Ecologist/Conservation Horticulturalist: Use SOP to collect data properly and keep web map offline areas up to date on assigned field phone, assist other staff in proper use of field phones and data collection
- Lead Plant Technician: Use SOP to collect data properly and keep web map offline areas up to date on all Plant Tech field phones, assist techs in proper use of field phones and data collection, ensure data collected is QA/QC checked

Procedure

Before leaving the office:

- Make sure phone is fully charged, bring fully charged portable power bank if possible.
- Sign-in to ArcGIS Field Maps with Conservancy ESRI account (sign in information is saved on a note on the phone home screen if you do not remember).
- Check that the following maps have offline areas downloaded, even if it is not the project you are going into the field for (*you never know when or where you will find a rare or invasive plant*):
    - Invasive Plant 2024 Collection for invasive treatments and surveys
    - Native Plant Master Collection 2024 for native plant surveys
    - Master Restoration Collection for exclosure work and plantings
- If one of the maps above does not have a recent offline area downloaded, hit the three dots next to the map name and choose "Add offline area", then next to "Level of detail" hit the blue text and change it to "Buildings", move the rectangle to cover the entire

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

island and hit “DOWNLOAD AREA”. NOTE: This may take a while and a few attempts due to slow/spotty internet so if it fails just try it again.

- Once the offline area is downloaded, hit the three dots next to the offline area’s name and choose “Rename area”, change the name to the current date (i.e., 7/25/2024) and remove older offline areas.
- Offline areas should be redownloaded at least once a week.

In the field:

- When beginning surveys, open the ArcGIS Field Maps app and turn on “My tracks”, this helps record what areas have been surveyed and acts as a source of negative data.
- To add data to one of the maps, open the relevant maps and tap the blue plus sign in the bottom right of the screen. This will open a list of feature classes that you can add new features to and changes depending on the map you have open.
- Once the type of feature you are adding to the map has been chosen, a form will present you with a list of forms to fill out, fill all the fields out to the best of your ability (Guidance on the meaning on fields for native and invasive plants will be explained in a separate SOP).
- Make sure the location of the feature you are collecting (particularly points) is centered on your location by hitting the cross hairs in the top right if they appear.
- When ending surveys, return to the main page of the Field Maps app and turn off “Tracks”.

After returning to the office:

- Once reconnected to internet, open each map you collected data in and make sure the data syncs by hitting the circling arrows in the top toolbar and pressing “SYNC NOW” when prompted. NOTE: this may take a while and a few attempts due to slow/spotty internet so if it fails just try it again.
- Close the Field Maps app, turn off the phone, and plug it back into its charger, make sure the portable power banks are plugged in as well.
- Lead Plant Tech should assign someone the duty of QA/QC checking the data through ArcGIS Online that day or on the next office day (QA/QC process is detailed in separate SOP).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 2. Feature Classes Available in the "Invasive Plant 2024 Collection" Map.

Feature Class	Use	Note
Invasive treatment point	Relatively small, centralized population of invasive species that have been treated	
Invasive survey point	Relatively small, centralized population of invasive species that have not been treated	
No target point invasive survey	Population of invasive species that was not found during a second targeted survey	
Breadcrumb invasives	Short, general comments concerning invasives not tied to a specific species	
Note point invasives	Specific comment about a single occurrence of an invasive species	
Survey effort line invasives	Records survey time and path	Essentially replaced with the "Tracks" feature for our purposes
Invasive treatment polygon	Larger, dispersed populations of invasive species that have been treated	
Invasive survey polygon	Larger, dispersed populations of invasive species that have not been treated	

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 3. Feature Classes Available in the "Native Plant Master Collection 2024" Map.

Feature Class	Use	Note
CNPS Historical	Duplicate of "_species_CNPS_merge_2018" layer which shows location of historical plant observations	Do not add new features to this layer, it was added by mistake
Native species point	Relatively small, centralized population of native species	
Breadcrumb	Short, general comments concerning native plants not tied to a specific species	
Note Point	Specific comment about a single occurrence of a native species	
No Target Point	Population of native species that was not found during a second targeted survey	
Tissue Point	Collection of tissue samples from a native plant	
Survey effort line invasives	Records survey time and path	Essentially replaced with the "Tracks" feature for our purposes
Native species polygon	Larger, dispersed populations of native species	

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 4. Feature Classes Available in the "Master Restoration Collection" Map.

Feature Class	Use	Note
Note Point	Specific comment about a single occurrence of a native species	
Point of Restoration Planting Maintenance Visit	Observations of native plants at restoration sites	
Point of Restoration Planting	Location of new plantings	
Exclosure Repair	Length of repaired sections of fence	
Exclosure need to be repaired	Length of damaged sections of fence	
Polygon of Past Plantings	Location of past plantings	
Polygon of Restoration Planting Maintenance Visit	Observations of native plants at restoration sites	
Polygon Restoration Planting	Location of new plantings	

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4.3 Invasive Plant Survey and Treatment SOP

Purpose

This standard operating procedure (SOP) outlines the procedures for conducting safe, effective, and efficient plant surveys and treatments. It combines best management practices for field work with invasive plant management considerations for Conservancy staff and contractors in the field.

Responsibilities

- Plant Conservation Manager: responsible for the overall program workflow
- Plant Program Lead Technician: responsible for ensuring staff compliance with this SOP and that CIPP project staff is trained on this SOP
- Conservation Technicians and Interns: responsible for implementing the SOP

Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)

Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) is essential for ensuring the safety of individuals working with herbicides. PPE should be inspected before each use to verify its functionality. The following PPE is mandatory for herbicide application:

1. Sun protection: Sunscreen, sunglasses, and a hat are necessary to protect against harmful UV rays.
2. Eye protection: Use shaded or clear glasses to shield your eyes from potential splashes or debris.
3. Long-sleeved shirt: Reduce skin exposure to chemicals and plants by wearing a long-sleeved shirt.
4. Nitrile gloves: High-quality, flexible gloves with no holes; store dipped gloves and herbicide/nitrile gloves in a ziplock bag (consider bringing an extra pair as a backup).
5. Long pants: Choose pants made of sturdy material that allow for a full range of motion.
6. Sturdy closed-toed shoes: Opt for well-fitted shoes with 8-inch height for ankle protection, non-skid soles, and suitability for the field terrain.
7. Optional: Wear a buff, bandana, or other face covering for additional protection.

Proper use and maintenance of PPE are crucial for minimizing the risk of injury or exposure to chemicals during herbicide application. Always inspect PPE before use and replace any damaged or worn items to ensure maximum effectiveness.

Field Gear

When preparing for fieldwork, in addition to PPE, it is essential to bring the following equipment to ensure safety, efficiency, and data accuracy:

1. Navigation tools: Carry a map, compass, and GPS device for navigation and wayfinding.
2. Communication devices: Bring a cell phone and Walkie-talkie; 2 VHF per team, plus an extra battery; radio call signs. Bring back up signaling devices, including a small mirror and whistle, in case of emergency and other communication devices do not work.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3. First aid kit: Pack a well-stocked first aid kit (fully stocked, non-expired, clean, in Ziplock or H_2O proof baggie) to handle minor injuries and emergencies. Bring any personal medication that is necessary (e.g., Epinephrine autoinjector or EpiPen if you have severe allergies). Bring toilet paper with Ziplock bags to put used paper in, as needed.
4. Weather-appropriate gear: Prepare for various weather conditions with items such as rain gear, extra layers, and insect repellent.
5. Hydration and snacks: Carry ample water (2 liters of water is mandatory; 3 are recommended) and nutrient-dense snacks to maintain energy throughout the day.
6. Data collection tools: Bring any necessary instruments, such as a camera, binoculars, field guides, and data sheets or digital recording devices.
7. Herbicide treatment supplies: In addition to plant specific treatment equipment, bring flagging tape to mark areas where herbicide was used, and an herbicide spill kit. Bring hand wipes and cleaner.
8. Seed collection materials: Bring paper bags/envelopes, Ziploc bags, paper towel, handsaw, and pruners.

Ensuring that you are well-equipped for fieldwork will contribute to a successful and productive experience while promoting personal safety and comfort. Refer to the Conservancy Field Gear Checklist for more details.

General Vehicle Safety and Fire Prevention Precautions

Prioritize safety and vehicle maintenance during fieldwork by adhering to the following guidelines:

1. Vehicle inspection: Before leaving the base yard, ensure your vehicle is equipped with essential safety items such as a fire extinguisher and first aid kit.
2. Parking precautions: Avoid parking on dry grass to minimize fire risk. If necessary, clear the area using a weed whacker before parking.
3. Radio usage: Conserve vehicle battery life by turning on the radio only during extended drives and turning it off when parked.
4. Emergency preparedness: Park the vehicle in a way that allows for easy and swift exit in case of an emergency, avoiding the need for complicated maneuvers.
5. Travel documentation: Accurately record the beginning and end of each trip in the travel log.
6. Regular vehicle maintenance: Routinely check the car sun visor for repair mileage, and notify the Conservation Operations Coordinator when an inspection is due.

By following these procedures, you can help maintain the safety and reliability of our vehicles, ensuring a smooth and efficient fieldwork experience.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Pre-Work Procedure for Surveys or Treatments

To optimize fieldwork efficiency and minimize environmental impact, follow these pre-work procedures:

1. Plan survey routes and locations:
    - Review previous survey and treatment data (e.g., polygons, points, and track lines in the Conservancy geospatial database).
    - Utilize historical data from CIPP crews to inform your approach.
    - Identify potential sensitive native animals or plants and note any areas requiring special attention or avoidance.
    - Bring relevant plant identification guides to aid in accurate plant identification.
    - Prepare for possible seed or cutting collection, and native plant population mapping.
2. Study invasive species in the work area:
    - Ensure proper identification of target invasive species and their various life stages.
    - Consider plants' reproductive strategies, such as vegetative spread or seed/cutting production, and adapt treatment methods accordingly.
3. Review herbicide use:
    - Consult the Herbicide Use Standard Operating Procedure document to address concerns related to:
        - Target plants and appropriate herbicide use.
        - Proximity to riparian habitats and water sources.
        - Potential weather impacts (e.g., extreme temperatures, rain, wind speed, and direction).
        - Necessary personal protective equipment (PPE) for each herbicide.
4. Inspect equipment and vehicles:
    - Thoroughly examine clothes, equipment, and vehicles for invasive plant propagules to prevent accidental spread and cross-contamination.

By adhering to these pre-work procedures, you can contribute to the successful management of invasive species while ensuring the preservation of native plants and sensitive ecosystems.

Field Work Procedure for Surveys or Treatments

To ensure effective fieldwork execution, follow these guidelines:

1. Activate tracking in Field Maps:
    - Enable tracks upon arrival to the site to aid data management and estimate surveyed acres.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- Accurate tracking provides valuable information on areas without invasive species.

2. Assess environmental conditions:
    - Survey the area for potential entry points, water sources, sensitive vegetation, and historical/cultural resources.
    - Minimize adverse impacts by following Invasive Plant Management Principles:
        - Evaluate invasion stages (colonization, establishment, expansion) and population size.
        - Target large populations from the outside in to prevent re-expansion.
        - Begin at the top of watersheds or upwind areas to avoid reinfestation.
        - On steep slopes, start at the far end and work back towards the exit.
        - Avoid moving through infestations to prevent further spread.
3. Survey native and invasive species:
    - Use Field Maps to record point features for clustered or small single-species populations.
    - Provide patch size estimates for points (survey or treatment).
    - Use polygon features for dispersed populations, increased accuracy of dispersal extent, or multiple species in a defined area.
4. Document herbicide use:
    - Record herbicide application details in real-time to streamline data entry in Microsoft Teams.
5. Conduct photo monitoring:
    - Capture images to document vegetation changes and guide future management efforts.
    - Include both short-term (before and after) and long-term monitoring scenarios with dedicated GIS points, server folders, and standardized procedures.
6. Capture relevant photos:
    - Document invasive plant removal, fieldwork, browsing on native plants, and unique findings.
    - Upload general photos to the designated server folder.
    - Contribute species-specific images to appropriate plant photo folders.
7. Collect plant vouchers:
    - When properly trained on the Specimen Collection SOP, gather plant specimens for the herbarium.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- Refer to the server for a list of needed specimens and detailed collection instructions.
- Handle unknown invasive specimens carefully, storing them in an airtight Ziploc bag or documenting them with photos.

By adhering to these procedures, you can contribute to the successful management and monitoring of invasive species while minimizing environmental impact.

Post-Work Procedure for Surveys or Treatments

To maintain environmental safety and facilitate efficient follow-up work, follow these post-fieldwork procedures:

1. Site flagging:
    - Clearly mark treated areas, particularly if herbicides were applied near high-traffic locations.
    - This helps to prevent accidental exposure and alerts others to the recent treatment.
2. Inspect equipment and vehicles:
    - Thoroughly examine clothes, equipment, and vehicles for invasive plant propagules before leaving the site.
    - This precaution reduces the risk of spreading invasives to new locations.
3. Assess the need for follow-up work:
    - Document in Field Maps if additional surveys or treatments are required, considering factors such as:
        - The necessity of multiple monitoring surveys for specific species throughout the season.
        - Remaining plants or propagules in the survey area that need attention.
4. Deactivate tracking:
    - Turn off tracks upon returning to the vehicle to maintain accurate data and conserve battery life.

By adhering to these guidelines, you contribute to the safe and responsible management of invasive species while ensuring the effectiveness of ongoing monitoring and treatment efforts.

This SOP may be updated at any time during the year; minimally, the SOP should be reviewed annually by those whose work is covered by the SOP.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4.4 Invasive Plant Database Data Entry SOP

Purpose

This standard operating procedure (SOP) is to ensure accurate reporting of all Invasive Plant Project management activities. A database entry needs to be completed at the end of each field day. Much of the survey and treatment information can be completed prior to finishing the GIS data entry for the day, but some data, for example acreage, it will need to be filled in after the GIS data is completed. Failure to comply with this SOP will result in incomplete and incorrect data and reporting. If you have questions, please ask Plant Conservation Manager or Plant Program Lead Technician.

Responsibilities

- Plant Conservation Manager: Distributes SOP and trains staff, interns and volunteers on how to use database. Updates database with new data definitions as needed. Completes quality analysis and quality control in the database to ensure data entry protocols and procedures are being followed. Creates monthly, quarterly and annual reports using database data.
- Plant Program Lead Technician: Trains technicians and interns in Database SOP. Updates Database with new data definitions as needed. Completes quality analysis and quality control in the database to ensure proper entry by self and others.
- Conservation Technicians and Interns: At the end of each field day collect field notes from other interns/technicians. Complete daily database entry. Entries should be updated before the end of day to ensure no information is missed or forgotten.

Data Entry Protocol

The data entered in each invasive plant database form in Microsoft Access reflects data collected and entered into the geospatial database (e.g., ArcGIS Field Maps). The Access database allows for a flexible reporting function as well as more detail and interpretation of the work conducted, and data collected.

Please note: if work was conducted in multiple watersheds in the same day, then please create an entry for each watershed management unit.

- **Date:** the date the management activity took place (often the current day).
- **Location1:** drop down of watersheds, select correct one.
- **Specific location:** provide as much details of the area managed as possible. Reference roads, land marks, trails, or elevation or ridges. Ex: “Drainage from Cotton Dam Rd to Cottonwood beach” or “5th ridge SW of Disappoint Spur off U Coffeepot Rd”
    - Or if you worked in multiple WMUs that day list them here
- **Grant #:** is filled in to show what grant is funding the project work. If unsure of the whether or not it is a grant specific project, ask Plant Program Lead Technician or Plant Conservation Manager.
- **Survey Acres:** is the total number of acres surveyed within that specific watershed. If you surveyed in multiple watersheds you must make a survey polygon for each watershed in order to calculate survey acres for the individual watersheds.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- **Species 1:** primary target species for the day or the species with the highest density of plants and / or treatment effort.
- **Manual Treatment:** drop down selection. Select 'None" if no manual treatment occurred.
- **Herbicide 1:** drop down selection. Select 'None" if no chemical treatment occurred.
- **Herbicide Method 1:** drop down selection. Select 'None" if no chemical treatment occurred.
- **Oz Herbicide 1:** Herbicide amounts reflect the amount of mixed herbicide, not the total amount of concentrated herbicide used. You are estimating, so leaving the conversion to the hundredths implies an accuracy that isn't there! Insert a zero (0) if no herbicide was used or no treatment occurred.
- **Treatment 1 Acres:** calculate using the ArcMap All_Species attributes table data. The Statistics tool (right click on Acres column) tallies the acres for multiple lines per species if you use the selection function.
- **Mature 1:** tally of mature Species 1 individuals (mature plants are individuals with reproductive parts present: flowers, fruits, buds &/or very large specimens that have reproductive capacity in the past). Plant count is for treated plants ONLY.
- **Immature 1:** tally of immature Species 1 individuals (immature plants are individuals without reproductive parts present, sometimes with cotyledon leaves present). Plant count is for treated plants ONLY.
- Follow the instructions above for **Species 2, Species 3, etc**. The higher the number should represent less plants treated or even surveillance only work effort. If more than 6 plants were surveyed for and / or treated, create a new database entry for them.
- **Work hours**: account for hours spent on management for each watershed. Include prep time at base yard and commute time. PPLT = plant program lead technician. Split work hours b/w watersheds if crew worked in multiple WMUs during the day. *Do NOT forget to total the hours.*
- **Comments**:
    - Crew initials
    - Plants Found: six (6) letter species code for each plant that was found
    - For each species surveyed for and / or treated, please provide information on population, for example if the plants were heavily browsed, if they were seeding, or may need to retreated for some reason.
    - Provide details on the survey work – was the survey completed? Was the vegetation dense or fairly open? Do we need to resurvey soon? Was it sunny, raining, windy? Was there something you didn't have that should be brought the next time? Anything unusual like a squirrel attack? The comment section is a good place to mention other invasives or natives you noticed but did not work on.
    - Think about what you wish you would have known prior to the survey! Remember: these notes, along with GIS polygons and photos, are all future crews have to go off of!

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

    - Access point information: put in details of how to best access the survey site, where to park, safety issues to look out for. For example, "Do not attempt to walk back up South ridgeline because you will get cliffed out."
    - Mention ALL safety issues, even if it wasn't an issue for you. Drop GPS waypoints on "waterfalls" and other hazards then save in the "Misc" folder when you get back to the office.
- **Final step:** save your work! Save the database!

For reference, here are some example comments that might be entered in the database:

- BJD SO ORR JMC Plants Found: GENLIN, SILMAR
- GENLIN: Survey tx; numerous populations in and on either side of the main drainage that serves Cottonwood beach. Many matures already set seed. Otherwise, they were mostly saplings.
- SILMAR: Survey; a few populations near previous treatment polygons that had already set seed and died back. Some new populations were also treated.
- ARUDON: Survey; none found.
- TETTET: Survey; historic pops on cottonwood beach still thriving. Only one surveillance polygon was created although we did see it on both sides of drg where polygons were created in 2016.
- Notes: We left MR by 7:45am and started our survey around 8:15am. We parked one truck at Cottonwood Beach and then drove up and down into Cottonwood Dam Rd and parked there. That's where we started our survey. We surveyed the drainage and surrounding area from Cottonwood Dam road going westward. We had to survey on either side of the drainage to get past the actual Cottonwood Dam, but that was not too difficult. There were, however, several areas of dense vegetation that we had to survey through, and several spots within the drainage area that were heavily infested with poison oak. Gaps in survey polygon were due to two factors: we surveyed the roadsides while walking to and from the drainage, and often could not see to our other survey line in the drg, and we ran into a bison in the middle of the drg and had to chase him out so we could continue towards the beach. Large CA sycamores were naturalized in the drainage, too, although we did not map them. Overall survey was pretty easy but the dense pockets and poison oak and bison threw some challenges our way. We finished the survey at Cottonwood Beach around 2:15pm, then drove back for the other truck in Cottonwood Dam Rd, then returned to MR by 3pm ish.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

5 References

APRS Implementation Team. 2000. Alien Plants Ranking System Version 5.1. Jameston, ND: Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center Home Page. http://www.npwrc.usgs.gov/resource.2000/aprs.htm

Babbit, B. 1998. Foreword. In: Robert S. Devine. *Alien Invasion: America's Battle with Non-Native Animals and Plants*. Washington D.C.: National Geographic Society. 277 pp.

Baskin, Y. 2002. Nature's Space Invaders. In: *Nature Conservancy, Nature Org*. Summer 2002. 88 pp.

California Invasive Plant Council (Cal-IPC). 2012. Preventing the Spread of Invasive Plants: Best Management Practices for Land Managers (3rd ed.). Cal-IPC Publication 2012-03. California Invasive Plant Council, Berkeley, CA. Available at www.cal-ipc.org

Colorado Natural Areas Program, Colorado State Parks, Colorado Department of Natural Resources, and Colorado Department of Agriculture Division of Plant Industry. 2000. *Creating An Integrated Weed Management Plan: A Handbook far Owners and Managers of Lands with Natural Values*. Caring for the Land Series. State of Colorado. 83 p.

DiTomaso, J.M., G.B. Kyser, S.B. Orloff, S.F. Enloe·, and G.A. Nader. 1999. New growth regulator herbicide provides excellent control of yellowstar thistle. California Agriculture 53(2):12-16.

Kiehn, M. 2011. Invasive Alien Species and Islands. Pp.365-384 In Bramwell, D. and Caujapé-Castells, J. (eds.). *The Biology of Island Floras*. Editors Cambridge University Press.

Knapp, J.J. 2007. Catalina Island Invasive Plant Management Plan. Unpublished Report submitted to the Catalina Island Conservancy, Avalon, California. 30 Pp.

Lemke A, Kowarik I, von der Lippe M. 2019. How traffic facilitates population expansion of invasive species along roads: The case of common ragweed in Germany. *J Appl Ecol*. 56: 413–422. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13287

Mullin, B. H., L. W. Anderson, M. DiTomaso, R. E. Eplee, and K. D. Getsinger. 2000. Invasive Plant Species. Issue Paper Number 13. Council for Agricultural Science and Technology. 18 pp.

Randall, J. M. and M.C. Hoshovsky. 2000. California's wildland invasive plants. Pp. 11-27 In C. C. Bossard, J. M. Randall, and M. C. Hoshovsky (eds.). *Invasive plants of California's wildlands.* University of California Press, Berkley, CA.

Stolzenburg, W. 2000. America the bountiful. Taking stock of the nation's biological diversity. Nature Conservancy 50(3):10-25.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Appendix B

Catalina Island Plant List

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table B-1. Catalina Island Plant List.

The list provided by the Catalina Island Conservancy in 2023 includes current known plant species found on Santa Catalina Island. This list excludes species native to the island but now extirpated, ornamental vegetation in developed areas, and invasive species without established populations that have been removed in past control efforts. Introduced species are marked with an asterisk (*) before their scientific names.

FERNS AND FERN ALLIES

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Azollaceae	*Azolla filiculoides* Lam.	Mosquito fern
Blechnaceae	*Woodwardia fimbriata* Sm.	Giant chain fern
Cyatheaceae	**Sphaeropteris cooperi* (Hook. ex F. Muell.) R.M. Tryon	Scaly tree fern
Dennstaedtiaceae	*Pteridium aquilinum* (L.) Kuhn var. pubescens Underw.	Western bracken
Dryopteridaceae	*Dryopteris arguta* (Kaulf.) Maxon	Wood fern
Equisetaceae	*Equisetum hyemale* L. subsp. affine (Engelm.) Calder & Roy L. Taylor	Common scouring rush
	Equisetum laevigatum A. Braun	Smooth scouring rush
	Equisetum telmateia Ehrh. subsp. *braunii* (J. Milde) Hauke	Giant horsetail
Ophioglossaceae	*Ophioglossum californicum* Prantl	California adder's-tongue
Polypodiaceae	*Polypodium californicum* Kaulf.	California polypody
Pteridaceae	*Adiantum capillus-veneris* L.	Southern maidenhair
	Adiantum jordanii Müll. Hal.	California maidenhair
	Aspidotis californica (Hook.) Copel.	California lace fern
	Notholaena californica D.C. Eaton	California cloak-fern
	Pellaea andromedifolia (Kaulf.) Fée	Coffee fern
	Pellaea mucronata (D.C. Eaton) D.C. Eaton	Bird's-foot fern
	Pentagramma triangularis (Kaulf.) Yatsk. et al. subsp. *triangularis*	Goldback fern
	Pentagramma triangularis (Kaulf.) Yatsk. et al. subsp. *viscosa* (D.C. Eaton) Yatsk. et al.	Silverback fern
Selaginellaceae	*Selaginella bigelovii* Underw.	Bigelow's spike-moss

GYMNOSPERMS

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Cupressaceae	**Calocedrus decurrens* (Torr.) Florin	Incense cedar
	**Hesperocyparis macrocarpa* (Hartw.) Bartel	Monterey cypress
	**Hesperocyparis stephensonii* (C.B. Wolf) Bartel	Cuyamaca cypress
Pinaceae	**Cedrus deodara* (Roxb. ex D. Don) G. Don f.	Deodar cedar
	**Pinus attenuata* Lemmon	Knobcone pine
	**Pinus canariensis* C. Smith ex DC	Canary Island pine
	**Pinus coulteri* D. Don	Coulter pine
	**Pinus halepensis* P. Mill.	Aleppo pine
	**Pinus muricata* D. Don	Bishop pine
	**Pinus pinea* L.	Italian stone pine
	**Pinus radiata* D. Don	Monterey pine
	**Pinus torreyana* Carrière subsp. *insularis* J.R. Haller	Santa Rosa Island torrey pine

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

ANGIOSPERMS

Magnoliids

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Saururaceae	*Anemopsis californica* (Nutt.) Hook. & Arn.	Yerba mansa

Monocots

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Agavaceae	**Agave americana* L.	American century plant
	Chlorogalum pomeridianum (DC.) Kunth	Soap plant
Alliaceae	*Allium praecox* Brandegee	Wild onion, Early onion
Arecaceae	**Phoenix canariensis* Chabaud	Canary Island palm
	**Washingtonia robusta* H. Wendl.	Mexican fan palm
Asparagaceae	**Asparagus asparagoides* (L.) Druce	Asparagus
	**Asparagus officinalis* L. subsp. *officinalis*	Garden asparagus
Cyperaceae	*Bolboschoenus maritimus* (L.) Palla subsp. *paludosus* (A. Nelson) T. Koyama	Saltmarsh bulrush, Alkali bulrush
	Bolboschoenus robustus (Pursh) Soják	Seacoast bulrush
	Carex globosa Boott	Round-fruited sedge
	Carex praegracilis W. Boott	Freeway sedge
	Carex triquetra Boott	Trigonous sedge
	Carex tumulicola Mack.	Foothill sedge
	Cyperus eragrostis Lam.	Tall flatsedge
	Cyperus esculentus L. var. *leptostachyus*	Yellow nutgrass
	Cyperus odoratus L.	Fragrant flatsedge
	Eleocharis macrostachya Britton	Creeping spike-rush
	Schoenoplectus americanus (Pers.) Schinz & R. Keller	Olney's three-square bulrush
	Schoenoplectus pungens (Vahl) Palla var. *longispicatus* (Britton) S.G. Sm.	Common three-square bulrush
	Scirpus microcarpus J. Presl & C. Presl	Small fruit bulrush
Iridaceae	*Sisyrinchium bellum* S. Watson	Western blue-eyed-grass
Juncaceae	*Juncus acutus* L. subsp. *leopoldii* (Parl.) Snogerup	Southwestern spiny rush
	Juncus balticus Willd. subsp. *ater* (Rydb.) Snogerup	Baltic rush
	Juncus bufonius L. var. *bufonius*	Toad rush
	Juncus mexicanus Willd.	Mexican rush
	Juncus textilis Buchenau	Basket rush
	Juncus xiphioides E. Mey.	Iris-leaved rush
Liliaceae	*Calochortus albus* (Benth.) Benth.	Fairy-lantern
	Calochortus catalinae S. Watson	Catalina mariposa lily
	Calochortus splendens Benth.	Lilac mariposa
Orchidaceae	*Epipactis gigantea* Hook.	Stream orchid
	Piperia cooperi (S. Watson) Rydb.	Chaparral rein-orchid
	Piperia elongata Rydb.	Chaparral orchid
	Piperia unalascensis (Spreng.) Rydb.	Slender-spire orchid

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Poaceae	*Agrostis exarata* Trin.	Spike bent grass
	Agrostis pallens Trin.	Dune bent grass
	**Agrostis stolonifera* L.	Creeping bent
	**Aira caryophyllea* L.	Silver hair grass
	Andropogon glomeratus (Walter) Britton et al. var. *scabriglumis* C.S. Campb.	Southwestern bushy bluestem
	Aristida adscensionis L.	Sixweeks three-awn
	**Arundo donax* L.	Giant reed
	**Avena barbata* Link	Slender wild oat
	**Avena fatua* L.	Wild oat
	**Avena sativa* L.	Cultivated oat
	Bothriochloa barbinodis (Lag.) Herter	Cane bluestem
	**Brachypodium distachyon* (L.) P. Beauv.	False brome
	**Briza minor* L.	Annual quaking grass
	Bromus arizonicus (Shear) Stebbins	Arizona brome
	**Bromus berteroanus* Colla	Chilean chess
	Bromus carinatus Hook. & Arn.	California brome
	**Bromus catharticus* Vahl	Rescue grass
	**Bromus diandrus* Roth	Ripgut brome
	**Bromus hordeaceus* L.	Soft chess
	Bromus laevipes Shear	Woodland brome
	**Bromus madritensis* L. subsp. *rubens* (L.) Husn.	Red brome
	Bromus pseudolaevipes Wagnon	Coast range brome
	**Bromus sterilis* L.	Poverty brome
	**Cortaderia selloana* (Schult. & Schult. f.) Asch. & Graebn.	Pampas grass
	**Crypsis vaginiflora* (Forssk.) Opiz	Modest prickle grass
	**Cynodon dactylon* (L.) Pers.	Bermuda grass
	**Dactylis glomerata* L.	Orchard grass
	**Dactyloctenium aegyptium* (L.) Willd.	Durban crowfoot
	**Desmazeria rigida* (L.) Tutin	
	Dissanthelium californicum (*Poa thomasii* Refulio)	California dissanthelium
	Distichlis littoralis (Engelm.) H.L. Bell & Columbus	Shore grass
	Distichlis spicata (L.) Greene	Salt grass
	**Ehrharta calycina* Sm.	Perennial veldt grass
	**Ehrharta erecta* Lam.	Panic veldt grass
	Elymus condensatus J. Presl	Giant wild-rye
	Elymus glaucus Buckley	Blue wild-rye, Western wild-rye
	Elymus multisetus (J.G. Sm.) Burtt Davy	Big squirreltail
	Elymus triticoides Buckley	Beardless wild rye
	**Festuca arundinacea* Schreb.	Tall fescue
	**Festuca bromoides* L.	Brome fescue
	Festuca microstachys Nutt.	Small fescue
	**Festuca myuros* L.	Rattail sixweeks grass
	Festuca octoflora Walter	Sixweeks grass

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Poaceae	**Festuca perennis* (L.) Columbus & J.P. Sm.	English ryegrass, Perennial ryegrass
	**Festuca temulenta* (L.) Columbus & J.P. Sm.	Darnel
	**Gastridium phleoides* (Nees & Meyen) C.E. Hubb.	Nit grass
	**Hainardia cylindrica* (Willd.) Greuter	Barb grass
	Hordeum brachyantherum Nevski subsp. *californicum* (Covas & Stebbins) Bothmer et al.	California barley
	Hordeum intercedens Nevski	Bobtail barley
	**Hordeum marinum* Huds. subsp. *gussoneanum* (Parl.) Thell.	Mediterranean barley
	**Hordeum murinum* L. subsp. *glaucum* (Steud.) Tzvelev	Smooth barley
	**Hordeum murinum* L. subsp. *leporinum* (Link) Arcang.	Hare barley
	**Hordeum murinum* L. subsp. *murinum*	Wall barley
	**Hordeum vulgare* L.	Common barley
	**Lamarckia aurea* (L.) Moench	Goldentop
	Melica imperfecta Trin.	Little California melica
	Muhlenbergia microsperma (DC.) Kunth	Littleseed muhly
	**Panicum capillare* L.	Witchgrass
	**Parapholis incurva* (L.) C.E. Hubb.	Sickle grass
	**Paspalum dilatatum* Poir.	Dallis grass
	Paspalum distichum L.	Knot grass
	**Pennisetum clandestinum* Chiov.	Kikuyu grass
	**Pennisetum setaceum* (Forssk.) Chiov.	Fountaingrass
	**Phalaris aquatica* L.	Harding grass
	**Phalaris canariensis* L.	Canary grass
	**Phalaris caroliniana* Walter	Carolina canary grass
	Phalaris lemmonii Vasey	Lemmon's canary grass
	**Phalaris minor* Retz.	Little-seeded canary grass
	**Phalaris paradoxa* L.	Hood canary grass
	**Poa annua* L.	Annual blue grass
	Poa secunda J. Presl subsp. *secunda*	One-sided blue grass
	**Polypogon interruptus* Kunth	Ditch beard grass
	**Polypogon monspeliensis* (L.) Desf.	Rabbitfoot grass
	**Polypogon viridis* (Gouan) Breistr.	Water beard grass
	**Schismus arabicus* Nees	Arabian grass
	**Schismus barbatus* (L.) Thell.	Mediterranean grass
	**Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Moench	Sorghum
	Stipa cernua Stebbins & Love	Nodding needle grass
	Stipa lepida Hitchc.	Foothill needle grass
	**Stipa miliacea* (L.) Hoover var. miliacea	Smilo grass
	Stipa pulchra Hitchc.	Purple needle grass
	**Stipa tenuissima* Trin.	Mexican feathergrass

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Potamogetonaceae	**Potamogeton crispus* L.	Crisp-leaved pondweed
	Stuckenia pectinata (L.) Börner	Fennel-leaf pondweed
Ruppiaceae	*Ruppia maritima* L.	Ditch-grass
Themidaceae	*Bloomeria crocea* (Torr.) Coville	Common goldenstar
	Brodiaea jolonensis Eastw.	Chaparral cluster-lily
	Dichelostemma capitatum (Benth.) Alph. Wood subsp. *capitatum*	Blue dicks
Typhaceae	*Typha domingensis* Pers.	Southern cattail
	Typha latifolia L.	Broad-leaved cattail
Zosteraceae	*Phyllospadix scouleri* Hook.	Surf-grass
	Phyllospadix torreyi S. Watson	Torrey's surf-grass
	Zostera marina L.	Eel grass
	Zostera pacifica S. Watson	Pacific eel grass
Eudicots		
Adoxaceae	*Sambucus mexicana*	Blue elderberry
Aizoaceae	**Aptenia cordifolia* (L. f.) Schwantes	Baby sun-rose
	**Carpobrotus chilensis* (Molina) N.E. Br.	Sea fig
	**Carpobrotus edulis* (L.) N.E. Br.	Freeway iceplant
	**Mesembryanthemum crystallinum* L.	Crystalline iceplant
	**Mesembryanthemum nodiflorum* L.	Slender-leaved iceplant
	**Tetragonia tetragonioides* (Pall.) Kuntze	New Zealand spinach
Amaranthaceae	**Amaranthus albus* L.	Tumbleweed
	**Amaranthus deflexus* L.	Low amaranth
Anacardiaceae	*Malosma laurina* (Nutt.) Abrams	Laurel sumac
	Rhus integrifolia (Nutt.) Rothr.	Lemonade berry
	Rhus integrifolia x *ovata*	Hybrid sugar bush
	Rhus ovata S. Watson	Sugar bush
	**Schinus molle* L.	Peruvian pepper tree
	**Schinus terebinthifolius* Raddi	Brazilian pepper tree
	Toxicodendron diversilobum (Torr. & A. Gray) Greene	Poison oak
Apiaceae	*Apiastrum angustifolium* Nutt.	Wild celery
	Bowlesia incana Ruiz & Pav.	Bowlesia
	Daucus pusillus Michx.	Rattlesnake weed
	**Foeniculum vulgare* Mill.	Fennel
	Sanicula arguta J.M. Coult. & Rose	Sanicle
	Sanicula crassicaulis DC.	Pacific sanicle
	**Torilis arvensis* (Huds.) Link	
	**Torilis nodosa* (L.) Gaertn.	knotted hedge-parsley
	Yabea microcarpa (Hook. & Arn.) Koso-Pol.	Caucalis
Apocynaceae	*Asclepias fascicularis* Decne.	Narrow-leaf milkweed
	Funastrum cynanchoides (Decne.) Schltr. var. *hartwegii* (Vail) Krings	Climbing milkweed
	**Vinca major* L.	Greater periwinkle

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Asteraceae	*Achillea millefolium* L.	Yarrow
	Achyrachaena mollis Schauer	Blow-wives
	Acourtia microcephala DC.	Perezia, Sacapellote
	Amblyopappus pusillus Hook. & Arn.	Coast weed, Pineapple weed
	Ambrosia acanthicarpa Hook.	Annual bur-sage
	Ambrosia chamissonis (Less.) Greene	Beach bur-sage
	Ambrosia psilostachya DC.	Western ragweed
	**Anthemis cotula* L.	Mayweed
	Artemisia californica Less.	California sagebrush
	Artemisia douglasiana Besser	Mugwort
	Artemisia dracunculus L.	Tarragon
	Baccharis glutinosa Pers.	Marsh baccharis
	Baccharis pilularis DC. subsp. *consanguinea* (DC.) C.B. Wolf	Coyote brush
	Baccharis salicifolia (Ruiz & Pav.) Pers. subsp. *salicifolia*	Mule fat
	Baccharis salicina Torr. & A. Gray	Emory baccharis
	Baccharis sarothroides A. Gray	Broom baccharis
	Brickellia californica (Torr. & A. Gray) A. Gray	California brickellbush
	**Carduus pycnocephalus* L. subsp. *pycnocephalus*	Italian thistle
	**Centaurea cineraria* L.	Dusty miller
	**Centaurea melitensis* L.	Tocalote
	**Centaurea solstitialis* L.	Yellow star-thistle
	Centromadia pungens (Hook. & Arn.) Greene subsp. *pungens*	Common spikeweed
	Cirsium occidentale (Nutt.) Jeps. var. *californicum* (A. Gray) D.J. Keil & C.E. Turner	California thistle
	Cirsium occidentale (Nutt.) Jeps. var. *occidentale*	Cobwebby thistle
	**Cirsium vulgare* (Savi) Ten.	Bull thistle
	Constancea nevinii (A. Gray) B.G. Baldwin	Nevin's woolly sunflower
	Corethrogyne filaginifolia (Hook. & Arn.) Nutt.	Cud-weed aster
	**Cotula australis* (Spreng.) Hook. f.	Australian brass-buttons
	**Cotula coronopifolia* L.	Brass-buttons
	**Crepis setosa* Haller f.	Bristly hawksbeard
	**Cynara cardunculus* L. subsp. *flavescens* Wiklund	Artichoke thistle
	Deinandra clementina (Brandegee) B.G. Baldwin	Island tarplant
	Deinandra fasciculata (DC.) Greene	Common tarplant
	**Delairea odorata* Lem.	German ivy
	Encelia californica Nutt.	Bush sunflower
	Ericameria palmeri (A. Gray) H.M. Hall var. *pachylepis* (H.M. Hall) G.L. Nesom	Palmer's goldenbush
	**Erigeron bonariensis* L.	Flax-leaved fleabane
	**Erigeron canadensis* L.	Horseweed
	Erigeron foliosus Nutt. var. *foliosus*	Leafy fleabane

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Asteraceae	*Eriophyllum confertiflorum* (DC.) A. Gray var. *confertiflorum*	Golden-yarrow
	Euthamia occidentalis Nutt.	Western goldenrod
	Gamochaeta ustulata (Nutt.) Holub	Purple cudweed
	**Glebionis coronaria* (L.) Spach	Garland, Crown daisy
	Gnaphalium palustre Nutt.	Lowland cudweed
	Grindelia camporum Greene	Robust gumplant
	Hazardia squarrosa (Hook. & Arn.) Greene var. *grindelioides* (DC.) W.D. Clark	Saw-toothed goldenbush
	**Hedypnois cretica* (L.) Dum. Cours.	Crete weed
	Helenium puberulum DC.	Sneezeweed
	**Helminthotheca echioides* (L.) Holub	Bristly ox-tongue
	Heterotheca grandiflora Nutt.	Telegraph weed
	**Hypochaeris glabra* L.	Smooth cat's-ear
	**Hypochaeris radicata* L.	Rough cat's-ear
	Isocoma menziesii (Hook. & Arn.) G.L. Nesom var. *decumbens* (Greene) G.L. Nesom	Decumbent goldenbush
	Isocoma menziesii (Hook. & Arn.) G.L. Nesom var. *menziesii*	Menzies coast goldenbush
	Isocoma menziesii (Hook. & Arn.) G.L. Nesom var. *sedoides* (Greene) G.L. Nesom	Prostrate coastal goldenbush
	Isocoma menziesii (Hook. & Arn.) G.L. Nesom var. *vernonioides* (Nutt.) G.L. Nesom	Coast goldenbush
	Jaumea carnosa (Less.) A. Gray	Jaumea
	**Lactuca saligna* L.	Willow lettuce
	**Lactuca serriola* L.	Prickly lettuce
	Laënnecia coulteri (A. Gray) G.L. Nesom	Coulter's horseweed
	Lasthenia gracilis (DC.) Greene	Common goldfields
	Layia platyglossa (Fisch. & C.A. Mey.) A. Gray	Tidy-tips
	Leptosyne gigantea Kellogg	Giant coreopsis
	Logfia arizonica (A. Gray) Holub	Arizona cottonrose
	Logfia filaginoides (Hook. & Arn.) Morefield	California cottonrose
	**Logfia gallica* (L.) Coss. & Germ.	Daggerleaf cottonrose
	Madia elegans D. Don	Common madia
	Madia exigua (Sm.) A. Gray	Threadstem madia/tarweed
	Madia gracilis (Sm.) Applegate	Gumweed
	Madia sativa Molina	Coast tarweed
	Malacothrix saxatilis (Nutt.) Torr. & A. Gray var. *tenuifolia* (Nutt.) A. Gray	Cliff aster
	**Matricaria discoidea* DC.	Pineapple weed
	Matricaria occidentalis Greene	Valley mayweed
	Micropus californicus Fisch. & C.A. Mey. var. *californicus*	slender cottonweed
	Microseris douglasii (DC.) Sch. Bip. subsp. *platycarpha* (A. Gray) K.L. Chambers	Small-flowered microseris
	Pentachaeta lyonii A. Gray	Lyon's pentachaeta
	Perityle emoryi Torr.	Emory's rock daisy

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Asteraceae	*Pluchea odorata* (L.) Cass. var. *odorata*	Saltmarsh fleabane
	Pluchea sericea (Nutt.) Coville	Arrow-weed
	Pseudognaphalium beneolens (Davidson) Anderb.	Fragrant everlasting
	Pseudognaphalium biolettii Anderb.	Two-tone everlasting, Bicolored everlasting
	Pseudognaphalium californicum (DC.) Anderb.	California everlasting, Green everlasting
	Pseudognaphalium canescens (DC.) Anderb.	
	**Pseudognaphalium luteoalbum* (L.) Hilliard & B.L. Burtt	Weedy cudweed
	Pseudognaphalium microcephalum (Nutt.) Anderb.	Felt-leaf everlasting, White everlasting
	Pseudognaphalium stramineum (Kunth) Anderb.	Cotton-batting
	Psilocarphus tenellus Nutt.	Slender woolly-marbles
	**Pulicaria paludosa* Link	False-fleabane
	Rafinesquia californica Nutt.	California chicory
	Senecio aphanactis Greene	Chaparral ragwort
	Senecio flaccidus Less. var. *douglasii* (DC.) B.L. Turner & T.M. Barkley	Douglas' threadleaf ragwort
	Senecio lyonii A. Gray	Island senecio
	**Senecio vulgaris* L.	Common groundsel
	**Silybum marianum* (L.) Gaertn.	Milk thistle
	Solidago velutina DC. subsp. *californica* (Nutt.) Semple	California goldenrod
	**Soliva sessilis* Ruiz & Pav.	Spur weed
	**Sonchus asper* (L.) Hill subsp. *asper*	Prickly sow thistle
	**Sonchus oleraceus* L.	Common sow thistle
	**Sonchus tenerrimus* L.	Slender sow thistle
	Stebbinsoseris heterocarpa (Nutt.) K.L. Chambers	Grassland silverpuffs
	Stephanomeria diegensis Gottlieb	San Diego wreath plant, San Diego milk-aster
	Stephanomeria exigua Benth. ssp. *coronaria*	White plume wirelettuce
	Stephanomeria virgata Benth. subsp. *virgata*	Wand chicory
	Stylocline gnaphaloides Nutt.	Everlasting neststraw
	Symphyotrichum subulatum (Michx.) G.L. Nesom	Annual saltmarsh aster
	**Taraxacum officinale* F.H. Wigg.	Common dandelion
	**Tragopogon porrifolius* L.	Salsify, oyster plant
	Uropappus lindleyi (DC.) Nutt.	Silverpuffs
	**Xanthium spinosum* L.	Spiny cocklebur
	**Xanthium strumarium* L.	Cocklebur
Bataceae	*Batis maritima* L.	Saltwort, Beachwort
Boraginaceae	*Amsinckia intermedia* Fisch. & C.A. Mey.	Common fiddleneck
	Amsinckia menziesii (Lehm.) A. Nelson & J.F. Macbr.	Small-flowered fiddleneck
	Cryptantha clevelandii Greene	Cleveland's cryptantha
	Cryptantha intermedia (A. Gray) Greene	White forgive-me-not
	Cryptantha maritima (Greene) Greene	Guadalupe cryptantha

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Boraginaceae	*Cryptantha microstachys* (A. Gray) Greene	Tejon cryptantha
	Cryptantha wigginsii I.M. Johnst.	Wiggins' cryptantha
	Harpagonella palmeri A. Gray	Palmer's grapplinghook
	Johnstonella micromeres (A. Gray) Hasenstab & M.G. Simpson	Minute-flowered cryptantha
	Pectocarya linearis (Ruiz & Pav.) DC. subsp. *ferocula* (I.M. Johnst.) Thorne	Narrow-toothed pectocarya
	Pectocarya penicillata (Hook. & Arn.) A. DC.	Northern pectocarya
	Plagiobothrys acanthocarpus (Piper) I.M. Johnst.	Adobe popcornflower
	Plagiobothrys canescens Benth.	Popcorn flower
	Plagiobothrys collinus (Phil.) I.M. Johnst. var. *fulvescens* (I.M. Johnst.) Higgins	Rough-stemmed popcornflower
	Plagiobothrys collinus (Phil.) I.M. Johnst. var. *gracilis* (I.M. Johnst.) Higgins	San Diego popcornflower
	Plagiobothrys nothofulvus (A. Gray) A. Gray	Rusty popcornflower
Brassicaceae	*Athysanus pusillus* (Hook.) Greene	Athysanus
	**Brassica nigra* (L.) W.D.J. Koch	Black mustard
	**Brassica rapa* L.	Yellow field mustard
	**Cakile maritima* Scop.	Sea rocket
	**Capsella bursa-pastoris* (L.) Medik.	Shepherd’s purse
	Cardamine californica (Nutt.) Greene	Milk maids
	**Cardamine oligosperma* Nutt.	Bitter-cress
	Caulanthus lasiophyllus (Hook. & Arn.) Payson	California mustard
	Descurainia pinnata (Walter) Britton	Tansy mustard
	Draba cuneifolia Torr. & A. Gray	Whitlow-grass
	**Erysimum cheiri* (L.) Crantz	Wallflower
	**Hirschfeldia incana* (L.) Lagr.-Fossat	Shortpod mustard
	**Lepidium didymum* L.	Lesser swine cress
	**Lepidium draba* L.	Hoary cress
	Lepidium lasiocarpum Nutt. subsp. *lasiocarpum*	Hairy peppergrass
	Lepidium latipes Hook.	Dwarf peppergrass
	Lepidium nitidum Nutt.	Shining peppergrass
	Lepidium oblongum Small	Island peppergrass, Lentejilla
	**Lepidium strictum* (S. Watson) Rattan	
	**Lepidium virginicum* L. subsp. *menziesii* (DC.) Thell.	Bird’s peppergrass
	**Lobularia maritima* (L.) Desv.	Sweet alyssum
	**Nasturtium officinale* W.T. Aiton	Water cress
	**Raphanus raphanistrum* L.	Jointed charlock
	**Raphanus sativus* L.	Radish
	Sibara filifolia (Greene) Greene	Santa Cruz Island rockcress
	**Sinapis arvensis* L.	Charlock
	**Sisymbrium altissimum* L.	Tumble mustard
	**Sisymbrium irio* L.	London rocket
	**Sisymbrium officinale* (L.) Scop.	Hedge mustard

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Brassicaceae	**Sisymbrium orientale* L.	Oriental mustard
	Thysanocarpus curvipes Hook.	Hairy lacepod
	Thysanocarpus laciniatus Nutt.	Fringepod, Narrow-leaved lacepod
	Tropidocarpum gracile Hook.	Dobie pod
	Turritis glabra L.	Tower mustard
Cactaceae	*Bergerocactus emoryi* (Engelm.) Britton & Rose	Velvet cactus
	Cylindropuntia prolifera (Engelm.) F.M. Knuth	Coast cholla
	Opuntia engelmannii Engelm. var. engelmannii	Engelmann prickly-pear
	**Opuntia ficus-indica* (L.) Mill.	Mission prickly-pear
	Opuntia littoralis (Engelm.) Cockerell	Coastal prickly pear
	Opuntia oricola Philbrick	Pancake prickly pear, Tall prickly pear
Campanulaceae	*Lobelia dunnii* Greene var. *serrata* (A. Gray) McVaugh	
	Triodanis biflora (Ruiz & Pav.) Greene	Venus looking-glass
Caprifoliaceae	*Lonicera hispidula* (Lindl.) Torr. & A. Gray	Hairy honeysuckle
	Lonicera subspicata Hook. & Arn. var. *denudata* Rehder	Wild honeysuckle
	Lonicera subspicata Hook. & Arn. var. *subspicata*	Santa Barbara honeysuckle
	Symphoricarpos mollis Nutt.	Creeping snowberry
Caryophyllaceae	**Cerastium glomeratum* Thuill.	Sticky mouse-ear chickweed
	**Herniaria hirsuta* L. var. *cinerea* (DC.) Loret & Barrandon	Rupturewort
	Minuartia douglasii (Torr. & A. Gray) Mattf.	Douglas' stitchwort
	Polycarpon depressum Nutt.	Prostrate polycarp
	**Polycarpon tetraphyllum* (L.) L. var. *tetraphyllum*	Four-leaved allseed
	Sagina apetala Ard.	Dwarf pearlwort
	Sagina decumbens (Elliott) Torr. & A. Gray subsp. *occidentalis* (S. Watson) G.E. Crow	Western pearlwort
	Silene antirrhina L.	Sleepy catchfly
	Silene coniflora Otth	Multinerved catchfly
	**Silene gallica* L.	Windmill pink
	**Spergula arvensis* L.	Stickwort
	**Spergularia bocconi* (Scheele) Graebn.	Boccone's sand-spurrey
	Spergularia macrotheca (Cham. & Schltdl.) Heynh. var. *macrotheca*	Sticky sand-spurrey
	Spergularia marina (L.) Besser	Saltmarsh sand-spurrey
	**Spergularia villosa* (Pers.) Cambess.	Hairy sand-spurrey
	**Stellaria media* (L.) Vill.	Common chickweed
	Stellaria nitens Nutt.	Shining chickweed
Chenopodiaceae	*Aphanisma blitoides* Moq.	Aphanisma
	Arthrocnemum subterminale (Parish) Standl.	Pickleweed
	Atriplex argentea Nutt. var. *expansa* (S. Watson) S.L. Welsh & Reveal	Silverscale
	Atriplex coulteri (Moq.) D. Dietr.	Coulter’s saltbush

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Chenopodiaceae	*Atriplex lentiformis* (Torr.) S. Watson	Big saltbush
	Atriplex leucophylla (Moq.) D. Dietr.	Beach saltbush
	Atriplex pacifica A. Nelson	South coast saltscale
	Atriplex patula L.	Spear orach
	Atriplex prostrata DC.	Fat-hen
	**Atriplex rosea* L.	Tumbling orach
	**Atriplex semibaccata* R. Br.	Australian saltbush
	Atriplex serenana Abrams var. *davidsonii* (Standl.) Munz	Davidson's saltscale
	Atriplex serenana Abrams var. *serenana*	Bractscale
	**Atriplex suberecta* I. Verd.	Sprawling saltbush
	Atriplex watsonii Abrams	Watson's saltbush, Matscale
	**Bassia hyssopifolia* (Pall.) Kuntze	Five-hook bassia
	**Beta vulgaris* L. subsp. *maritima* (L.) Arcang.	Sea beet
	Chenopodium berlandieri Moq.	Pitseed goosefoot
	Chenopodium californicum (S. Watson) S. Watson	California goosefoot
	**Chenopodium macrospermum*	Largeseed goosefoot
	**Chenopodium murale* L.	Nettle-leaf goosefoot
	**Dysphania ambrosioides* (L.) Mosyakin & Clemants	Mexican tea
	**Dysphania pumilio* (R. Br.) Mosyakin & Clemants	Australian goosefoot
	Extriplex californica (Moq.) E.M. Zacharias	California orach
	Salicornia pacifica Standl.	Pickleweed
	**Salsola australis* R. Br.	Russian thistle, Tumbleweed
	**Salsola tragus* R. Br.	Russian thistle, Tumbleweed
	Suaeda calceoliformis (Hook.) Moq.	Horned seablite
	Suaeda taxifolia (Standl.) Standl.	Woolly seablite
Cistaceae	*Crocanthemum scoparium* (Nutt.) Millsp.	Peak rush-rose
	Crocantheumum greenei (B.L. Rob.) Sorrie	Island rush-rose
	Helianthemum greenei x *scoparium*	Hybrid rush-rose
Cleomaceae	*Peritoma arborea* (Nutt.) H.H. Iltis	Bladderpod
Convolvulaceae	*Calystegia macrostegia* (Greene) Brummitt	Morning-glory
	Calystegia macrostegia (Greene) Brummitt subsp. cyclostegia (House) Brummitt	Coast morning-glory
	Calystegia macrostegia (Greene) Brummitt subsp. *intermedia* (Abrams) Brummitt	Intermediate morning-glory
	Calystegia macrostegia (Greene) Brummitt subsp. *macrostegia*	Morning-glory
	Calystegia soldanella (L.) R. Br.	Beach morning glory
	**Convolvulus arvensis* L.	Bindweed
	Convolvulus simulans L.M. Perry	Small-flowered morning-glory
	Cressa truxillensis Kunth	Alkali weed
	Cuscuta occidentalis Millsp.	California dodder

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Convolvulaceae	*Dichondra occidentalis* House	Western dichondra
Cornaceae	*Cornus glabrata* Benth.	Brown dogwood
Crassulaceae	*Crassula aquatica* (L.) Schönl.	Water pygmy weed
	Crassula connata (Ruiz & Pav.) A. Berger	Pygmy-weed
	Dudleya greenei Rose	Greene's dudleya
	Dudleya virens (Rose) Moran subsp. *hassei* (Rose) Moran	Catalina liveforever
	Dudleya virens (Rose) Moran subsp. *insularis* (Rose) Moran	Island green dudleya
Crossosomataceae	*Crossosoma californicum* Nutt.	Catalina crossosoma
Cucurbitaceae	*Marah fabacea* (Naudin) Greene	California man-root
	Marah macrocarpa (Greene) Greene	Wild cucumber
Elatinaceae	*Elatine californica* A. Gray	California waterwort
Ericaceae	*Arctostaphylos catalinae* P.V. Wells	Santa Catalina Island manzanita
	Comarostaphylis diversifolia (Parry) Greene subsp. *planifolia* (Jeps.) G.D. Wallace	Summer holly
	Xylococcus bicolor Nutt.	Mission manzanita
Euphorbiaceae	*Croton californicus* Müll. Arg.	California croton
	Croton setiger Hook.	Turkey-mullein
	**Euphorbia* aff. *maculata*	Spotted spurge
	Euphorbia crenulata Engelm.	Chinese caps
	Euphorbia misera Benth.	Cliff spurge
	**Euphorbia peplus* L.	Petty spurge
	Euphorbia serpyllifolia Pers.subsp. *serpyllifolia*	Thyme-leafed spurge
	Euphorbia spathulata Lam.	Warty fruit spurge
	**Ricinus communis* L.	Castor bean
Fabaceae	**Acacia decurrens* Willd.	Green wattle
	**Acacia melanoxylon* R. Br.	Blackwood acacia
	*Acmispon americanus (*Nutt.) Rydb. var. *americanus*	Spanish clover
	Acmispon argophyllus (A. Gray) Brouillet var. *argenteus* (Dunkle) Brouillet	Silver clover
	Acmispon brachycarpus (Benth.) D.D. Sokoloff	Hill lotus
	Acmispon dendroideus (Greene) Brouillet var. *dendroideus*	Island broom
	Acmispon grandiflorus (Benth.) Brouillet var. *grandiflorus*	Large-flowered lotus, chaparral lotus
	Acmispon heermannii (Durand & Hilg.) Brouillet	Heermann's lotus
	Acmispon maritimus (Nutt.) D.D. Sokoloff var. *maritimus*	Coastal lotus
	Acmispon micranthus (Torr. & A. Gray) Brouillet	Crab lotus, Small-flowered lotus
	Acmispon strigosus (Nutt.) Brouillet	Bishop's lotus
	Acmispon wrangelianus (Fisch. & C.A. Mey.) D.D. Sokoloff	California lotus
	Astragalus didymocarpus Hook. & Arn. var. *didymocarpus*	Two-seeded milkvetch
	Astragalus gambelianus E. Sheld.	Gambel milkvetch

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Fabaceae	*Astragalus trichopodus* (Nutt.) A. Gray var. *lonchus* (M.E. Jones) Barneby	Rattleweed, Southern California locoweed
	Astragalus trichopodus (Nutt.) A. Gray var. *trichopodus*	Santa Barbara milkvetch
	**Caesalpinia spinosa* (Molina) Kuntze	Tara
	**Genista linifolia* L.	Dyer's greenwold
	**Genista monspessulana* (L.) L.A.S. Johnson	French broom
	**Lathyrus tingitanus* L.	Tangier pea
	Lathyrus vestitus Nutt. var. *alefeldii* (T.G. White) Isely	Wine red wild sweetpea
	Lathyrus vestitus Nutt. var. *vestitus*	Wild sweet pea
	**Lotus corniculatus* L.	Bird's-foot trefoil
	Lupinus albifrons Benth. var. *albifrons*	Silver bush lupine
	Lupinus bicolor Lindl.	Miniature lupine
	Lupinus concinnus J. Agardh	Bajada lupine
	Lupinus hirsutissimus Benth.	Stinging lupine
	Lupinus succulentus K. Koch	Arroyo lupine
	Lupinus truncatus Nutt.	Collar lupine, Truncate lupine
	**Medicago polymorpha* L.	California burclover
	**Medicago sativa* L.	Alfalfa
	**Melilotus albus* Medik.	White sweetclover
	**Melilotus indicus* (L.) All.	Sourclover
	**Senna didymobotrya* (Fresen.) H.S. Irwin & Barneby	African senna
	**Spartium junceum* L.	Spanish broom
	Trifolium albopurpureum Torr. & A. Gray	Indian clover, Rancheria clover
	Trifolium ciliolatum Benth.	Foothill clover
	Trifolium depauperatum Desv. var. truncatum (Greene Isely)	Truncate sack clover
	Trifolium gracilentum Torr. & A. Gray	Pinpoint clover
	**Trifolium hirtum* All.	Rose clover
	Trifolium macraei Hook. & Arn.	Macrae's clover
	Trifolium microcephalum Pursh	Small-head clover
	Trifolium microdon Hook. & Arn.	Thimble clover
	Trifolium palmeri S. Watson	Souther island clover
	Trifolium willdenovii Spreng.	Tomcat clover
	**Vicia benghalensis* L.	Purple vetch
	Vicia hassei S. Watson	Slender vetch
	Vicia ludoviciana Torr. & A. Gray subsp. *ludoviciana*	Deerpea vetch
	**Vicia villosa* Roth subsp. *varia* (Host) Corb.	Hairy vetch
Fagaceae	*Quercus chrysolepis* Liebm.	Canyon live oak
	Quercus douglasii Hook. & Arn.	Blue oak
	Quercus engelmannii Greene	Engelmann oak
	Quercus lobata Née	Valley oak
	Quercus pacifica Nixon & C.H. Mull.	Island scrub oak

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Fagaceae	*Quercus tomentella* Engelm.	Island oak
	Quercus x *macdonaldii* Greene	Macdonald oak
Frankeniaceae	*Frankenia salina* (Molina) I.M. Johnst.	Alkali heath
Gentianaceae	*Zeltnera venusta* (A. Gray) G. Mans.	California centaury
Geraniaceae	*California macrophylla* (Hook. & Arn.) J.J. Aldasoro et al.	Round-leaved filaree
	**Erodium botrys* (Cav.) Bertol.	Big beak filaree, Broad-leaf filaree
	**Erodium brachycarpum* (Godr.) Thell.	Storkbill
	**Erodium cicutarium* (L.) Aiton	Redstem filaree
	**Erodium moschatum* (L.) Aiton	Greenstem filaree
	Erodium texanum A. Gray	Texas filaree
	Geranium carolinianum L.	Carolina cranesbill
	**Geranium pusillum* L.	Small-flowered geranium
	**Pelargonium* x *hortorum* L.H. Bailey	Fish geranium
	**Pelargonium peltatum* (L.) L'Hér.	Ivy geranium
Geraniaeae	**Geranium molle*	Woodland geranium
Grossulariaceae	*Ribes viburnifolium* A. Gray	Santa Catalina Island currant
Heliotropiaceae	*Heliotropium curassavicum* L. var. *oculatum* (A. Heller) Tidestr.	Alkali heliotrope
Hydrophyllaceae	*Emmenanthe penduliflora* Benth. var. *penduliflora*	Whispering bells
	Eriodictyon traskiae Eastw. subsp. *traskiae*	Trask's yerba santa
	Eucrypta chrysanthemifolia (Benth.) Greene	Eucrypta
	Phacelia cicutaria Greene var. *hispida* J.T. Howell	Caterpillar phacelia
	Phacelia distans Benth.	Fern-leaf phacelia
	Phacelia grandiflora (Benth.) A. Gray	Large-flowered phacelia
	Phacelia lyonii A. Gray	Lyon's phacelia
	Phacelia minor (Harv.) F. Zimm.	Wild canterbury bells
	Phacelia viscida (Lindl.) Torr. var. *viscida*	Sticky phacelia
	Pholistoma auritum (Lindl.) Lilja var. *auritum*	Fiesta flower
	Pholistoma racemosum (A. Gray) Constance	White fiesta flower
Juglandaceae	**Juglans californica* S. Watson	Southern California black walnut
Lamiaceae	*Clinopodium douglasii* (Benth.) Kuntze	Yerba buena
	Lepechinia fragrans (Greene) Epling	Fragrant pitcher sage
	**Marrubium vulgare* L.	Horehound
	**Mentha aquatica* L.	Watermint
	**Mentha spicata* L.	Spearmint
	**Mentha* x *piperita* L.	Peppermint
	Salvia apiana Jeps.	White sage
	Salvia apiana x *mellifera*	Hybrid sage
	Salvia columbariae Benth.	Chia
	Salvia mellifera Greene	Black sage
	Trichostema lanceolatum Benth.	Vinegar weed
Linaceae	*Hesperolinon micranthum* (A. Gray) Small	Dwarf flax

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Loasaceae	*Mentzelia affinis* Greene	Yellow comet, Hydra stick-leaf
	Mentzelia micrantha (Hook. & Arn.) Torr. & A. Gray	Blazing star, Small-flowered stick-leaf
Lythraceae	*Ammannia robusta* Heer & Regel	Red-stem
	**Lythrum hyssopifolia* L.	Loosestrife
	**Punica granatum* L.	Pomegranate
Malvaceae	*Eremalche exilis* (A. Gray) Greene	White mallow
	Malacothamnus fasciculatus (Torr. & A. Gray) Greene var. *catalinensis* (Eastw.) Kearney	Santa Catalina Island bush-mallow
	Malva assurgentiflora (Kellogg) M.F. Ray subsp. *glabra* (Philbrick) Guilliams in ed.	Island mallow, Malva rosa
	**Malva nicaeensis* All.	Bull mallow
	**Malva parviflora* L.	Cheeseweed
	Malvella leprosa (Ortega) Krapov.	Alkali-mallow
Montiaceae	*Calandrinia menziesii* (Hook.) Torr. & A. Gray	Red maids
	Cistanthe maritima (Nutt.) Hershk.	Seaside cistanthe
	Claytonia parviflora Hook. subsp. *parviflora*	Narrow leaved miner's lettuce
	Claytonia perfoliata Willd. subsp. *mexicana* (Rydb.) John M. Mill. & K.L. Chambers	Miner’s lettuce
	Claytonia perfoliata Willd. subsp. *perfoliata*	Miner’s lettuce
Moraceae	**Ficus carica* L.	Edible fig
Myrsinaceae	**Lysimachia arvensis* (L.) U. Manns & Anderb.	Scarlet pimpernel
Myrtaceae	**Eucalyptus camaldulensis* Dehnh.	River red gum
	**Eucalyptus globulus* Labill.	Blue gum
	**Eucalyptus polyanthemos* Schauer	Silver dollar gum
Nyctaginaceae	*Abronia maritima* S. Watson	Red sand-verbena
	Abronia maritima x *umbellata*	Hybrid sand verbena
	Abronia umbellata Lam. var. *umbellata*	Beach sand verbena
	Mirabilis laevis (Benth.) Curran var. *crassifolia* (Choisy) Spellenb.	Wishbone bush
Onagraceae	*Camissoniopsis intermedia* (P.H. Raven) W.L. Wagner & Hoch	Suncups
	Camissoniopsis micrantha (Spreng.) W.L. Wagner & Hoch	Mini suncups
	Camissoniopsis robusta (P.H. Raven) W.L. Wagner & Hoch	Robust suncups
	Clarkia epilobioides (Torr. & A. Gray) A. Nelson & J.F. Macbr.	Willow-herb clarkia
	Clarkia purpurea (Curtis) A. Nelson & J.F. Macbr. subsp. *quadrivulnera* (Lindl.) H. Lewis & M. Lewis	Wine cup clarkia
	Clarkia unguiculata Lindl.	Elegant clarkia
	Epilobium brachycarpum C. Presl	Panicled willow herb
	Epilobium canum (Greene) P.H. Raven subsp. *canum*	California fuchsia
	Epilobium ciliatum Raf. subsp. *ciliatum*	Willow herb
	Eulobus californicus Torr. & A. Gray	Mustard suncup

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Onagraceae	*Ludwigia peploides* (Kunth) P.H. Raven subsp. *peploides*	Floating primrose-willow
	**Oenothera sinuosa* W.L. Wagner & Hoch	Wavy-leaf gaura
Orobanchaceae	*Castilleja affinis* Hook. & Arn. subsp. affinis	Indian paintbrush
	Castilleja exserta (A. Heller) T.I. Chuang & Heckard	Purple owl's-clover
	Castilleja foliolosa Hook. & Arn.	Woolly paintbrush
	Orobanche bulbosa Beck	Chaparral broomrape
	Orobanche fasciculata Nutt.	Clustered broomrape
	Orobanche parishii (Jeps.) Heckard subsp. *brachyloba* Heckard	Short-lobed broomrape
Oxalidaceae	**Oxalis articulata* Savigny subsp. *rubra* (A. St.-Hil.) Lourteig	Windowbox wood-sorrel
	Oxalis californica (Abrams) R. Knuth	California wood-sorrel
	**Oxalis corniculata* L.	Weed oxalis, Creeping wood sorrel
	**Oxalis pes-caprae* L.	Bermuda buttercup
Papaveraceae	*Dendromecon harfordii* Kellogg	Channel island tree poppy
	Eschscholzia californica Cham.	California poppy
	Eschscholzia ramosa (Greene) Greene	Island poppy
	Papaver californicum A. Gray	Fire poppy
	Papaver heterophyllum (Benth.) Greene	Wind poppy
	**Papaver somniferum* L.	Opium poppy
	Platystemon californicus Benth.	Cream cups
Phrymaceae	*Diplacus brevipes* (Benth.) G.L. Nesom	Yellow field monkeyflower
	Diplacus puniceus Nutt.	Red bush monkeyflower
	Diplacus traskiae (A.L. Grant) G.L. Nesom	Santa Catalina Island monkeyflower
	Erythranthe cardinalis (Douglas ex Benth.) Spach	Scarlet monkeyflower
	Erythranthe floribunda (Douglas ex Lindl.) G.L. Nesom	Slimy monkeyflower
	Erythranthe guttata (Fisch. ex DC.) G.L. Nesom	Creek monkeyflower
Pittosporaceae	**Pittosporum undulatum* Vent.	Mock orange
Plantaginaceae	*Antirrhinum kelloggii* Greene	Blue twining snapdragon, Climbing snapdragon
	Antirrhinum nuttallianum A. DC. subsp. *subsessile* (A. Gray) D.M. Thomps.	Violet snapdragon, Nuttall's snapdragon
	Callitriche marginata Torr.	Water starwort
	Collinsia heterophylla Graham var. *heterophylla*	Chinese-houses
	Gambelia speciosa Nutt.	Showy island snapdragon
	Keckiella cordifolia (Benth.) Straw	Heart-leaved penstemon, Climbing penstemon
	**Kickxia elatine* (L.) Dumort.	Fluellin
	Nuttallanthus texanus (Scheele) D.A. Sutton	Blue toadflax
	**Plantago coronopus* L.	Rattail plantain

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Plantaginaceae	*Plantago erecta* E. Morris	California plantain
	**Plantago lanceolata* L.	English plantain
	**Plantago major* L.	Common plantain
	Plantago ovata Forssk. var. *insularis* (Eastw.) S.C. Meyers & A. Liston	Island plantain
	Veronica sp.	Speedwell
Platanaceae	**Platanus racemosa* Nutt.	Western sycamore
Plumbaginaceae	**Limonium sinuatum* (L.) Mill.	Statice
Polemoniaceae	*Allophyllum glutinosum* (Benth.) A.D. Grant & V.E. Grant	Stinky gilia
	Eriastrum filifolium (Nutt.) Wooton & Standl.	Threadstem wool star
	Gilia angelensis V.E. Grant	Chaparral gilia
	Gilia capitata Sims subsp. *abrotanifolia* (Greene) V.E. Grant	Bluehead gilia
	Gilia clivorum (Jeps.) V.E. Grant	Purplespot gilia
	Gilia nevinii A. Gray	Nevin's gilia
	Leptosiphon bicolor Nutt.	True baby stars
	**Leptosiphon parviflorus* Benth.	Variable linanthus
	Linanthus dianthiflorus (Benth.) Greene	Ground pink, Fringed linanthus
	Navarretia atractyloides (Benth.) Hook. & Arn.	Holly-leaved skunkweed
	Navarretia hamata Greene subsp. *leptantha* (Greene) H. Mason	Hooked skunkweed
Polygonaceae	*Chorizanthe staticoides* Benth.	Turkish rugging
	**Eriogonum fasciculatum* Benth. var. *foliolosum*	Coastal California buckwheat
	Eriogonum giganteum S. Watson var. *giganteum*	Santa Catalina Island Buckwheat/St. Catherine's lace
	Eriogonum grande Greene var. *grande*	Island buckwheat
	Lastarriaea coriacea (Goodman) Hoover	Leather-spineflower
	Persicaria amphibia (L.) Gray	Water smartweed
	**Polygonum argyrocoleon* Kunze	Persian knotweed
	**Polygonum aviculare* L. subsp. *depressum* (Meisn.) Arcang.	Common knotweed
	Pterostegia drymarioides Fisch. & C.A. Mey.	Woodland threadstem
	**Rumex conglomeratus* Murray	Green dock
	**Rumex crispus* L.	Curly dock
	Rumex fueginus Phil.	Golden dock
	Rumex salicifolius Weinm.	Willow dock
Portulacaceae	**Portulaca oleracea* L.	Purslane
Primulaceae	*Primula clevelandii* (Greene) A.R. Mast & Reveal var. *insularis* (H.J. Thomps.) A.R. Mast & Reveal	Island shooting star
Ranunculaceae	*Clematis ligusticifolia* Nutt.	Western virgin's bower
	Delphinium parryi A. Gray subsp. *maritimum* (Davidson) M.J. Warnock	Maritime larkspur
	Ranunculus californicus Benth. var. *cuneatus* Greene	California buttercup

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Ranunculaceae	*Ranunculus hebecarpus* Hook. & Arn.	Hebe buttercup
Resedaceae	*Oligomeris linifolia* (Hornem.) J.F. Macbr.	Oligomeris
Rhamnaceae	*Ceanothus arboreus* Greene	Feltleaf ceanothus
	Ceanothus megacarpus Nutt. var. *insularis* (Eastw.) Munz	Island ceanothus
	Ceanothus megacarpus Nutt. var. *megacarpus*	Bigpod ceanothus
	Rhamnus pirifolia Greene	Island redberry
Rosaceae	*Adenostoma fasciculatum* Hook. & Arn.	Chamise
	Aphanes occidentalis (Nutt.) Rydb.	Lady's mantle
	Cercocarpus betuloides Nutt. var. *blancheae* (C.K. Schneid.) Little	Island mountain-mahogany
	Cercocarpus traskiae Eastw.	Catalina Island mountain-mahogany
	**Cotoneaster pannosus* Franch.	Silverleaf cotoneaster
	Drymocallis glandulosa (Lindl.) Rydb. var. *wrangelliana* (Fisch. & Avé-Lall.) Ertter	Sticky cinquefoil
	Heteromeles arbutifolia (Lindl.) M. Roem.	Toyon
	Holodiscus discolor (Pursh) Maxim. var. *discolor*	Oceanspray
	Lyonothamnus floribundus A. Gray subsp. *floribundus*	Santa Catalina Island ironwood
	**Poterium sanguisorba* L. var. *polygamum* (Waldstein & Kitaibel) Visiani	Garden burnet
	*P*runus ilicifolia (Hook. & Arn.) D. Dietr. subsp. lyonii (Eastw.) P.H. Raven	Catalina cherry
	Rosa californica Cham. & Schltdl.	California rose
	**Rubus armeniacus* Focke	Himalayan blackberry
	Rubus ursinus Cham. & Schltdl.	California blackberry
Rubiaceae	*Galium angustifolium* A. Gray subsp. *angustifolium*	Narrowly leaved bedstraw
	Galium aparine L.	Goose grass
	Galium catalinense A. Gray subsp. *catalinense*	Santa Catalina Island bedstraw
	**Galium murale*	Tiny bedstraw
	Galium nuttallii A. Gray subsp. *insulare* Ferris	Nuttall's island bedstraw
	Galium nuttallii A. Gray subsp. *nuttallii*	San Diego bedstraw
	**Galium parisiense* L.	Wall bedstraw
	Galium porrigens Dempster var. *porrigens*	Climbing bedstraw
Salicaceae	*Populus fremontii* S. Watson subsp. *fremontii*	Fremont cottonwood
	Populus trichocarpa Hook.	Black cottonwood
	Populus xparryi Sarg.	Hybrid cottonwood
	Salix exigua Nutt.	Narrow-leaved willow, Coyote willow
	Salix laevigata Bebb	Red willow
	Salix lasiolepis Benth.	Arroyo willow
Saxifragaceae	*Jepsonia malvifolia (*Greene) Small	Island jepsonia
	Lithophragma affine A. Gray	Woodland star
Scrophulariaceae	*Scrophularia villosa* Pennell	Santa Catalina figwort
Solanaceae	*Datura wrightii* Regel	Jimson weed

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Family	Scientific Name	Common Name
Solanaceae	*Lycium brevipes* Benth. var. *hassei (*Greene) C.L. Hitchc.	Santa Catalina Island desert-thorn
	Lycium californicum Nutt.	California box-thorn
	Nicotiana clevelandii A. Gray	Cleveland's tobacco
	**Nicotiana glauca* Graham	Tree tobacco
	Nicotiana quadrivalvis Pursh	Indian tobacco
	Solanum douglasii Dunal	White Douglas' nightshade
	**Solanum elaeagnifolium* Cav.	White horse-nettle
	**Solanum rostratum* Dunal	Buffalo berry
	Solanum wallacei (A. Gray) Parish	Wallace's nightshade
Tamaricaceae	**Tamarix parviflora* DC.	Smallflower tamarisk
	**Tamarix ramosissima* Ledeb.	Saltcedar
Tropaeolaceae	**Tropaeolum majus* L.	Garden nasturtium
Urticaceae	*Hesperocnide tenella* Torr.	Western nettle
	Parietaria hespera Hinton	Pellitory
	Parietaria hespera Hinton var. *californica* Hinton	Pellitory
	Parietaria hespera Hinton var. *hespera*	Pellitory
	Urtica gracilis Ait. subsp. *holosericea* (Nutt.) W.A. Weber	Hoary nettle
	**Urtica urens* L.	Dwarf nettle
Valerianaceae	**Centranthus ruber* (L.) DC.	Red valerian
Verbenaceae	*Phyla nodiflora* (L.) Greene	Mat-grass
	Verbena bracteata Lag. & Rodr.	Vervain
	Verbena lasiostachys Link	Western verbena
	Verbena lasiostachys Link var. *lasiostachys*	Vervain
	Verbena lasiostachys Link var. *scabrida* Moldenke	Vervain
Violaceae	*Viola pedunculata* Torr. & A. Gray	Johnny-jump-up
Vitaceae	*Vitis girdiana* Munson	Desert wild grape
Zygophyllaceae	**Tribulus terrestris* L.	Puncture vine

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table B-2. Summary of the Number of Santa Catalina Island Plants, including all Species, Subspecies, or Varieties, by Plant Family and Taxonomic Group.

	Native	Introduced	Total
PLANTS	**473**	**236**	**709**
FERNS AND FERN ALLIES	**18**	**1**	**19**
Azollaceae	1	0	**1**
Blechnaceae	1	0	**1**
Cyatheaceae	0	1	**1**
Dennstaedtiaceae	1	0	**1**
Dryopteridaceae	1	0	**1**
Equisetaceae	3	0	**3**
Ophioglossaceae	1	0	**1**
Polypodiaceae	1	0	**1**
Pteridaceae	8	0	**8**
Selaginellaceae	1	0	**1**
GYMNOSPERMS	**0**	**12**	**12**
Cupressaceae	0	3	**3**
Pinaceae	0	9	**9**
ANGIOSPERMS	**455**	**223**	**678**
Magnoliids	**1**	**0**	**1**
Saururaceae	1	0	**1**
Monocots	**68**	**60**	**128**
Agavaceae	1	1	**2**
Alliaceae	1	0	**1**
Arecaceae	0	2	**2**
Asparagaceae	0	2	**2**
Cyperaceae	13	0	**13**
Iridaceae	1	0	**1**
Juncaceae	6	0	**6**
Liliaceae	3	0	**3**
Orchidaceae	4	0	**4**
Poaceae	28	54	**82**
Potamogetonaceae	1	1	**2**
Ruppiaceae	1	0	**1**
Themidaceae	3	0	**3**
Typhaceae	2	0	**2**
Zosteraceae	4	0	**4**
Eudicots	**386**	**163**	**549**
Adoxaceae	1	0	**1**
Aizoaceae	0	6	**6**
Amaranthaceae	0	2	**2**
Anacardiaceae	5	2	**7**

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

	Native	Introduced	Total
Apiaceae	6	3	**9**
Apocynaceae	2	1	**3**
Asteraceae	76	34	**110**
Bataceae	1	0	**1**
Boraginaceae	15	0	**15**
Brassicaceae	14	20	**34**
Cactaceae	5	1	**6**
Campanulaceae	2	0	**2**
Caprifoliaceae	4	0	**4**
Caryophyllaceae	9	8	**17**
Chenopodiaceae	18	11	**29**
Cistaceae	3	0	**3**
Cleomaceae	1	0	**1**
Convolvulaceae	9	1	**10**
Cornaceae	1	0	**1**
Crassulaceae	5	0	**5**
Crossosomataceae	1	0	**1**
Cucurbitaceae	2	0	**2**
Elatinaceae	1	0	**1**
Ericaceae	3	0	**3**
Euphorbiaceae	6	3	**9**
Fabaceae	34	16	**50**
Fabaceae	7	0	**7**
Frankeniaceae	1	0	**1**
Gentianaceae	1	0	**1**
Geraniaceae	3	7	**10**
Geraniaeae	0	1	**1**
Grossulariaceae	1	0	**1**
Heliotropiaceae	1	0	**1**
Hydrophyllaceae	11	0	**11**
Juglandaceae	0	1	**1**
Lamiaceae	7	4	**11**
Linaceae	1	0	**1**
Loasaceae	2	0	**2**
Lythraceae	1	2	**3**
Malvaceae	4	2	**6**
Montiaceae	5	0	**5**
Moraceae	0	1	**1**
Myrsinaceae	0	1	**1**
Myrtaceae	0	3	**3**
Nyctaginaceae	4	0	**4**
Onagraceae	11	1	**12**
Orobanchaceae	6	0	**6**
Oxalidaceae	1	3	**4**

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

	Native	Introduced	Total
Papaveraceae	6	1	**7**
Phrymaceae	6	0	**6**
Pittosporaceae	0	1	**1**
Plantaginaceae	10	4	**14**
Platanaceae	0	1	**1**
Plumbaginaceae	0	1	**1**
Polemoniaceae	10	1	**11**
Polygonaceae	8	5	**13**
Portulacaceae	0	1	**1**
Primulaceae	1	0	**1**
Ranunculaceae	4	0	**4**
Resedaceae	1	0	**1**
Rhamnaceae	4	0	**4**
Rosaceae	11	3	**14**
Rubiaceae	6	2	**8**
Salicaceae	6	0	**6**
Saxifragaceae	2	0	**2**
Scrophulariaceae	1	0	**1**
Solanaceae	7	3	**10**
Tamaricaceae	0	2	**2**
Tropaeolaceae	0	1	**1**
Urticaceae	5	1	**6**
Valerianaceae	0	1	**1**
Verbenaceae	5	0	**5**
Violaceae	1	0	**1**
Vitaceae	1	0	**1**
Zygophyllaceae	0	1	**1**

Plant Species: A group of individual plants with similar characteristics, such as appearance, reproductive traits, and genetic makeup, that are capable of interbreeding and producing fertile offspring. Species represent the basic taxonomic unit of biological classification, sharing a common ancestry and occupying specific ecological niches.

Subspecies (subsp.): A geographic or ecological subdivision of a species that exhibits distinct characteristics from other individuals of the same species but is still capable of interbreeding. Subspecies are often isolated from other populations, allowing them to develop unique traits while maintaining their connection to the broader species.

Varieties (var.): A taxonomic category within a species or subspecies that displays minor differences in morphological or physiological features from the more typical members. Varieties often result from genetic mutations or environmental factors, and they can be naturally occurring or selectively bred by humans for desired traits, such as increased pest resistance or improved taste.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Appendix C

Land Cover Change Analysis from 1985 to 2022

Native Island Vegetation Recovery Following Feral Goat and Pig Removal and the Interaction of Impacts from Large Fires, Invasive Mule Deer Browse, and Precipitation Variability

Prepared for

CATALINA ISLAND CONSERVANCY℠

708 Crescent Ave.
Avalon, CA 90704

Prepared by

Travis Longcore, PhD, UCLA Institute for Environmental Studies
Nina Noujdina, Geospatial Scientist
Travis Brooks, Restoration Ecologist, Land IQ

APRIL 2024

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary ..... **iv**

1 Introduction **1**

2 Methods **3**

2.1 Data 3

2.2 Land Cover History and Trends 4

3 Results **5**

3.1 Land Cover Maps 5

3.2 Land Cover Trends 10

3.3 Cross-Cutting Influences 11

3.3.1 Slope 11

3.3.2 Geology 12

3.3.3 Orientation of Main Drainage 13

3.3.4 Fire History 17

3.3.5 Precipitation and Drought 18

3.4 Synthetic Analysis 21

3.4.1 Typology 21

3.4.2 Group 1 – Eastern Leeward Side of West End 23

3.4.3 Group 2 – Windward Side of West End and Near Isthmus on East End 24

3.4.4 Group 3a1. Eastern Leeward Side of East End without Recent Large Fire - Catalina Schist ... 25

3.4.5 Group 3a2. Eastern Leeward Side of East End Impacted by 2006 Empire Fire - Catalina Schist 26

3.4.6 Group 3a3. Eastern Leeward Side of East End Impacted by 1999 Goat Fire - Catalina Schist 27

3.4.7 Group 3b1. Eastern Leeward Side of East End without Recent Large Fire - Volcanic Rock 28

3.4.8 Group 3b2. Eastern Leeward Side of East End Impacted by 2007 Island Fire - Volcanic Rock 29

3.4.9 Group 4a1. Western Windward Side of East End without Recent Large Fire – Schist with Landslide Deposits 31

3.4.10 Group 4a2. Western Windward Side of East End with 2003 Airport Fire Impacts–Catalina Schist with Landslide Deposits 32

3.4.11 Group 4a3. Western Windward Side of East End with 2006 Empire Fire Impacts–Catalina Schist with Landslide Deposits 33

3.4.12 Group 4b1. Western Windward Side of East End without Recent Large Fire - Volcanic Rock 34

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.4.13 Group 4b2. Western Windward Side of East End with 2007 Island Fire Impacts - Volcanic Rock 35

3.4.14 Group 5. Management Units Dominated by Development 36

3.4.15 Summary 37

4 Discussion 39

5 References 40

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Location of indigenous settlement locations from which ^{14}C dates have been analyzed. 1

Figure 2 Timeline of presence of exotic herbivores on Catalina Island. 2

Figure 3 Watershed management units and the main drainage divide between leeward and windward sides. 4

Figure 4 1985 Land Cover. 6

Figure 5 1998 Land Cover. 7

Figure 6 2007 Land Cover with extent of the 2006 Empire Fire and 2007 Island Fire. 8

Figure 7 2022 Land Cover extent of the 2006 Empire Fire and 2007 Island Fire. 9

Figure 8 Land Cover trends from 1985 to 2022. 10

Figure 9 Influence of slope on land cover. 11

Figure 10 Influence of parent material on land cover. 12

Figure 11 Average annual wind speed. 14

Figure 12 Average annual precipitation. 15

Figure 13 Influence of orientation of the main drainage on land cover. 16

Figure 14 Relative land cover by orientation of the main drainage of the watershed management unit. 17

Figure 15 Land cover trends in watershed management units with and without fires from 1985 to 2022. 18

Figure 16 Precipitation record from 1910 to 2022. 19

Figure 17 Trends in land cover on Catalina Island 1985 to 2022 as an average of watershed management units that either did or did not have a significant fire during the period, with drought periods (3 or more consecutive years with under average precipitation) marked in gray. 20

Figure 18 Groups for analysis of land cover trends. 22

Figure 19 Group 1 land cover trends, 1985 to 2022. 23

Figure 20 Group 2 cover trends, 1985 to 2022. 24

Figure 21 Group 3a1 land cover classification over time. 25

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 22 Land cover trajectories in leeward management units with schist parent materials affected by the 2006 Empire Fire. 26

Figure 23 Land cover trajectories in leeward management units with schist parent materials affected by the 1999 Goat Fire. 27

Figure 24 Land cover trajectories in leeward management units with volcanic parent materials affected by any large fires. 28

Figure 25 Land cover trajectories in leeward management units with volcanic parent materials affected by the 2007 Island Fire. 29

Figure 26 Land cover trajectories in windward management units with schist parent materials unaffected by recent large fires. 31

Figure 27 Land cover trajectories in windward management units with schist parent materials affected by the 2003 Airport Fire. 32

Figure 28 Land cover trajectories in windward management units with schist parent materials affected by the 2006 Empire Fire. 33

Figure 29 Land cover trajectories in windward management units with volcanic parent materials unaffected by large fires since 1985. 34

Figure 30 Land cover trajectories in windward management units with volcanic parent materials affected by the 2007 Island Fire. 35

Figure 31 Land cover trajectories in management units heavily influenced by development. 36

Figure 32 Comparison of land cover class trajectories by watershed management groups, 1985 to 2022. 38

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Catalina Island's distinct evolutionary history has fostered a unique ecosystem with many endemic plant species due to its isolation, Mediterranean climate, and the absence of ungulates (hoofed animals that eat plants, like pigs, goats, sheep, cattle, bison, and deer). The removal of the Indigenous population, followed by the introduction of ungulates for ranching in the early 1800s and later for sport hunting, significantly altered the island's vegetation cover. Native woody vegetation and endemic plants declined, and nonnative Eurasian plant cover increased. However, with the successful eradication of invasive pigs and goats by the Catalina Island Conservancy beginning in the 1990s, native habitat has shown signs of recovery.

Despite high interest in vegetation dynamics, no recent island-wide assessments of land cover have been conducted, with the most recent vegetation map dating back to 2005. A more frequent and cost-effective method for tracking significant changes in vegetation is needed. Utilizing the US Forest Service's Landscape Change Monitoring System (LCMS) product, this report generates a time series of vegetation form maps from 1985 to 2022 at a 30 m resolution. While other land cover models may perform better in specific contexts, the LCMS offers a consistent methodology for time series analysis, ensuring reliable results without systematic bias. By analyzing land cover by watershed management unit, slope, geology, orientation of main drainage, fire history, and precipitation, we explore the influence of invasive ungulate removal, fire, drought, and other landscape factors on vegetation dynamics.

Six land cover classes in LCMS predominate on Catalina Island: Trees, Grass/Forb/Herb & Tree Mix, Shrubs, Grass/Forb/Herb & Shrub Mix, Grass/Forb/Herb, and Barren or Impervious. For the whole island, Tree cover (a combination of Island Woodland and Island Chaparral) increased from 43.0% in 1985 to 51.8% in 1998, where it remained stable until the 2006 Empire Fire and 2007 Island Fire, which burned a combined 12% of the island. Following the large fires, Tree cover decreased to 47.9% in 2007 and decreased further to 43.5% in 2022. Barren cover has decreased consistently over the past 37 years, replaced largely by Shrubs and Grass/Forbs/Herbs cover classes.

By 2022, the burned areas had recovered somewhat but not completely. Periods of drought (2011 to 2016 and 2020 to 2022) and the continued presence of introduced herbivores complicated post-fire recovery of island vegetation such that Tree cover was only 0.5% above 1985 levels, even as Barren cover had decreased to 8.5%.

The results align with known observations, such as the expansion of woody vegetation following invasive goat and pig removal, and the negative effects of deer browsing on island tree cover. Large fires, combined with deer browsing pressure, appear to contribute to the decline in natural chaparral and woodland vegetation. This highlights the importance of effective management strategies, such as invasive species eradication and fire ignition prevention, to protect and restore Catalina Island's biodiversity.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

1 INTRODUCTION

Catalina Island has a unique evolutionary history as an offshore island, with no land connection for at least 5 million and probably more years (Vedder and Howell 1980). The vegetation therefore had millions of years of evolution without mid-sized or large herbivores. The only land mammals arguably native to Catalina Island are a deer mouse, ornate shrew, island fox (introduced 6kya) (Sacks et al. 2022), harvest mouse, California ground squirrel (Rick et al. 2012). The maritime-moderated Mediterranean climate and isolation led to evolution of many island endemic plant species, all evolved in the absence of larger herbivores.

Indigenous settlements on Catalina Island are dated using ^{14}C to 6,165 to 5,745 years before present (Radde et al. 2024). San Clemente Island has documented settlement sites from ~8,500 cal BP (Gusick et al. 2021), and San Nicolas ~8,400 cal BP (Rick et al. 2005). Researched settlement sites are found throughout the coast and terraces of Catalina (Figure 1) and more sites are submerged given that the island is slowly sinking and sea level into the modern era has been rising (Porcasi et al. 1999).




Figure 1 *Location of indigenous settlement locations from which ^{14}C dates have been analyzed.*
(Radde et al. 2024)

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Vegetation management through fire was a part of Indigenous culture on the Channel Islands (Hardiman et al. 2016), but all indications, including massive shell mounds, are that staple foods on Catalina were marine in origin. The Indigenous population was present when the island was visited by Vizcaino in 1602 (Williamson 1903) and subsequently suffered through conflicts with Russian fur traders (Mead 1899) and enslavement by the Spanish during the Mission period.

By the 1830s, the Indigenous population had been killed or removed to the San Gabriel Mission. European ranchers and small-lot farmers settled, and an era of extensive and eventually uncontrolled grazing and browsing by introduced herbivores began (Figure 2). Sheep (*Ovis aries*), cattle (Bos taurus), and goats (*Capra hircus*) were introduced in the 1820s and persisted for a century. Sheep were removed in the 1920s and were replaced by pigs (*Sus scrofa*). Bison (*Bison bison*) were added in the 1920s as well, followed by mule deer in 1928 (Landis 2000). Goats and pigs were controlled in the 1990s through about 2000 and bison kept in check through fertility management starting in 2009 (Duncan et al. 2017). Prior to 2009, bison were periodically shipped off the island until it was determined that they had hybridized with cattle prior to introduction on the island and were no longer good candidates for reintroductions on the mainland (Vogel et al. 2007). Pigs were fully eradicated by 2004 and goats by 2005.




Figure 2 Timeline of presence of exotic herbivores on Catalina Island.

Vegetation has responded to the exotic herbivores. They reduced biomass so much that naturally occurring fire was quite uncommon through the 1980s (Minnich 1982). Comparison of aerial photography revealed a decline in the extent of oak trees from 1943 to 2005 (Knapp 2010). Notwithstanding high interest in vegetation dynamics in response to land management, no recent island wide assessments of land cover have been undertaken. The most recent vegetation map was published in 2005 (Knapp 2005). Preliminary work on an updated map has been started but no new map has been produced. Field mapping at the scale of vegetation alliances is expensive and time consuming and therefore only occurs periodically. It would be useful to have an assessment that can be repeated more often to track major changes in vegetation form, even if not providing the taxonomic resolution of proper vegetation maps.

Remote sensing products can provide insight on vegetation form over time even if not providing definitive information about. The US Forest Service has developed a product

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

that maps vegetation cover based on growth form (grass/forb/herb, shrub, tree) at a 30-meter resolution nationally with an annual cadence since 1985. Classification by growth form is consistent with the US National Vegetation Classification Standard, in which the highest levels of classification (Formations) are determined based on growth form, and global macroecological factors such as latitude and altitude. Growth form classification of land cover on Catalina on an annual basis presents a unique opportunity to understand vegetation dynamics with high spatial resolution to track the influence of herbivore removal, fire, and other landscape factors such as soils (parent material), slope, and aspect.

In this report, we document the use of the USFS Landscape Change Monitoring System product to create a time series of maps of vegetation characterized by form, summarize land cover by watershed management unit, slope, geology, aspect, and fire history, and to explore land cover trajectories over 37 years (1985 to 2022).

2 METHODS

We mapped and calculated the long-term trends in land cover types within management units on Catalina, classified the Catalina Island Conservancy (Conservancy) watershed management units by shared characteristics, and analyzed the resulting trends with respect to slope, aspect, parent material, fire history, and grazing history.

2.1 DATA

The Landscape Change Monitoring System (LCMS) is operated by the U.S. Forest Service to monitor long-term trajectories of different vegetation cover types across vast areas (USDA Forest Service, 2023) (Platt et al. 2023). It is available for Catalina Island for the period 1985 to 2022 at 30 m resolution. The LCMS product uses a combination of remote sensing data, machine learning algorithms, and expert knowledge to map and monitor land cover changes.

We loaded the LCMS v2022.8 data through the Google Earth Engine Data Catalog. The data define the land cover in each 30 by 30 m pixel each year as one of 11 categories for Catalina: Trees, Shrubs & Trees Mix, Grass/Forb/Herb & Trees Mix, Barren & Trees Mix, Shrubs, Grass/Forb/Herb & Shrubs Mix, Barren & Shrubs Mix, Grass/Forb/Herb, Barren & Grass/Forb/Herb Mix, Barren or Impervious, or Water. We later eliminated some categories from annual summaries because they had a negligible number (<0.5 ha) of classified pixels per management unit (e.g., Barren & Trees Mix, Shrubs & Trees Mix).

Watershed Management Units were provided as polygons by the Conservancy (Figure 3). Elevation and associated values (e.g., slope, aspect) were calculated from a Digital Elevation Model (DEM) derived from 2002/2003 Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar (IfSAR) (NAVD88 vertical datum). The generalized geology is from Schumann et al. (2012) based on the Preliminary Geologic Map of Santa Catalina Island (Bohannon and Reiss 2004). Fire perimeters and dates were obtained from the Conservancy. Weather data was obtained from the Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC 2024). We used

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Long Beach Airport data to define drought periods because the Catalina precipitation record is missing data. We defined a drought as three consecutive years of below-average precipitation, which yielded the following time periods: 1987 to 1990, 2011 to 2016, 2020 to 2022.



Figure 3 *Watershed management units and the main drainage divide between leeward and windward sides.*

2.2 LAND COVER HISTORY AND TRENDS

Using the land cover classification data as inputs for each year, we used the ArcGIS Zonal Statistics (count option) tool to compute the number of pixels of each land cover in each management unit each year. We also used map algebra to calculate change from year to year by multiplying the land cover code for year(x) by 100 and adding it to the code for year(x+1) so that the resulting integer could be interpreted as a land cover change between two identifiable categories (e.g., Grass/Forb/Herb & Trees to Trees). We also used Zonal Statistics (count option) to summarize the land cover changes within each management unit for each year (except the first year of 1985).

Then, we visualized the influence of landscape factors on land cover. Time series of land cover by watershed management unit (n=105) were plotted. Then overall land cover as an average of all watershed management units (each weighted equally) were graphed

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

as time series. These time series were also subsequently divided by landscape factors of orientation (windward/leeward), underlying geology (schist or volcanic), steepness (moderate, steep, very steep, extremely steep, and excessively steep calculated as the most common category in the management unit), and fire history (no major fire since 1985, burned in Empire, Goat, or Island fires). Time series were depicted with the mean and standard error of the values by land cover classification across watershed management units.

Spatial data acquisition and analysis were undertaken in Google Earth Engine and ESRI ArcGIS Pro, while time series analysis were performed in JMP Pro 17.

3 RESULTS

The land cover on Catalina is classified predominantly into six classes (Trees, Grass/Forb/Herb & Tree Mix, Shrubs, Grass/Forb/Herb & Shrub Mix, Grass/Forb/Herb, and Barren or Impervious). Some pixels were unclassified, and a few other categories were present but in such low numbers that they were excluded from further analysis but are included in the symbology of the land cover maps in Section 3.1 for completeness. The dataset provides time series classifications by watershed management unit and then summarized by dominant features in watershed (slope and aspect, fire history, orientation, and geology). Overall trends, cross-cutting influences, and patterns arising from groups of watershed management units with shared characteristics are presented below.

Before considering the result, please note that there is not a one-to-one correspondence between the LCMS classifications and vegetation types previously mapped on Catalina. The “Trees” category contains Island Chaparral, Island Woodland, Non-native Woodland, and Riparian Woodland. The Shrubs category contains Coastal Bluff Scrub, Maritime Cactus Scrub, Coastal Sage Scrub. Transitions between Trees and Shrubs, Grass/Forb/Herb & Shrub Mix, and Grass/Forb/Herb & Tree Mix could reflect either a change in vegetation vigor and canopy density or actual changes in vegetation composition.

3.1 LAND COVER MAPS

Land cover maps were produced for each year from 1985 to 2022. General trends are apparent from the maps, which are quantified in the next section. The 1985 map shows a landscape that is 43% Trees (a combination of Island Woodland and Island Chaparral) and 13.8% Barren (Figure 4). By 1998, the year before the first significant fire in the analysis period, Trees had increased to 51.8% and Barren decreased to 10.9% (Figure 5).

The two fires in 2006 (Empire Fire; Figure 6) and 2007 (Island Fire; Figure 6) define the subsequent land cover assessments, dramatically reducing the area of the landscape assessed to be predominated by land cover containing Trees and resulting in a concomitant increase in Grass/Forb/Herb cover. Together these fires burned close to 5,800 acres of the island (roughly 12%).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 4 1985 Land Cover.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 5 1998 Land Cover.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 6 2007 Land Cover with extent of the 2006 Empire Fire and 2007 Island Fire.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 7 2022 Land Cover extent of the 2006 Empire Fire and 2007 Island Fire.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

By 2022, the burned areas had recovered somewhat but not completely (Figure 7). Drought and continued presence of exotic herbivores complicated post-fire recovery such that overall Tree cover was only 0.5 percentage points above 1985 levels, even as Barren cover had decreased to 8.5%.

3.2 LAND COVER TRENDS

For overall trends in watershed characteristics, we summarized the data by averaging by watershed management units. Most of these units are roughly similar in size, so this analysis does not differ from a raw area analysis, except for slighting over emphasizing small management units and under emphasizing larger units.

The general trends in land cover since 1985 at the scale of the entire island are apparent (Figure 8). Most dramatically, barren and impervious area decreased consistently from 14.5% in 1985 to 10.0% in 2006. It increased slightly following the large fires and then remained basically stable, ending up at 9.0% in 2022. Tree cover started at 43.0% in 1985, increased to 51.8% in 1998, where it remained stable, then decreased to 47.9% in 2007 following the fires, and decreased further to 43.5% in 2022. Shrubs increased consistently from 6.4% in 1985 to 10.3% in 2006, jumped to 12.4% by 2008, and slowly increased to 14.0% in 2022. Grass/Forbs/Herb cover started at 11.8% in 1985, decreased to 9.7% in 2006, increased to 12.3% after the fires, and declined to 11.0% in 2022.




Figure 8 Land Cover trends from 1985 to 2022.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.3 CROSS-CUTTING INFLUENCES

3.3.1 SLOPE

Across all years, barren soil was most prevalent in watershed management units that were excessively steep (22.9% at 1:1 average slope) and decreasing consistently to 1.3% in moderately sloped units (4:1) (Figure 9). Grass/Forb/Herb cover was influenced most consistently by steepness, fire history, and orientation, with geology influences less consistent but still highly significant. Cover of grass/forb/herb vegetation was lowest on the steepest slopes (4.9% median) and increased to 8.7% in very steep watershed (2:1), 11.6% in steep watershed (3:1), and 38.1% in moderately steep watershed (4:1).




Figure 9 Influence of slope on land cover.

Grass/Forb/Herb & Shrubs mix was influenced most consistently by drainage orientation, steepness, and geology, with fire history also influencing cover during the period. This cover class was below 10% for watersheds with average slope of 1:1 to 3:1 and jumped to 29.7% in watersheds of moderate slope. Although driven somewhat by outliers, the prevalence of Grass/Forb/Herb & Tree cover was greatest (11.9%) in the steepest watershed management units (1:1) and was slightly less in steep watersheds (9.7% for 1.5:1, 2:1; 7.9% for 3:1) and lowest at moderate steepness (8.1% at 4:1). Shrubs had the highest cover in watershed management units with intermediate slope for the range on the island, 12.4% at 2:1 slope. Cover was less at both steeper and

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

shallower slows, at 8.2% in units with 1:1 average slope and 4.5% in units with moderate (4:1) slope. Tree cover is similar across the intermediate slope categories at 50.3 to 51.2% for the range from 1.5:1 to 3:1. Greater average slopes reduced tree cover to 39% (at 1:1) and flatter units to 15% (4:1).

3.3.2 GEOLOGY

The major geological distinction on Catalina Island is between soils derived from schist and those derived from volcanic parent material. These categories influenced land cover in consistent ways. All else being equal, tree cover was greater (52.2%) on volcanic as opposed to schist (46.4%) soils (Figure 10). Similarly, Grass/Forb/Herb & Tree mix was greater on volcanic soils (13.4% vs. 7.6% on schist). Barren soil was slightly lower (9.8%) on volcanic soils compared to schist (10.1%) but this difference was not significant. Shrubs were higher on schist soils (11.1%) compared to volcanics (8.1%). The related Grass/Forb/Herb & Shrub classification was also higher on schist (12.1%) compared to volcanic soils (6.4%). Grass/Forb/Herb was higher as well on schist (11.2% vs. 8.8%). Overall, grass and shrubs give way to more tree cover when moving from schist to volcanic soils.




Figure 10 Influence of parent material on land cover.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.3.3 ORIENTATION OF MAIN DRAINAGE

Location on the leeward (NE side of the island) or windward side of the island, as classified by the main drainage in each watershed management unit, is highly influential for land cover. This influence results from the greater precipitation, north and north-eastern aspect, and lower windspeeds. We compiled available meteorological data to illustrate this difference. Weather stations on the leeward side had average windspeeds of 1.8 to 2.5 mph, while those on the windward side were as high as 6.9 mph average (Figure 11). The airport location, although technically on the leeward side, is located at the exposed ridge of the island and has higher average windspeeds than typical leeward locations.

Precipitation records from stations across the island show lower average totals on the extreme windward side (8.2 to 8.5 inches per year) compared with leeward side stations at 9.6 to 10.5 inches per year or more (Figure 12). The range in average precipitation on the island (8.2 to 10.5 inches) is lower than in coastal southern California region, which ranges from 9.5 to 13 inches (240 to 330 mm) (Okin et al. 2018).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 11 Average annual wind speed.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 12 Average annual precipitation.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

A gradient of north-eastness (correlating with overall landscape orientation) is established as a proxy measure for wetness on the Channel Islands (Paudel et al. 2016). The most dramatic influence of leeward compared with windward orientation on Catalina is that the Tree cover is almost twice as great on the leeward (61.8%) compared to the windward side (36.5%) (Figure 13). Grass/Forb/Herb & Tree Mix is even on both sides (9.6%). All other cover classes are greater on the windward side than the leeward side, including shrubs (11.8% vs. 8.2%), Grass/Forb/Herb & Shrubs Mix (15.1% vs. 3.0%), Grass/Forb/Herb (11.6% vs. 9.8%), and Barren or Impervious (13.8% vs. 6.3%). Urban development, found more on the leeward side, increases the impervious cover there.




Figure 13 Influence of orientation of the main drainage on land cover.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

These patterns are consistent through the time series (Figure 14). Even the total Tree cover following fires on the leeward side is greater than the maximum Tree cover on the windward side.




Figure 14 *Relative land cover by orientation of the main drainage of the watershed management unit.*

3.3.4 Fire History

Classifying watershed management units by whether they had any fires in the period 1985 to 2022 segregates long-term trends attributable to other factors from the influence of fire. During the period of analysis, unburned watersheds started with tree cover of 40.2%, which increased to a maximum of 48.7% in 1998 then declined from that point through to a low of 40.1% in 2022 (Figure 15). During this period, barren soil decreased (15.5% to 10.3%), shrubs more than doubled (6.9% to 15.0%), Grass/Forb/Herb was stable at 11.0 to 12.1%, and Grass/Forb/Herb & Shrubs Mix increased from 11.1% to 14.7%.

Management units that burned at all during this period show immediate responses to fire and evidence of succession following it. Tree cover started at 52.0% in 1985 and increased until just before the Empire fire (63.2% in 2005). Tree cover declined to 49.5% in 2008 and then stayed stable for 8 years and increased slightly into 2022 to 54.0%.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Barren soil started at 8.6% in 1985, decreased to 4.0% before the Empire Fire, increased to 5.7% with the Island Fire, then decreased to 2.7% in 2022. Grass/Forb/Herb showed a significant response to fire, having been stable between 10.9% and 9.2% from 1985 to 2005, it increased to 18.1% following the Island Fire, and declined to 10.7% in 2022.




Figure 15 Land cover trends in watershed management units with and without fires from 1985 to 2022.

3.3.5 PRECIPITATION AND DROUGHT

The weather data for Catalina are incomplete, with a period from the early-1990s through 2000 missing (Figure 16). The remaining record shows typical oscillations of a Mediterranean climate, with the influence of the El Niño/La Niña oscillation and the Pacific Decadal Oscillation apparent in the yearly extremes and the cycling between wet and dry periods. Temperature has been trending upwards and is projected to continue to do so. We graphed the land cover trends with drought periods for areas that either had a large fire in the WMU since 1985 or did not to better visualize the effect of drought.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 16 Precipitation record from 1910 to 2022.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Inspection of the overall land cover trends during 1985 to 2022 suggest the influence of drought on vegetation trends. Tree cover was increasing in the period 1985 to 1990 even though this period contained a 3-year period of below average rainfall for Long Beach (our proxy because of the missing data from Catalina). The Catalina record, however, shows that this was still a period where the 10-year average of precipitation was significantly above normal. It also corresponds with the period when the vegetation was first recovering from the initial partial removal of goats and pigs. Tree cover declined slowly through the period 1998 to 2010 in those areas that did not burn without there being a significant drought event (Figure 17). However, for those areas that burned in 2006 and 2007, recovery of Tree cover increased in recovery but then declined during the 2011 to 2016 drought period. This was true across both burned and unburned areas (see next section, 3.4). Further drought in 2020 through 2022 was similarly associated with reductions in the Tree classification in the cover maps.




Figure 17 *Trends in land cover on Catalina Island 1985 to 2022 as an average of watershed management units that either did or did not have a significant fire during the period, with drought periods (3 or more consecutive years with under average precipitation) marked in gray.*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.4 SYNTHETIC ANALYSIS

3.4.1 TYPOLOGY

Our review of the changing land cover patterns and associations with slope, orientation, geology, and fire history resulted in a proposed classification that assigns the 105 watershed management units used by the Conservancy into a hierarchical system of 13 groups. The top level combines drainage, geography, and land use into five groups:

Group 1. Leeward side of the West End

Group 2. Windward side of the West End and near Isthmus

Group 3. Leeward side of main island

Group 4. Windward side of main island

Group 5. Dominated by development

Then, Group 3 is divided into areas with schist geology (3a) and volcanic geology (3b). Group 4 is similarly divided by geology into schist (4a) and volcanic (4b). Finally, fire history is added as a subgroup for 3 and 4 within each of the geology classifications and depending on the fire. The result is a system with 13 categories that isolate different influences on vegetation and their trajectories over time (Figure 18).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 18 Groups for analysis of land cover trends.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.4.2 GROUP 1 – EASTERN LEEWARD SIDE OF WEST END

The leeward side of the West End contains 10 watershed management units (1 to 10). It has had no significant fires and soils are primarily derived from Catalina Schist and Landslide parent material. Tree cover has ranged from 56.7% in 1985 to 65.1% in 2006 to 60.4% in 2022. Grass/Forb/Herb & Tree Mix increased from 7.7% in 2006 to 9.1% in 2022, indicating that some of the reduction in tree cover is dieback and thinning (Figure 19). Shrubs increased from 6.4% in 1985 to 9.2% in 1993, remained stable through 2006 and then increased to 12.3% in 2022. Grass/Forb/Herb started at 13.8% in 1985, declined to 10.6% in 1994 and has remained stable since, ending at 10.4% in 2022. Barren soil declined from 3.9% in 1986 to 2.3% in 2022.




Figure 19 Group 1 land cover trends, 1985 to 2022.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.4.3 Group 2 – Windward Side of West End and Near Isthmus on East End

The windward side of the west end and nearby management units on and next to the isthmus make up Group 2. The parent material is primarily Catalina Schist and Landslide. All these units are very steep and they have the most sustained fog cover into the summer months. It has less island scrub oak because of the fog and indeed the tree cover is quite low in comparison with other groups. It has large areas of grassland and patches of black sage and other low-growing shrubs.

For the group (units 67 to 81), tree cover started in 1985 at 20.9%, increased to 26.6% in 1998, then declined consistently to 9.4% in 2022 (Figure 20). Shrub cover increased consistently from 7.4% in 1985 to 24.4% in 2012 and has remained stable for the past decade. Grass/Forb/Herb class increased from 8.5% in 1985 to 11.4% in 1995 and has remained reasonably stable since then, ending at 11.3% in 2022. Barren land was at a maximum of 24.7% in 1987 and since then declined to 17.9% in 2022.

Individual watershed management units had variations on this theme, including influence by some smaller fires. Unit 67 (Euphorbia Haven) has a high cover of the Grass/Forb/Herb & Tree Mix, which has been steadily declining and replaced by more shrub classes. Units 68, 69, and 71 have seen an increase in the Grass/Forb/Herb & Shrubs Mix at the expense of Tree cover. Unit 70 (Ballast Point) has also seen a decrease in trees in favor of shrubs; it burned in 1982 and partially burned in 2011. Variability is highest in units 72 to 81, but also show a loss of trees in favor of shrubs and the Grass/Forb/Herb & Shrub Mix class.




Figure 20 Group 2 cover trends, 1985 to 2022.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.4.4 Group 3a1. Eastern Leeward Side of East End without Recent Large Fire - Catalina Schist

Group 3 is the leeward side of the main island (east of the isthmus). Within it, 3a are units with primarily schist geology and 3a1 are those units without large fires, and include watershed management units 12, 14, 16, 18, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, and 31. These are primarily very steep channel facing drainages with primarily Catalina Schist parent material with other Landslide Deposits and volcanic derived soils.

Overall, these units have seen a steady gradual increase in tree cover following goat/pig removal, but with a decrease following the extended drought in the 2010s. Tree cover was at 59.3% in 1985, increased to 69.0% in 2005 and decreased to 62.9% in 2022 (Figure 21). Shrub cover increased some from 1985 to 2005 (8.9% to 9.5%) and then relatively more from then until 2022 (12.3%). Grass/Forb/Herb cover remained stable; (12.0% in 1985, 11.3% in 2022). Barren cover decreased from 5.1% in 1986 to 2.4% in 2022.

Within the group, units 12, 14, and 16 had small increases in tree and shrub cover from 1985 to 1998. Units 18, 22, 23, and 24 also had gradual tree increases but dropped following the 2010s drought. Units 25, 26, 29, 30, and 31 remained quite stable but with some small increases in tree cover. This group is the best comparison with group 3a2, which burned in the Empire Fire and had a drop in tree cover but no recovery afterward.




Figure 21 Group 3a1 land cover classification over time.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.4.5 GROUP 3A2. EASTERN LEEWARD SIDE OF EAST END IMPACTED BY 2006 EMPIRE FIRE - CATALINA SCHIST

Group 3a2 includes leeward management units with Catalina Schist as the predominant parent material that were affected by the 2006 Empire Fire. It includes management units 19, 20, and 21.

Similar fire impacts in management units on both leeward and windward sides of the main drainage divide (compare with Group 4a3). Tree cover increased following goat and pig removal from 68.3% in 1985 to a maximum of 79.2% in 2005 (Figure 22). Since the fire in 2006, tree cover has declined and not recovered (63% in 2007; 60.4% in 2022), being replaced by more shrub cover and grassland. Shrub cover declined from 1985 (7.5%) to 2006 (5.2%) and then increased dramatically after the fire to a maximum of 21.5% in 2012, followed by a decline to 15.5% in 2022. Grass/Forb/Herb class was mostly stable from 1985 (9.7%) to 2006 (7.5%) and since then increased to 12.5% in 2022. Shifts from tree cover to shrub cover do not necessarily mean a change in species composition; island scrub oak can recover but be at a smaller stature during an extended recovery period in a drier climate. Lack of tree recovery following the 2006 fire is attributable to both extended drought in the 2010s and mule deer foraging in areas with resprouting vegetation.




Figure 22 Land cover trajectories in leeward management units with schist parent materials affected by the 2006 Empire Fire.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.4.6 Group 3a3. Eastern Leeward Side of East End Impacted by 1999 Goat Fire - Catalina Schist

Group 3a3 shares all characteristics with 3a2 except it includes those areas affected by the 1999 Goat Fire instead. It includes management units 27 and 28. Tree cover reached a maximum (64.8%) in these units in 1997, declining to 62.7% by the time of the fire and then continuing to a low of 55.9% in 2002 (Figure 23). It subsequently has increased to 61.4% (2022). Shrub cover shows a complementary trend, stable from 1985 (6.0%) to 1997 (7.0%), then increasing to 13.0% in 2002 and to 14.6% by 2015, after which it decreases to 10.4% in 2022. Barren cover decreased through the whole period from 8.7% in 1986 to 2.9% in 2022. Grass/Forb/Herb remained reasonably stable, from 7.5% in 1985 to 8.7% in 2022.




Figure 23 *Land cover trajectories in leeward management units with schist parent materials affected by the 1999 Goat Fire.*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.4.7 GROUP 3B1. EASTERN LEEWARD SIDE OF EAST END WITHOUT RECENT LARGE FIRE - VOLCANIC ROCK

Group 3b1 consists of leeward management units with volcanic parent material (Tv or Tmqd) on the main island that have not had a large recent fire. These units are steep with landslide deposits common. They have higher annual rainfall and lower windspeeds than on the windward side of the island and slopes are North-Northwest to East facing, increasing the available moisture. This contrasts with most of the western windward side of the island that has slope aspects that typically range from South-Southeast to West facing. The exception is Bullrush Canyon, which has dominant North-Northeast facing slopes, due to the northwest to southeast alignment of the canyon, which parallels the orientation of the main axis of the island and the leeward, channel-facing watersheds. The rest of the canyons on the western windward side, generally are aligned from the southwest to the northeast, which also roughly aligns with the prevailing westerly wind direction off the open ocean. The unburned units in this category include 40c and 41 and serve as a comparison for Group 3b2, which burned in the 2007 Island Fire.

For this group, tree cover is high, between 84.5% and 87.3% from 1985 to 2015, with a dip in 2016 and decline to 82.9% in 2022 (Figure 24). The Grass/Forb/Herb & Tree Mix increases in 2016 associated with the Tree dip. Shrub cover increased from 0.5% in 1985 to 2.3% in 2022, replacing some of the tree cover. Barren cover declined very slightly from 4.7% in 1985 to 4.0% in 2022.




Figure 24 *Land cover trajectories in leeward management units with volcanic parent materials affected by any large fires.*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.4.8 GROUP 3B2. EASTERN LEEWARD SIDE OF EAST END IMPACTED BY 2007 ISLAND FIRE - VOLCANIC ROCK

These areas on the leeward side on volcanic soils have higher tree cover in general (see analysis above) and are affected by the 2007 Island Fire. They show substantial gains in tree cover following goat removal, increasing from 61.8% in 1985 to 74.7% in 2006 (Figure 25). The fire reduced tree cover by a quarter to 56.2% in 2008, after which it has somewhat recovered to 64.9%. Grass/Forb/Herb & Tree Mix had declined with Tree increases from 1985 to 2006, decreased immediately after the fire and increased to a persistently higher level during the drought from 2010 to 2017 and decreased slightly into 2022. Barren areas have a long-term decline from 11.7% in 1987 to 4.4% in 2022 with a spike in 2007 to 9.5%. Grass/Forb/Herb cover spiked from 3.2% in 2006 to 16.1% in 2008 and remains well above 1985 to 2006 levels at 6.3% in 2022. Grass/Forb/Herb & Shrub Mix also remains above its 1985 to 2006 levels (2.3% in 2022 vs. 1.3% in 1985). Post-fire recovery appears to be hampered by both drought (2010s) and browsing.




Figure 25 *Land cover trajectories in leeward management units with volcanic parent materials affected by the 2007 Island Fire.*

Within this group unit 32a has both volcanic parent material and schist parent material. The portion that burned had volcanic patient material. This unit increased in tree cover from 1985 to 2007, lost significantly in 2007, and had continued declines into 2022. Unit 32b is like 32a but has had some recent gains in tree cover. It has some luff/silty loam soils, which differ from other volcanic soils in this group which have loam (Tv parent) to

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

gravelly loam (Tmqd parent) soils. It is also the unit where White's exclosure is located, which eliminates the effect of mule deer browsing on regeneration. Unit 32c also saw increased tree cover from 1985 to 2007, which has also recovered following the 2007 fire. This is similarly attributable to the luff/silty loam soils. Both 33 and 34 were less affected by the fire and have stable and increasing tree cover. Finally, units 35 to 39, 40a, and 40b increased from 1985 to 2007, lost tree cover proportional to the area that burned and have not yet recovered to 2007 tree cover levels.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.4.9 Group 4a1. Western Windward Side of East End without Recent Large Fire – Schist with Landslide Deposits

Group 4 management units on the windward side of the island are typically less steep (with the exception of unit 50a). They also include soils derived from volcanic origins (Catalina Island pluton; quartz diorite) of Miocene age and Jurassic aged Catalina Schist. This group contains WMUs 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61a, 61b, 61i, 63a, 63d, 64, 66a and 66b.

The general pattern for this group was an increase in tree cover from 37.3% in 1985 to 49.9% in 1998, followed by a decline to 40.8% in 2022 (Figure 26). In the period of increasing tree cover, barren cover decreased (from 18.8% in 1985 to 14.0% in 1998) while Shrub cover remained stable around 8%. As tree cover declined, shrub cover doubled, from 8.0% in 1998 to 16.8% in 2022. The exceptions to this general pattern were units 60 (Cowboy Canyon), 61a (Ben Weston), 63d (Upper Cottonwood), and 66a (Little Harbor), each of which was stable or had some increase in tree cover from 1985 to 2022.




Figure 26 Land cover trajectories in windward management units with schist parent materials unaffected by recent large fires.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.4.10 GROUP 4A2. WESTERN WINDWARD SIDE OF EAST END WITH 2003 AIRPORT FIRE IMPACTS–CATALINA SCHIST WITH LANDSLIDE DEPOSITS

Group 4a2 illustrates the effects of the 2003 Airport Fire on windward management units with Catalina Schist parent material. Tree cover in this unit (63c) increased from 62.7% in 1985 to a high of 72% in 1998 (Figure 27). The fire reduced tree cover from 70.4% in 2002 to 66.3% in 2003, and then drought and lack of recovery has led to a continued decline in tree cover to 56.5% in 2022, falling below even the 1985 levels. Shrubs to some degree have replaced tree cover, increasing from 10.4% in 2002 to peak at 14.6% in 2010 and continuing higher at 13.5% in 2022. Barren cover decreased from 4.6% in 1985 to 0.7% in 2003 and remains low at 0.5% in 2022. Although tree cover declined slightly before the 2003 Airport Fire, its trajectory has been negative in this management unit since that fire.




Figure 27 Land cover trajectories in windward management units with schist parent materials affected by the 2003 Airport Fire.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.4.11 GROUP 4A3. WESTERN WINDWARD SIDE OF EAST END WITH 2006 EMPIRE FIRE IMPACTS–CATALINA SCHIST WITH LANDSLIDE DEPOSITS

Group 4a3 shares characteristics with the other 4a groups but was affected by the 2006 Empire Fire. It includes WMUs 65 and 66c. These units had some small increase in tree cover from 1985 to 1993, then remained stable at 36% through 2005 (Figure 28). After the fire, tree cover jumped down to 27.4% and declined further to 19.8% in 2022. Shrub cover increased steadily from 1985 (9.9%) to 2005 (17.1%) and continued to increase after a slight decrease associated with the fire, to 20.8% in 2011. Grass/Forb/Herb and Grass/Forb/Herb & Shrub Mix move in opposite directions over time, presumably tracking growth and dieback of shrubs within grasslands.




Figure 28 *Land cover trajectories in windward management units with schist parent materials affected by the 2006 Empire Fire.*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.4.12 GROUP 4B1. WESTERN WINDWARD SIDE OF EAST END WITHOUT RECENT LARGE FIRE - VOLCANIC ROCK

Group 4b includes windward management units on the main island with volcanic derived soils. Group 4b1 includes those WMUs without a recent large fire: 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 61c, 61d, 61g, 61h, 61j, 61k, 61l, 61m, 61n, 62 and 63b).

Tree cover in these units increased from 37.3% in 1985 to a high of 49.9% in 1998, then slowly declined to 40.8% in 2022 (Figure 29). During the Tree decline, Shrubs increased, from 8.0% in 1998 to 16.8% in 2022. Barren ground decreased from 18.8% in 1985 to 10.7% in 2022. The Grass/Forb/Herb & Shrubs Mix increased from a low of 4.9% in 1998 to 13.3% in 2022, mirroring the increase in Shrubs.

A few management units did not follow the overall patterns. WMU 51 (Coffee Pot Canyon) saw significant increase in tree cover (perhaps from the riparian woodland drawing from a spring that feeds this area) between 1985 and 1998, which then dropped off and other vegetation classes increased relative to Barren. WMUs 61g (Upper Bullrush Canyon), 61m (Hayfield), and 61n (Middle Ranch Reservoir) all saw a steady increase in Tree cover or Tree and Shrubs cover.




Figure 29 Land cover trajectories in windward management units with volcanic parent materials unaffected by large fires since 1985.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.4.13 GROUP 4B2. WESTERN WINDWARD SIDE OF EAST END WITH 2007 ISLAND FIRE IMPACTS - VOLCANIC ROCK

Group 4b2 includes those management units on the windward side of the main island that were affected by the 2007 Island Fire (50a, 50b, 50c, 61e, 61f). They each have substantial increases in Tree cover from 1985 to 2006 (from 22.1% to 37.6%) and then decline in Tree cover following the fire and proportional to the amount burned in each unit (Figure 30). Like similar unburned units, Barren cover decreased consistently from 1985 (9.1%) to 2022 (0.9%) with only a slight increase in 2007. Shrubs cover increased from 1985 to 2009 (9.1% to 18.0%) and has remained stable since, even as Tree cover has increased as part of the post-fire recovery. Grass/Forb/Herb declined consistently from 1985 (25.2%) to 2006 (19.5%), increased after the fire (26.6%) and then reduced in extent again as Grass/Forb/Herb & Shrub and Tree covers increased after the fire.




Figure 30 Land cover trajectories in windward management units with volcanic parent materials affected by the 2007 Island Fire..

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.4.14 GROUP 5. MANAGEMENT UNITS DOMINATED BY DEVELOPMENT

The developed area of five management units is a large proportion of its total area so we separated these out for separate consideration. They include the Wrigley Institute, Two Harbors, Two Harbors Campground, and the Quarries (11, 13, 15, 17, 42). Avalon and Middle Ranch were not lumped into this group because their developed areas are small compared with the total area of their management units.

The second largest land cover class in these units is Barren or Impervious, which stays consistently high throughout the period of analysis around 22% (Figure 31). Tree cover is the highest and ranges from 24.8% in 1985 to 32.0% in 2005 and down to 21.3% in 2022. Grass/Forb/Herb & Tree Mix declined from 10.3% in 1985 to 4.3% in 2022. Shrubs increased consistently, from 8.4% in 1985 to 19.4% in 2022.




Figure 31 Land cover trajectories in management units heavily influenced by development.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.4.15 SUMMARY

Returning to the overall trends, the watershed management unit groups are useful to compare trends in different land cover classes and their variability in different conditions on the island (Figure 32). For example, Barren and Impervious cover declines across most groups, but stays high and stable for Group 5 (developed units) and Group 2 (windward side of west end). Tree cover increases in all groups coming out of 1985, but then declines start. First is Group 2 (windward side of west end), then Group 4 (windward side of east end), then Group 3a (leeward side of east end with schist soils) and Group 1 (leeward side of west end), and finally Group 3b (leeward side of east end with volcanic soils). Declines in Tree classifications started earliest in groups with the lowest Tree cover (1998, Group 2, 26.6%) and latest in groups with highest Tree cover (2012, Group 3b1, 86.9%). It also becomes clear that the only Groups with an increasing trend in Tree cover heading into 2022 are among those that experienced fires (dotted lines in Figure 32).

The other major observation from the Group comparison is that Shrub classified pixels increased in all groups over time. Spikes in presence are found in Groups that had fires (dotted lines) and corresponding with those fires. These patterns help to corroborate that the underlying classification scheme is accurately assessing changes in vegetation form over time.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 32 Comparison of land cover class trajectories by watershed management groups, 1985 to 2022.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4 DISCUSSION

Use of the LCMS land cover classification system for Catalina provides insights on the changes in vegetation form over time. The underlying methodology has been tested and performs well in analysis of change in forest system but can be outperformed by other land cover models (Desrochers et al. 2022). The approach applies a single, consistent methodology to the entire time series and in that way is appropriate for a time series analysis – there is no reason to suspect systematic bias in the results over time.

Once accounting for classification of healthy chaparral as Trees, as well as Trees including proper woodlands, the patterns observed in the dataset are consistent with known observations. Barren land cover at the start of the time series likely included grass and forblands that were heavily grazed, to the point of being close to bare soil. This is consistent with descriptions from this period. The analysis highlights decline in Tree cover, which has been a concern of island managers (Knapp 2010), as well as showing increases following the removal of goats and pigs. The expansion of woody vegetation, both Shrubs and Trees, following goat and pig removal is consistent with Minnich's conclusion based on historical photographs that woody vegetation was widespread before introduction of exotic herbivores (Minnich 1980).

The gradual decline of Tree (island chaparral) cover over time, and especially following fire in all but the most suitable locations, can be attributed to the effects of deer browsing (Ramirez et al. 2012). This has been investigated with exclosures following fire that isolate the effects of deer. Bison are primarily grazers and avoid woody vegetation unless food is limited (e.g., Beschta et al. 2020), so the differences inside and outside of post-fire exclosures can, at this point, be attributed to mule deer browsing. This includes significant reductions in growth and survival of dominant native shrub cover following fire, including *Heteromeles arbutifolia, Rhamnus pirifolia,* and *Rhus integrifolia* (Ramirez et al. 2012). Although remnant, but established island chaparral and woodland communities might survive and decline slowly from drought stress and resulting additional browsing pressure in the absence of large fires (see unburned tree trajectories above), large fires in conjunction with mule deer browsing pressure appear to lead to further decline in the natural chaparral and woodland vegetation. Reduction in dominant shrub cover (*Ceanothus* spp.) in long-unburned chaparral caused by deer (and woodrat) browsing in central California demonstrates this mechanism (Fox and Potts 2023). Although in that study, removal of deer was seen to simplify the community and reduce its diversity, such condition would be natural for Catalina Island as lacking large browsers throughout its evolutionary history, and would be highly beneficial to the endemic shrubs, as has already been conclusively demonstrated (Dvorak et al. 2016, Dvorak and Catalano 2016).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

5 REFERENCES

Beschta, R. L., Ripple, W. J., Kauffman, J. B., & Painter, L. E. 2020. Bison limit ecosystem recovery in northern Yellowstone. *Food Webs*, 23, e00142.

Bohannon, R.G., and C. Reiss. 2004. Preliminary Geologic Map of Santa Catalina Island. General geology mapped by J.G. Vedder, S.Q. Boundy-Sanders, H. McClean, and R.G. Bohannon. The schist facies in the central part of the island after Platt (1975). Digitized and modified by B. Coleman and P. Rebl. Provided by the Catalina Island Conservancy.

Desrochers, M. L., W. Tripp, S. Logan, E. Bevilacqua, L. Johnson, and C. M. Beier. 2022. Ground-Truthing Forest Change Detection Algorithms in Working Forests of the US Northeast. *Journal of Forestry* 120:575–587.

Duncan, C. L., J. L. King, and P. Stapp. 2017. Effects of prolonged immunocontraception on the breeding behavior of American bison. *Journal of Mammalogy* 98:1272–1287.

Dvorak, T. M., and A. E. Catalano. 2016. Exclusion of introduced deer increases size and seed production success in an island-endemic plant species. *Ecology and Evolution* 6:544–551.

Dvorak, T. M., A. E. Catalano, and C. M. Guilliams. 2016. Monitoring within non-native ungulate exclosures documents the inherent size of Crocanthemum greenei (Cistaceae). *PhytoKey*s:11.

Fox, L. R., and S. E. Potts. 2023. Herbivory mediates direct and indirect interactions in long-unburned chaparral. *Ecological Monographs* 93:e1546.

Gusick, A. E., J. Perry, K. Gill, and W. Teeter. 2021. A trans-holocene approach to assess maritime development on the California Channel Islands archipelago: A case study from Eel Point, San Clemente island. *Quaternary International* 597:37–49.

Hardiman, M., A. C. Scott, N. Pinter, R. S. Anderson, A. Ejarque, A. Carter-Champion, and R. A. Staff. 2016. Fire history on the California Channel Islands spanning human arrival in the Americas. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 371:20150167.

Knapp, D. A. 2005. Vegetation community mapping on Santa Catalina Island using orthorectification and GIS. Pages 193–203 Proceedings of the Sixth California Islands Symposium (DK Garcelon and CA Schwemm, eds.). National Park Service Technical Publication CHIS-05-01. Institute for Wildlife Studies, Arcata, California.

Knapp, D. A. 2010. Changes in oak distribution and density by decade on Santa Catalina Island, 1943 to 2005. Page Oak ecosystem restoration on Santa Catalina Island, California: Proceedings of an on-island workshop, February 2-4, 2007. Catalina Island Conservancy, Avalon, California.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Landis, Frank. 2000. "Unburned and grazed chaparral: a case study." Interface between Ecology and Land Development in California 00-62.

Longhurst, W. M., A. S. Leopold, and R. F. Dasmann. 1952. A survey of California deer herds: their ranges and management problems. State of California, Department of Fish and Game, Bureau of Game Conservation.

Mead, J. R. 1899. Archaeology of Catalina Island. Transactions of the Annual Meetings of the Kansas Academy of Science 17:215–216.

Minnich, R. A. 1980. Vegetation of Santa Cruz and Santa Catalina Islands. Pages 123–137 in D. M. Power, editor. The California Islands: Proceedings of a multidisciplinary symposium. Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History, Santa Barbara, California.

Minnich, R. A. 1982. Grazing, fire, and the management of vegetation on Santa Catalina Island, California. Dynamics and management of Mediterranean-type ecosystems. USDA Forest Service, General Technical Report PSW-58. Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, Berkeley, California, USA:444–449.

Okin, G. S., Dong, C., Willis, K. S., Gillespie, T. W., & MacDonald, G. M. 2018. The impact of drought on native Southern California vegetation: Remote sensing analysis using MODIS-derived time series. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, 123, 1927–1939. https://doi.org/10.1029/ 2018JG004485

Paudel, S., G. W. T. Wilson, B. MacDonald, T. Longcore, and S. R. Loss. 2016. Predicting spatial extent of invasive earthworms on an oceanic island. *Diversity and Distributions* 22.

Platt, R. V., T. B. Chapman, and J. K. Balch. 2023. Fire refugia are robust across Western US forested ecoregions, 1986–2021. *Environmental Research Letters* 19:014044.

Porcasi, P., J. F. Porcasi, and C. O'Neill. 1999. Early Holocene coastlines of the California Bight: the Channel Islands as first visited by humans. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 35:1–24.

Radde, H. D., W. G. Teeter, D. R. Martinez, and K. O. Kennedy-Richardson. 2024. A critical evaluation of radiocarbon dates and Indigenous settlement patterns on Santa Catalina Island, California. *The Journal of Island and Coastal Archaeology* 0:1–25.

Ramirez, A. R., R. B. Pratt, A. L. Jacobsen, and S. D. Davis. 2012. Exotic deer diminish post-fire resilience of native shrub communities on Santa Catalina Island, southern California. *Plant Ecology* 213:1037–1047.

Rick, T. C., J. M. Erlandson, R. L. Vellanoweth, and T. J. Braje. 2005. From Pleistocene Mariners to Complex Hunter-Gatherers: The Archaeology of the California Channel Islands. *Journal of World Prehistory* 19:169–228.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Rick, T. C., C. A. Hofman, T. J. Braje, J. E. Maldonado, T. S. Sillett, K. Danchisko, and J. M. Erlandson. 2012. Flightless ducks, giant mice and pygmy mammoths: Late Quaternary extinctions on California's Channel Islands. *World Archaeology* 44:3–20.

Sacks, B. N., M. J. Statham, L. E. K. Serieys, and S. P. D. Riley. 2022. Population Genetics of California Gray Foxes Clarify Origins of the Island Fox. *Genes* 13:1859.

Schumann, R.R., S.A. Minor, D.R. Muhs, L.T. Groves, and J.P. McGeehan. 2012. Tectonic influences on the preservation of marine terraces: Old and new evidence from Santa Catalina Island, California. *Geomorphology*. 179. 208–224. 10.1016/j.geomorph.2012.08.012.

Vedder, J. G., and D. G. Howell. 1980. Topographic evolution of the southern California borderland during late Cenozoic time. Pages 7–31 The California Islands: proceedings of a multidisciplinary symposium. Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History Santa Barbara, California.

Vogel, A. B., Tenggardjaja, K., Edmands, S., Halbert, N. D., Derr, J. N., & Hedgecock, D. 2007. Detection of mitochondrial DNA from domestic cattle in bison on Santa Catalina Island. *Animal Genetics*, *38*(4), 410-412.

Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC). 2024. Cooperative Climatological Data Summaries. Web. Accessed 18 Feb. 2024. http://wrcc.dri.edu/climatedata/climsum/

Williamson, M. B. 1903. History of Santa Catalina Island. Annual Publication of the Historical Society of Southern California and of the Pioneers of Los Angeles County 6:14–31.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Appendix D

Habitat Suitability Models for Catalina Island Plants

Prepared for

CATALINA ISLAND CONSERVANCY™

708 Crescent Ave.
Avalon, CA 90704

Prepared by

LAND IQ

3791 Wade Street
Los Angeles, CA 90066

JUNE 2024

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary ..... **viii**

1 Introduction **1**

2 Methods **2**

2.1 Plant Samples 2

2.2 Environmental Variables 2

2.2.1 Climate 4

2.2.2 Topography 4

2.2.3 Geology and Soil 6

2.2.4 Vegetation Productivity 7

2.2.5 Analytical Mask 7

2.3 Model Development and Evaluation 8

3 Results **9**

3.1 Prediction Variables 10

4 Discussion **19**

4.1 Comparison with Existing Oak Models 19

4.1.1 Island Scrub Oak (*Quercus pacifica*) 19

4.1.2 Island Live Oak (*Quercus tomentella*) 21

4.2 Potential Vegetation Communities 21

4.2.1 Island Woodland 23

4.2.2 Island Chaparral 23

4.2.3 Coastal Sage Scrub 26

4.2.4 Coastal Bluff Scrub 28

4.2.5 Maritime Cactus Scrub 28

4.2.6 Vernal Ponds and Reservoirs 30

4.2.7 Coastal Marsh 30

4.2.8 Southern Beach and Dune 30

4.2.9 Grassland 32

4.2.10 Nonnative Herbaceous 34

4.2.11 Nonnative Scrub 34

4.3 Comparison with Existing Composite Potential Natural Vegetation Map 37

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

5 References 39

6 Supporting Materials Attachment 41

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1. Environmental Data. 3

Table 3-1. Summary of the Most Important Predictive Variables by Plant Species. 12

Table 6-1. Plants Selected for Species Environmental Niche Modeling. 42

Table 6-2 Soil Complexes with Primary Geology, Soil Series and Soil Texture (2008 Soil Map). 74

Table 6-3. Habitat Suitability Model Performance. 82

Table 6-4. Environmental Variable Permutation Importance in Models. 181

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3-1 Number of Environmental Variables in Potential Vegetation Models. 10

Figure 3-2 Distribution of Environmental Variables by Type. 11

Figure 4-1 Comparison of predicted suitability for Island Scrub Oak with MaxEnt and GLM models. 20

Figure 4-3 Comparison of predicted suitability for Island Live Oak with MaxEnt and GLM models. 22

Figure 4-4 Potential Natural Vegetation Binary Predictions of Three Dominant Species in the Californian Broadleaf Forest and Woodland Group. 24

Figure 4-5 Potential Natural Vegetation Binary Predictions of Seven Dominant Species in the California Chaparral Macro Group. 25

Figure 4-6 Potential Natural Vegetation Binary Predictions of Six Dominant Species in the Central and South Coastal Californian CSS Group. 27

Figure 4-7 Potential Natural Vegetation Binary Predictions of Six Dominant Species in the Coastal Baja California Norte Maritime Succulent Scrub Group. 29

Figure 4-8 Potential Natural Vegetation Binary Predictions of Four Dominant Species in the Four Different Vegetation Community Groups, Including Fresh Water Marsh, Brackish Meadow, Vernal Pool/Swale, and Dune Mat. 31

Figure 4-9 Potential Natural Vegetation Binary Predictions of Four Dominant Species in the Four Different Grassland Groups. 33

Figure 4-10 Potential Distribution of Seven Invasive Herbaceous Flowering Plants (excluding Grasses). 35

Figure 4-11 Potential Distribution of Four Invasive Grasses. 36

Figure 4-12 Potential Distribution of Three Invasive Shrubs. 37

Figure 4-2 Potential Natural Vegetation Type Map (Longcore et al. 2018). 38

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-1 Monthly Mean Cloud Albedo (Proxy for Cloudiness) for 1996 to 2018. 60
Figure 6-2 Solar Radiation Received During Winter Solstice. 61
Figure 6-3 Solar Radiation Received During Equinox. 62
Figure 6-4 Solar Radiation Received During Summer Solstice. 63
Figure 6-5 Elevation. 64
Figure 6-6 Aspect of Slope. 65
Figure 6-7 Northeastness Index. 66
Figure 6-8 Slope Steepness. 67
Figure 6-9 Topographic Position Index. 68
Figure 6-10 Topographic Wetness Index. 69
Figure 6-11 Terrain Ruggedness Index. 70
Figure 6-12 Preliminary Geology Map for Catalina Island. 71
Figure 6-13 Soil Map Units for 2008 NRCS Survey. 73
Figure 6-14 Soil Map Units for 1955 Soil Conservation Service Survey. 75
Figure 6-15 Soil Depth (1955 Soil Map). 76
Figure 6-16 Soil Texture (1955 Soil Map). 77
Figure 6-17 Soil Permeability (1955 Soil Map). 78
Figure 6-18 Underlying Material (1955 Soil Map). 79
Figure 6-19 Average Spring Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) from 2017 to 2022. 80
Figure 6-20 Shore Mask for Modeling. 81
Figure 6-21 Potential Vegetation Map for Red Sand Verbena (*Abronia maritima*). 87
Figure 6-22 Potential Vegetation Map for Common Yarrow (*Achillea millefolium*). 88
Figure 6-23 Potential Vegetation Map for Silver Birds Foot Trefoil (*Acmispon argophyllus*). 89
Figure 6-24 Potential Vegetation Map for Large Leaved Lotus (*Acmispon grandifloras*). 90
Figure 6-25 Potential Vegetation Map for Chamise (*Adenostoma fasciculatum*). 91
Figure 6-26 Potential Vegetation Map for Yerba Mansa (*Anemopsis californica*). 92
Figure 6-27 Potential Vegetation Map for Aphanisma (*Aphanisma blitoides*). 93
Figure 6-28 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Island Manzanita (*Arctostaphylos catalinae*), a Santa Catalina Island Endemic. 94
Figure 6-29 Potential Vegetation Map for California Sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*). 95
Figure 6-30 Potential Vegetation Map for Giant Reed (*Arundo donax*), an Invasive Plant. 96
Figure 6-31 Potential Vegetation Map for Narrowleaf Milkweed (*Asclepias fascicularis*). 97
Figure 6-32 Potential Vegetation Map for Coulter's Saltbush (*Atriplex coulteri*). 98
Figure 6-33 Potential Vegetation Map for South Coast Saltscale (*Atriplex pacifica*). 99

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-34 Potential Vegetation Map for Coyote Bush (*Baccharis pilularis*). 100
Figure 6-35 Potential Vegetation Map for Velvet Cactus (*Bergerocactus emoryi*), a Channel Island Endemic. 101
Figure 6-36 Potential Vegetation Map for Cane Bluestem (*Bothriochloa barbinodis*). 102
Figure 6-37 Potential Vegetation Map for Black Mustard (*Brassica nigra*), an Invasive Plant. 103
Figure 6-38 Potential Vegetation Map for California Brome (*Bromus sitchensis*). 104
Figure 6-39 Potential Vegetation Map for Sea Rocket (*Cakile maritima*), an Invasive Plant. 105
Figure 6-40 Potential Vegetation Map for Italian Thistle (*Carduus pycnocephalus*), an Invasive Plant. 106
Figure 6-41 Potential Vegetation Map for Felt-Leaf Ceanothus (*Ceanothus arboreus*), a Channel Island Endemic. 107
Figure 6-42 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Ceanothus (*Ceanothus megacarpus* var. *insularis*), a Channel Island Endemic. 108
Figure 6-43 Potential Vegetation Map for Bigpod Ceanothus (*Ceanothus megacarpus* var. *megacarpus*). 109
Figure 6-44 Potential Vegetation Map for Red Valerian (*Centranthus ruber*), an Invasive Plant. 110
Figure 6-45 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Island Mountain-Mahogany (*Cercocarpus traskiae*), a Santa Catalina Island Endemic, State and Federally Endangered Plant. 111
Figure 6-46 Potential Vegetation Map for Soap Plant (*Chlorogalum pomeridianum*). 112
Figure 6-47 Potential Vegetation Map for Bull Thistle (*Cirsium vulgare*), an Invasive Plant. 113
Figure 6-48 Potential Vegetation Map for Summer Holly (*Comarostaphylis diversifolia* subsp. *planifolia*). 114
Figure 6-49 Potential Vegetation Map for Pampas Grass (*Cortaderia selloana*), an Invasive Plant. ... 115
Figure 6-50 Potential Vegetation Map for Alkali Weed (*Cressa truxillensis*). 116
Figure 6-51 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Rush-Rose (*Crocanthemum greenei*), a Channel Island Endemic and Federally Threatened Plant. 117
Figure 6-52 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Island Crossosoma (*Crossosoma californicum*), Endemic to the Channel Islands and the Palos Verdes Peninsula. 118
Figure 6-53 Potential Vegetation Map for Coastal Cholla (*Cylindropuntia prolifera*). 119
Figure 6-54 Potential Vegetation Map for Artichoke Thistle (*Cynara cardunculus*), an Invasive Plant. 120
Figure 6-55 Potential Vegetation Map for Flatsedge (*Cyperus* spp.). 121
Figure 6-56 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Tarplant (*Deinandra clementina*), a Channel Island Endemic. 122
Figure 6-57 Potential Vegetation Map for Clustered Tarplant (*Deinandra fasciculata*). 123
Figure 6-58 Potential Vegetation Map for Maritime Larkspur (*Delphinium parryi* subsp. *maritimum*). 124

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-59 Potential Vegetation Map for Channel Island Tree Poppy (*Dendromecon harfordii*)..... 125

Figure 6-60 Potential Vegetation Map for Western Dichondra (*Dichondra occidentalis*). 126

Figure 6-61 Potential Vegetation Map for California Dissanthelium (*Dissanthelium californicum*), a Channel Island Endemic. 127

Figure 6-62 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Island Dudleya (*Dudleya virens* subsp. *hassei*), a Santa Catalina Island Endemic. 128

Figure 6-63 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Green Dudleya (*Dudleya virens* subsp. *insularis*). .. 129

Figure 6-64 Potential Vegetation Map for Giant Wild Rye (*Elymus condensatus*). 130

Figure 6-65 Potential Vegetation Map for California Sunflower Bush (*Encelia californica*). 131

Figure 6-66 Potential Vegetation Map for Palmer's Goldenbush (*Ericameria palmeri*). 132

Figure 6-67 Potential Vegetation Map for Trask's Yerba Santa (*Eriodictyon traskiae* ssp. *traskiae*), a Santa Catalina Island Endemic. 133

Figure 6-68 Potential Vegetation Map for St. Catherine's Lace (*Eriogonum giganteum var. giganteum*), a Santa Catalina Island Endemic. 134

Figure 6-69 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Buckwheat (*Eriogonum grande var. grande*). 135

Figure 6-70 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Poppy (*Eschscholzia ramosa*), a Channel Island Endemic. 136

Figure 6-71 Potential Vegetation Map for Cliff Spurge (*Euphorbia misera*), a Channel Island Endemic. 137

Figure 6-72 Potential Vegetation Map for Sweet Fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*), an Invasive Plant..... 138

Figure 6-73 Potential Vegetation Map for Alkali Heath (*Frankenia salina*). 139

Figure 6-74 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Island Bedstraw (*Galium catalinense* subsp. *catalinense*), a Santa Catalina Island Endemic. 140

Figure 6-75 Potential Vegetation Map for Showy Island Snapdragon (*Gambelia speciosa*). 141

Figure 6-76 Potential Vegetation Map for Mediterranean Broom (*Genista linifolia*), an Invasive Plant. 142

Figure 6-77 Potential Vegetation Map for Nevin's Gilia (*Gilia nevinii*), a Channel Island Endemic. 143

Figure 6-78 Potential Vegetation Map for Toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*)..... 144

Figure 6-79 Potential Vegetation Map for Vernal Barley (*Hordeum intercedens*)..... 145

Figure 6-80 Potential Vegetation Map for Menzie's Goldenbush (*Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii*).146

Figure 6-81 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Jepsonia (*Jepsonia malvifolia*), a Channel Island Endemic. 147

Figure 6-82 Potential Vegetation Map for Fragrant Pitcher Sage (*Lepechinia fragrans*)..... 148

Figure 6-83 Potential Vegetation Map for Giant Coreopsis (*Leptosyne gigantea*). 149

Figure 6-84 Potential Vegetation Map for California Boxthorn (*Lycium californicum*). 150

Figure 6-85 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Island Ironwood (*Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus*), a Santa Catalina Island Endemic. 151

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-86 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Island Bushmallow (*Malacothamnus fasciculatus* var. *catalinensis*), a Santa Catalina Island Endemic. 152

Figure 6-87 Potential Vegetation Map for Laurel Sumac (*Malosma laurina*). 153

Figure 6-88 Potential Vegetation Map for Littleseed Muhly (*Muhlenbergia microsperma*). 154

Figure 6-89 Potential Vegetation Map for Coastal Prickly Pear (*Opuntia littoralis*). 155

Figure 6-90 Potential Vegetation Map for Fountaingrass (*Pennisetum setaceum*), an Invasive Plant. 156

Figure 6-91 Potential Vegetation Map for Bladderpod (*Peritoma arborea*). 157

Figure 6-92 Potential Vegetation Map for Harding Grass (*Phalaris aquatica*), an Invasive Plant. 158

Figure 6-93 Potential Vegetation Map for Orchid (*Piperia* spp.). 159

Figure 6-94 Potential Vegetation Map for Popcornflower (*Plagiobothrys collinus*). 160

Figure 6-95 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Cherry (*Prunus ilicifolia* ssp. *lyonii*), a Channel Island Endemic. 161

Figure 6-96 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Scrub Oak (*Quercus pacifica*), a Channel Island Endemic. 162

Figure 6-97 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Live Oak (*Quercus tomentella*), a Channel Island Endemic. 163

Figure 6-98 Potential Vegetation Map for MacDonald Oak (*Quercus* x *macdonaldii*), a Channel Island Endemic and a naturally occurring hybrid of *Q. pacifica* and *Q. lobata.* 164

Figure 6-99 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Redberry (*Rhamnus pirifolia*), a Channel Island Endemic. 165

Figure 6-100 Potential Vegetation Map for Lemonade Berry (*Rhus integrifolia*). 166

Figure 6-101 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Island Currant (*Ribes viburnifolium*), a Channel Island Endemic. 167

Figure 6-102 Potential Vegetation Map for White Sage (*Salvia apiana*). 168

Figure 6-103 Potential Vegetation Map for Black Sage (*Salvia mellifera*). 169

Figure 6-104 Potential Vegetation Map for Blue Elderberry (*Sambucus mexicana*). 170

Figure 6-105 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Island Figwort (*Scrophularia villosa*), a Channel Island Endemic. 171

Figure 6-106 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Rockcress (*Sibara filifolia*), a Channel Island Endemic and Federally Endangered Plant. 172

Figure 6-107 Potential Vegetation Map for Milk Thistle (*Silybum marianum*), an Invasive Plant. 173

Figure 6-108 Potential Vegetation Map for Wallace's Nightshade (*Solanum wallacei*), a Channel Island Endemic. 174

Figure 6-109 Potential Vegetation Map for Nodding Needlegrass (*Stipa cernua*). 175

Figure 6-110 Potential Vegetation Map for Needlegrass (*Stipa* spp.). 176

Figure 6-111 Potential Vegetation Map for Saltcedar (*Tamarix ramosissima*), an Invasive Plant. 177

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-112 Potential Vegetation Map for Southern Island Clover (*Trifolium palmeri*), a Channel Island Endemic. 178

Figure 6-113 Potential Vegetation Map for Southern Cattail (*Typha domingensis*)..... 179

Figure 6-114 Potential Vegetation Map for Mission Manzanita (*Xylococcus bicolor*)..... 180

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Restoration ecology aims to restore ecosystems to their pre-disturbance state, raising the question of what baseline conditions to target. Defining these conditions is crucial for robust restoration planning, especially in areas where seed banks are depleted, leading to incomplete regeneration post-disturbance. Various approaches exist to identify species for floristic restoration, such as historical records and reference sites.

On Catalina Island, the presence of both intact and degraded areas calls for a nuanced restoration plan that addresses type conversion and seed bank loss from unsustainable grazing and browsing. Previous research has provided initial guidance through environmental niche modeling, but species-level assessment and probabilistic mapping are needed for comprehensive restoration plans.

This report presents environmental niche models for 80 native plant species and 14 invasive species on Catalina Island, using the MaxEnt algorithm. These models help identify suitable locations for plant reintroduction, inform weed management strategies, and provide insights into species distribution patterns and environmental drivers. Comparison with previous models and potential natural vegetation maps is also discussed, along with inferred potential natural vegetation alliances based on individual species distributions. This work aims to support effective restoration efforts and understanding of the island's unique ecosystem.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

1 INTRODUCTION

The perennial question in restoration ecology is "restore to what?" With the goal of restoration to return a system to its function and composition prior to disturbance, the definition of those conditions is essential to robust restoration planning (National Research Council 1992). In instances where seed banks have been eliminated or dramatically reduced, the definition of those baseline conditions and their floristic diversity is even more important, since natural passive regeneration following the removal of external stressors (e.g., invasive ungulates, agriculture) will be incomplete and biased toward persisting species.

Restoration ecologists have used different approaches to identifying the species that should be included in floristic restoration (Egan and Howell 2005). One approach is the development of species lists from historical records to ensure inclusion of the full range of species diversity. Another is to consult nearby, similar sites that can be presumed to be analogues of the restoration site and use these as "reference" sites. The relative abundance and suitability of species can also be calculated using mathematical models that relate environmental variables to probability of species presence.

The situation on Catalina is mixed in that it has intact and biodiverse natural vegetation communities still extant, but also has significantly degraded areas that have suffered type conversion and seedbank loss through the century of unsustainable grazing and browsing. The current distribution of both individual species and the vegetation associations and alliances that they form provide a partial, but incomplete, guide to the potential natural vegetation of the island. To address this, Longcore et al. (2018) used quantitative environmental niche modeling to produce probabilistic maps of the distribution of the major vegetation types on Catalina (e.g., Island Chaparral, Island Woodland). Although the summary map from this research provides a starting point, restoration plans need species-level assessment and probabilistic mapping to develop a nuanced restoration plan that maximizes probability of success by reintroducing plants to the most appropriate locations.

We therefore developed environmental niche models for 80 native plant species on Catalina to guide the development of habitat restoration plant palettes and overall restoration goals. We also developed distribution models for 14 invasive plant species to inform plans for weed management as part of the restoration program.

In this report, we document the development of these species distribution models using the MaxEnt algorithm, which has the advantage of requiring only presence data to train the model. We present the results and discuss the insights gained for understanding species distribution, such as the environmental variables most important in defining probability of presence for different plants. We also compare these results with previously developed models of oak tree distribution (Franklin and Knapp 2007) and with the composite potential natural vegetation map (Longcore et al. 2018). Finally, we

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

map the potential natural vegetation alliances or associations that can be inferred from the individual species distributions as they are modeled.

2 METHODS

We used the MaxEnt species distribution modeling approach because of its reliance on presence-only data and good performance with sparse training data (Phillips et al. 2006). We created probabilistic maps of presence of island plant species using the open-source MaxEnt program, Version 3.4.1 (Phillips et al. 2017) to model potential natural vegetation.

2.1 PLANT SAMPLES

There were five sources of geolocated plant records used for environmental niche modeling with MaxEnt:

1. Conservancy CHIRP invasive species survey and treatment location records (2016 to 2022)
2. Conservancy native plant observations (1995 to 2017)
3. CHH2 Herbarium Database records that have field collected geographic coordinates (2015 to 2019)
4. Conservancy native plant observations (2022 to 2023)
5. Locations collected by Land IQ during field visits in 2023

From these sources, 94 plant species were identified for modeling, which are presented in Table 6-1, including 8 Catalina island endemics, 22 island endemics, 50 other native species, and 14 invasive species.

The number of samples for each plant species depended on the number of observations in the record and the minimum distance between samples allowed. A minimum distance of 200 meters was preferred, but for rare species, while not optimal, smaller minimum distances were allowed as reported in Table 6-3.

2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL VARIABLES

To predict vegetation distributions, we generated a set of 19 environmental layers comprising 5 categorical and 14 continuous variables (Table 2-1). These layers encompass various factors known to influence vegetation patterns:

1. Climate (8 layers): Including solan insolation and cloud albedo variables to account for climatic influences on plant growth and distribution.
2. Topography (7 layers): Characterizing the physical landscape features such as elevation, slope, and aspect, which can impact local microclimate and soil properties.
3. Geology and Soil (3 layers): Representing the underlying geologic and edaphic factors that can affect nutrient availability and water-holding capacity.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 2-1. Environmental Data.

Environmental Variable	Description	Data Type	Source
CLIMATE			
alb_05_10m	Cloud Albedo, monthly average - May	Continuous	Clemesha unpublished data
alb_06_10m	Cloud Albedo, monthly average – June	Continuous	Clemesha unpublished data
alb_07_10m	Cloud Albedo, monthly average – July	Continuous	Clemesha unpublished data
alb_08_10m	Cloud Albedo, monthly average – August	Continuous	Clemesha unpublished data
alb_09_10m	Cloud Albedo, monthly average - September	Continuous	Clemesha unpublished data
solar_wintersol	total amount of incoming solar insolation, within Winter Solstice	Continuous	ArcGIS Solar Radiation Tool
solar_equinox	total amount of incoming solar insolation within Equinox	Continuous	ArcGIS Solar Radiation Tool
solar_summersol	total amount of incoming solar insolation, within Summer Solstice	Continuous	ArcGIS Solar Radiation Tool
TOPOGRAPHY			
DEM	Elevation	Continuous	2022/3 ifSAR 10-meter resolution DEM
asp1013	Aspect, 13 classes (including flat)	Categorical	DEM Derivative
neness10	Northeastedness	Continuous	DEM Derivative
sloper10	Slope, Radians	Continuous	DEM Derivative
tpi50	Topographic Position index, 50m window	Continuous	DEM Derivative
twi10	Terrain Wetness Index	Continuous	DEM Derivative
rugg10	Ruggedness	Continuous	DEM Derivative
GEOLOGY AND SOIL			
geol10	Geology	Categorical	Bohannon and Reiss 2004
soils08	2008 Soil Map Units (NRCS, Soil Survey 2008)	Categorical	NRCS 2008
soils55	1955 Soil Map Units (NRCS, Unpublished Soil Survey 1955)	Categorical	SCS 1955
VEGETATION PRODUCTIVITY			
ndvi	Spring NDVI	Continuous	Sentinel-2 Multispectral Data
ANALYTICAL MASK			
mask_shore	1,000-meter buffer on coastline for species limited to coastal habitat	Categorical	Buffer on Shoreline

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4. Vegetation Productivity (1 layer): Assessing the overall productivity of the vegetation in different areas, which can be indicative of resource availability and ecological interactions.

An additional shoreline mask layer was used to restrict the prediction to coastal areas for species known to be limited in their distribution. This multi-layered approach enabled us to account for the complex interplay of environmental factors that shape vegetation communities, providing a robust foundation for our predictive models.

2.2.1 CLIMATE

CLOUD ALBEDO

Monthly (May to September) mean cloud albedo (proxy for cloudiness) for 1996 to 2018 for Santa Catalina Island (Figure 6-1). Unpublished data provided by R. Clemesha, following methods for development of the San Clemente Island coastal clouds and fog high-resolution record (Clemesha et al. 2021).

SOLAR RADIATION

Incoming solar radiation (watt hours per square meter, Wh/m^2) calculated for the surface of the 10-meter DEM using the ArcGIS Solar Radiation Tool for 2018 Winter Solstice (Figure 6-2), 2018 Equinox (insolation for both spring and fall equinox are the same) (Figure 6-3) and 2018 Summer Solstice (Figure 6-4), based on methods from the hemispherical viewshed algorithm developed by Rich et al. (1994) and further developed by Fu and Rich (2000, 2002).

2.2.2 TOPOGRAPHY

ELEVATION

A 10-meter resolution Digital Elevation Model (DEM) was derived from 2002/2003 Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar (IfSAR) (NAVD88 vertical datum) (Figure 6-5).

ASPECT

Aspect was derived from the DEM using ArcGIS Spatial Analyst and classified into thirteen categorical values (Figure 6-6).

NORTHEASTNESS

Additional spatial data were derived for aspect (i.e., geographic orientation of a slope measured in degrees), and this variable was transformed ($\sin(\theta + 45°)$) into a continuous variable that represents an index of northeastness, a proxy for climatic conditions (i.e., an orientation closer to northeast is associated with cooler and wetter conditions) (Figure 6-7).

SLOPE

Slope steepness in radians was derived from the DEM using ArcGIS Spatial Analyst (Figure 6-8).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

TOPOGRAPHIC POSITION INDEX

The Topographic Position Index (TPI) is a measure of the relative position of a location within a landscape, considering its elevation and proximity to ridges and valleys. It helps classify topography into distinct landform categories, such as upper slopes, mid-slopes, and valley bottoms. TPI values were calculated by subtracting the elevation of a central cell from the average elevation of its surrounding cells within a radius of 50 meters in ArcGIS Pro (Figure 6-9).

TPI values can be positive, negative, or zero, which represent different topographic positions:

- **Positive TPI values:** Indicate that the central cell is higher than its surroundings, which generally represents ridge or hilltop locations. The higher the positive value, the more pronounced the ridge or hilltop.
- **Negative TPI values:** Represent cells that are lower than their surroundings, signifying valley or depression locations. The more negative the value, the deeper the valley or depression.
- **TPI values close to zero:** Signify cells with similar elevations to their surroundings, often found in flat areas or mid-slope locations between ridges and valleys.

TERRAIN WETNESS INDEX

A Terrain Wetness Index (TWI) is a numerical value between 0 and 1.0 that indicates the relative wetness or moisture level of a specific location in a landscape (Figure 6-10). TWI was calculated as "ln (a/tan b)" where a is the upstream contributing areas per unit width that is orthogonal to the flow direction and tan b is the local slope in radians (Beven and Kirkby 1979). The index is correlated with several soil attributes such as horizon depth, silt percentage, organic matter content, and phosphorus (Moore et al. 1993).

TWI is often used in geospatial analysis and environmental studies to understand the potential for soil saturation and surface runoff. The values are interpreted as follows:

- 0: This value represents the lowest possible wetness or moisture level. It indicates areas that are well-drained and less susceptible to standing water or waterlogging.
- 0 to 0.5: Lower values in this range signify areas with relatively drier conditions and better drainage. These areas are less likely to experience standing water or saturation.
- 0.5: This is considered an average wetness level, representing areas with moderate drainage and moderate susceptibility to waterlogging or saturation.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- 0.5 to 1.0: Higher values in this range signify areas with wetter conditions and poorer drainage. These areas are more likely to experience standing water, saturation, or waterlogging.
- 1.0: This value represents the highest possible wetness or moisture level. It indicates areas that are poorly drained and highly susceptible to standing water, waterlogging, or saturation.

Remember that TWI is a relative measure, meaning that values should be interpreted in the context of the surrounding landscape and other factors that affect soil moisture levels, such as climate, vegetation, and topography.

TERRAIN RUGGEDNESS INDEX

The Terrain Ruggedness Index (TRI) is a measure of ruggedness (or roughness), which calculates the difference in elevation from a center cell and the 8 cells surrounding it (Riley et al. 1999) (Figure 6-11). A higher value indicates more variation in elevation, while a lower value represents a more uniform and less rugged terrain. Here's how to interpret RI values:

- **Low RI values (e.g., < 5):** Indicate a relatively flat or smooth landscape with little variation in elevation. This can signify a landscape dominated by flat plains or gentle slopes.
- **Medium RI values (e.g., 5 to 10):** Represent a moderately rugged terrain with some variation in elevation, such as rolling hills or moderate slopes.
- **High RI values (e.g., > 10):** Signify a highly rugged and heterogeneous landscape with significant variation in elevation. This can include mountainous regions, steep slopes, or deeply incised valleys.

Keep in mind that the specific range of values may vary depending on the context and scale of the study area, so it's essential to consider the overall landscape characteristics and local topography when interpreting TRI values.

2.2.3 GEOLOGY AND SOIL

GEOLOGY

A preliminary unpublished U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) map by Bohannon and Reiss (2004) was provided by the Catalina Island Conservancy and was converted into a 10-meter resolution raster using the Nearest Neighbor method in ArcGIS Pro (Figure 6-12). Eighteen categorical values were assigned representing rock types from four geological time periods: Quaternary, Mioence, Late Cretaceous to Oligocne, and Jurassic

SOIL (2008)

Since 1975, the U.S. National Cooperative Soil Survey Program has used a systematic approach to classifying soils based on their properties and characteristics called Soil Taxonomy. This soil taxonomy framework was used to prepare the Soil Survey of Santa Catalina Island, published in 2008 (NRCS 2008). Twenty-three categorical soil map units

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

were converted into a 10-meter resolution raster using the Nearest Neighbor method in ArcGIS Pro (Figure 6-13 and Table 6-2).

SOIL (1955)

There was also an unpublished Soil Survey of the island prepared by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service (SCS) in 1955. Raster data was provided by the Conservancy and was resampled using the Nearest Neighbor method in ArcGIS Pro to create 44 soil map units at 10-meter resolution (Figure 6-14). These map units correspond to a range of different values, including soil depth (Figure 6-15), soil texture (Figure 6-16), soil permeability (Figure 6-17), and underlying geological material (Figure 6-18). The 1995 soil data was used by Franklin and Knapp (2010) for predictive modeling of *Quercus pacifica* and *Q. tomentella* potential distributions to help inform ecological relationships and potential habitat restoration sites.

2.2.4 VEGETATION PRODUCTIVITY

NORMALIZED DIFFERENCE VEGETATION INDEX

Average spring (March to June) Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) was computed from the time-series of Sentinel-2 Multispectral data (10-meter resolution) from 2017 to 2022 using Google Earth Engine API (Figure 6-19).

The NDVI values can be interpreted as follows:

- Less than zero is water, such as reservoir
- 0 to 0.14 are areas dominated by bare ground such as cliffs, quarries, beaches, and inland areas with little to no vegetative cover. These areas include Maritime Cactus Scrub.
- 0.14 to 0.23 include Grassland and upland scrubland with an open canopy, such as Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS).
- 0.23 to 0.32 includes upland scrubland with higher perennial cover, such as from Island Chapparal, including island scrub oak (*Quercus pacifica*).
- 0.32 to 0.7 are associated with denser perennial vegetation from Island Chaparral and Island Woodland.

2.2.5 ANALYTICAL MASK

SHORE MASK

A shoreline mask was created by buffering 1,000 meters on the shoreline for species limited to coastal habitat (Figure 6-20).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2.3 MODEL DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION

To develop a parsimonious species distribution model, we employed an iterative approach using the MaxEnt algorithm. Parsimony refers to the principle that the most plausible explanation for an occurrence, phenomenon, or event is the simplest one, requiring the fewest entities, assumptions, or changes. By following this principle, we aimed to develop a model with the optimal balance between accuracy and simplicity, while minimizing the risk of overfitting.

This process involved the following steps:

1. Initial model: We began by constructing a model that incorporated all available environmental variables.
2. Variable influence assessment: We analyzed the model results to determine the most influential variables affecting species distribution.
3. Variable reduction: We systematically removed the variables exhibiting the lowest influence on model performance.
4. Model re-evaluation: We re-ran the model with the reduced set of variables and assessed its performance.
5. Iterative refinement: We repeated the steps of variable removal and model re-evaluation until an optimal balance between model performance and simplicity was achieved.

Throughout the process, we carefully evaluated the model's performance to ensure the retention of essential variables and the overall effectiveness of the final model in predicting species distribution. Although some environmental variables may exhibit correlations, the MaxEnt algorithm has been shown to be largely robust to covariance among environmental variables (Elith et al. 2011), thus mitigating potential issues arising from multicollinearity.

We ran suitability models with one of two resampling methods. Cross-Validation was preferred for larger datasets, while subsampling was used with smaller datasets. Cross-Validation was used with 30% of the data reserved for testing predictions, meaning 70% of the data was used to train the model. Subsampling involves drawing multiple random samples (with replacement) from the original dataset, training the model on each sample, and averaging the performance across all samples. Subsampling can provide a more robust assessment of model performance in situations where data is scarce or computationally intensive methods are prohibitive. Both methods can be used in conjunction with MaxEnt to optimize model performance and ensure reliable predictions. The number of replicates, resampling method, and the number of samples for each plant species model is presented in Table 6-3.

Model fit and performance were assessed using Maxent's test gain and Area Under Curve (AUC) statistics (Merow et al. 2013, Phillips et al. 2017). A software generated Cloglog threshold was selected, 10 percentile training presence, which was specific to

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

each vegetation model, and determined the threshold for minimum suitability (Phillips et al. 2017).

3 RESULTS

The Area Under the Curve (AUC) is a commonly used metric for evaluating the performance of MaxEnt models. A low AUC value indicates poor model performance, meaning the model struggles to distinguish between suitable and unsuitable conditions for the species.

A model was created for each plant species, with performance ranging from fair (AUC > 0.7) to good (AUC > 0.8) and excellent (AUC > 0.9) for most models (88 out of 94 models) (Table 6-3).

Six of the potential plant distribution models performed better than chance but relatively poorly (AUC ≤0.70) compared to the other models, possibly due to the following factors:

1. Low Sample Size: MaxEnt models can be sensitive to the quantity or distribution of presence data across the range of environmental variables in the dataset. This may apply to models for *Acmispon argophyllus,* Dissanthelium *californicum*, and *Rhamnus pirifolia*.
2. Overprediction: The model might be predicting the species' presence across a large area, leading to a high false positive rate and thus a lower AUC. This can occur when the species has a generalist habitat requirement or when the environmental variables used do not sufficiently capture the specific conditions that determine its distribution. There may not be sufficient environmental data to accurately characterize the ecological niche of *Bromus sitchensis.*
3. Habitat generalization: Widespread species often have broad habitat tolerances and can thrive in a variety of environmental conditions (e.g., *Opuntia littoralis* and *Quercus pacifica* on Catalina Island). This can make it difficult for MaxEnt to identify specific environmental variables that strongly influence their distribution, leading to a weaker model performance.

The potential ecological niche model for each of the 94 plant species are presented in Figure 6-21 to Figure 6-114. These models can be visualized in a GIS to guide the selection of suitable habitat restoration sites focused on particular native plants species or vegetation communities that are characterized by specific plant species or can be used to identify appropriate habitat restoration targets for degraded areas targeted for habitat restoration projects.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

3.1 PREDICTION VARIABLES

Environmental variables played differing roles in predicting the distribution of plant species. Models were developed with between 4 to 10 environmental variables (Figure 3-1). The most common number of variables used in a model was 6.




Figure 3-1 Number of Environmental Variables in Potential Vegetation Models.

The most important environmental variables as measured by permutation importance were soil types from the 2008 Soil Survey and topographic variables such as Slope, Elevation, Aspect, and Terrain Wetness Index (Figure 3-2).The permutation importance measure depends only on the final Maxent model, not the path used to obtain it. The contribution for each variable is determined by randomly permuting the values of that variable among the training points (both presence and background) and measuring the resulting decrease in training AUC.

The most important predictive values for each of the 94 models are summarized in Table 6-4.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 3-2 Distribution of Environmental Variables by Type.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 3-1. Summary of the Most Important Predictive Variables by Plant Species.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Most Important Features of Predictive Env. Variables
Abronia maritima	red sand verbena	abrmar	Lowest productivity sites (NDVI peaking below 0.1), associated with high bare ground cover; near the coast; on flat to gentle slopes; Entisols soil with sand, sandy loam or very gravelly sand (Map Units 160, 190, 191, and 423).
Achillea millefolium	common yarrow	achmil	Lower productivity sites (NDVI mostly below 0.23); more common on less steep slopes but also on very steep slopes; on Xeralfs soils (Map Units 423 and 183).
Acmispon argophyllus	silver birds foot trefoil	acmarg	Alluvium (Qal), green Catalina Schist (Jcsg), and Catalina Island Pluton (Tmqd) soil parent material; with high summer solstice radiation; on ridges and hilltops.
Acmispon grandifloras	large leaved lotus	acmgra	Higher elevation sites on gentle to steep slopes; Nauti-Flyer-Marpol Complex soil; Catalina Schist (Jcsa, Jcsb), Andesite (Tma), and Alluvium (Qal) soil parent material.
Adenostoma fasciculatum	chamise	adefas	Xeralfs soils (Map Units 422 and 407); Blue and green Catalina Schist (Jcsb, Jcsg) soil parent material;
Anemopsis californica	yerba mansa	anecal	Flat to gentle slopes; valleys and drainages.
Aphanisma blitoides	aphanisma	aphbli	Low elevation sites (below 300 m); September cloud albedo peaking at 15% associated with the western, windward shoreline.
Arctostaphylos catalinae - SCIE	Catalina Island manzanita	arccat	High summer solstice radiation; Catalina Schist (Jcss, Jcsg), Intrusive rocks (Tmi), and Catalina Island pluton (Tmqd) soil parent material; east- to north- to west-facing slopes and less likely on south-facing aspects.
Artemisia californica	California sagebrush	artcal	More common on east-southeast to west-southwest facing aspects; common across on all elevations but more common below 150 meters; occurs on all soil types but more common soils with loam, sandy loam, and gravelly loamy sand; less likely on the western, windward shoreline with June cloud albedo above 24%.
*Arundo donax**	giant reed	arudon	Lower elevations below 200 m; disturbed or urbanized soils, and Ustalfs (Map Unit 184) soils associated with landslide deposits; flat to moderate slopes.
Asclepias fascicularis	narrowleaf milkweed	ascfas	Xeric soils (Map Units 191 and 421); low productivity sites (peaking at 0.2 NDVI).
Atriplex coulteri	Coulter's saltbush	atrcou	Lower productivity sites (peaking at 0.1 NDVI); high summer solstice radiation; occurs on all soil parent materials but more likely on Catalina Schist (Jcss, Jcsa, Jcsg).
Atriplex pacifica	South Coast saltscale	atrpac	Occurs on Xeralfs soils (Map Units 182, 422, 423, and 427); with low moisture levels (TWI below 0.5).
Baccharis pilularis	coyote bush	bacpil	Xerolls and Xeralfs soils (Map Units 156, 191, 411, 421, and 427); higher elevations (above 100 m); most soil parent material but more common on Alluvium (Qal).
Bergerocactus emoryi - CIE	velvet cactus	beremo	Low elevations near the coast (less than 150 m); on Alfisols soil (Map Unit 423); Catalina Schist (Jcsb, Jcsg) and Alluvium (Qal) soil parent material.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Most Important Features of Predictive Env. Variables
Bothriochloa barbinodis	cane bluestem	botbar	Low elevations (below 300 m); winter solstice solar radiation peaking at 1900 Wh/m^2, which is above the mean of 1,301; on flat to moderate slopes.
*Brassica nigra**	black mustard	branig	Low elevations (below 400 m); May cloud albedo peaking at 17.5%; flat or very rugged terrain; on Beaches-Abaft complex (Map Unit 160) or Alifsols soil (Map Units 183, 184, 411, 421, and 422).
Bromus sitchensis (*carinatus*)	California brome	brocar	Occurs across all soil parent materials but more common on serpentinite Alluvium (Qal), marine wave-cut bench deposits (Qt), Catalina Schist (Jcss), intrusive volcanic metamorphic rocks (Tmi), and Catalina Island pluton (Tmqd); and soils derived from these parent materials (Map Units 156, 157, 160, 190, 411, and 412); in sites with lower solar radiation at the equinox.
*Cakile maritima**	sea rocket	cakmar	Exclusively on sand and sandy loam soils (Map Units 160 and 190); on flat to gentle slopes.
*Carduus pycnocephalus**	Italian thistle	carpyc	In depressions or valleys; flat to gentle slopes; on sand to sandy or gravelly loams (Map Units 160, 400, 410, 411, 422, 423, 424, and 425); northerly-facing slopes.
Ceanothus arboreus - CIE	felt-leaf ceanothus	ceaarb	Low to moderate solar radiation at the equinox; very gravelly sand, gravelly loam, gravelly silty loam, sandy or silty loam soils (Map Units 181, 182, 191, 400, 422, and 424); cooler and wetter sites associated with northerly aspects.
Ceanothus megacarpus var. *insularis* - CIE	island ceanothus	ceamegins	Loam and silty loam (Map Units 182 and 407) on soils from volcanic parent material; higher elevations.
Ceanothus megacarpus var. *megacarpus*	bigpod ceanothus	ceamegmeg	High solar radiation at the equinox; silty loam, gravelly loam, and gravelly silty loam soils (Map Units 182, 400, and 423); higher elevations; east-northeast to south-southwest aspect.
*Centranthus ruber**	red valerian	cenrub	Disturbed urban (Map Unit 451) and gravelly loam soils (Map Unit 400); low elevations.
Cercocarpus traskiae - SCIE	Catalina Island mountain-mahogany	certra	Flyer-Loadline-Nauti complex and Masthead-Coastwise-Dewpoint complex soils (Map Units 411 and 423); September cloud albedo peaking at 12.5%; westerly-facing slopes.
Chlorogalum pomeridianum	soap plant	chlpom	Low August cloud albedo, below 10%; flat to steep slopes; on a variety of soils (Map Units 156, 182, 191, 407, and 422).
*Cirsium vulgare**	bull thistle	cirvul	Relatively flat sites to moderate slopes; drainages or valleys; variety of soils (Map Units 156, 157, 191, 293, 407, 411, 422, 424, 456, and 993).
Comarostaphylis diversifolia subsp. *planifolia*	summer holly	comdivpla	Certain Alfisols soils (Map Units 181, 422 and 423); low August cloud albedo; flat to steep slopes.
*Cortaderia selloana**	pampas grass	corsel	Sites with wetter conditions; disturbed and developed areas (Map Units 157, 451, 454, 992) and loam soil (Map Units 400, 422, 423, 424).
Cressa truxillensis	alkali weed	cretru	Low elevations (below 100 m).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Most Important Features of Predictive Env. Variables
Crocanthemum greenei - CIE	island rush-rose	crogre	Gentle to moderate slopes; high elevations (above 100 m); variety of soils (Map Units 157, 182, 400, 411, 422, 423, and 424); high solar radiation at the summer solstice.
Crossosoma californicum - CIE/PVP	Catalina Island crossosoma	crocal	Flat to moderately steep slopes; drier sites; alluvium (Qal), Catalina Schist (Jcsb, Jcsg), Catalina Island pluton (Tmqd), and andesite (Tmqd) soil parent material.
Cylindropuntia prolifera	coastal cholla	cylpro	Low productivity sites (NDVI peaking at 0.1); high September cloud albedo (peaking at 16%), associated with the coastal bluffs on the western, windward shoreline.
*Cynara cardunculus**	artichoke thistle	cyncar	Moderately high September cloud albedo (peaking a 15%, associated with the windward side of the island.
Cyperus spp.	flatsedge	cypspp	Alluvium (Qal), Catalina Schist (Jcsg, Jcsb), and Catalina Island pluton (Tmqd) soil parent material; soils associated with these parent materials (Map Units 191, 156, 181, and 411); wetter sites.
Deinandra clementina - CIE	island tarplant	deicle	Low elevations (below 100 m); Entisols (Map Units 160 and 191) and Alfisols (Map Units 157, 422, 423, and 424) soils
Deinandra fasciculata	clustered tarplant	deifas	Flat to moderate slopes; Alfisols soils (Map Units 183 and 423); more likely at lower elevations.
Delphinium parryi subsp. *maritimum*	maritime larkspur	delparmar	Lower solar radiation at the winter solstice; northerly aspects; lower elevations (below 300 m); lower May cloud albedo; more likely on Alluvium (Qal) and volcanic rock (Td, Tmv) soil parent material; sandy or loam soils (Map Units 156, 160, 191, 412, 422, and 425).
Dendromecon harfordii	Channel Island tree poppy	denhar	Coastal cliffs and higher elevations; less likely on southerly-facing slopes; Mollisols (Map Unit 157 and 412) and Alfisols soils (Map Units 182, 421, 422, 423, and 424).
Dichondra occidentalis	western dichondra	dicocc	Flat to steep slopes; Mollisols (Map Units 410 and 412) and Alfisols soils (Map Units 182, 183, 421, 422, 423, and 424).
Dissanthelium californicum - CIE	California dissanthelium	discal	Alifsols soils (Map Units 182, 183, 184, and 422); Flat to north-facing slopes.
Dudleya virens ssp. *hassei* - SCIE	Catalina Island dudleya	dudvirhas	Low elevations (below 100 m).
Dudleya virens subsp. *insularis*	island green dudleya	dudvirins	Lower solar radiation at the winter solstice; lower elevations (below 400 m); drier sites.
Elymus (Leymus) condensatus	giant wild rye	elycon	East- to north-facing slopes; all elevations but more likely at lower elevations; all soil parent materials but more likely on alluvium (Qal), green Catalina Schist (Jcsg), and marine sediments (Tms); soils associated with these parent materials (Map Units 157, 191, 183, 400, 421, and 422); high productivity sites.
Encelia californica	California sunflower bush	enccal	Low elevations (below 200 m); flat areas or mid-slope locations between ridges and valleys.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Most Important Features of Predictive Env. Variables
Ericameria palmeri	Palmer's goldenbush	eripal	Lower productivity sites (NDVI below 0.3); flat to steep slopes; drier sites; Alfisols soil (Map Units 182, 411, 422, and 427).
Eriodictyon traskiae ssp. *traskiae* - SCIE	Trask's yerba santa	eritra	Alluvial soils (Map Unit 191) and loam soils (Map Units 156, 157, 182, and 407); low September cloud albedo (peaking at 10%); moderate slopes; higher elevations (above 200 m).
Eriogonum giganteum var. *giganteum* - SCIE	St. Catherine's lace	erigig	On a variety of soil parent materials except for landslide deposits (Qls) and more likely on alluvium (Qal), beach sand deposits (Qb), and basaltic igneous intrusions (Td); variety of soil types but more likely certain soil types (Map Units 156, 157, 191, 400, 407, 411, 421, and 424); low elevations (below 100 m) and higher elevations (above 400 m) on slopes; lower May cloud albedo.
Eriogonum grande var. *grande*	island buckwheat	erigra	Entisols (Map Units 160, 190, and 191) and Alfisols soils (Map Units 183, 185, 421, and 424); low productivity sites (NDVI peaking at 0.05).
Eschscholzia ramosa - CIE	Island poppy	escram	Flat to steep slopes; occurs on most soil parent materials but more likely on alluvium (Qal) and volcanic rocks (Tmi, Tmso, Tmv); occurs on most soils but more likely on certain soil types (Map Units 156, 157, 182, 183, 191, 420, 424, and 427).
Euphorbia misera - CIE	cliff spurge	eupmis	Beach sand deposits (Qb) and green Catalina Schist (Jcsg) soil parent materials; Masthead-Coastwise-Dewpoint complex soil (Map Unit 423).
*Foeniculum vulgare**	sweet fennel	foevul	Occurs on a variety of soils but more likely on certain soil types (Map Units 157, 191, 411, and 421); occurs at all elevations but more likely below 100 m and above 400 m; occurs on most parent materials but more likely on Catalina Schist (Jcsss, Jcsg), alluvium (Qal), and volcanic rocks (Tmv) soil parent material.
Frankenia salina	alkali heath	frasal	Occurs on Entisols (Map Units 160, 190, and 191) and Alfisols (Map Units 421 and 423); lower productivity sites.
Galium catalinense ssp. *catalinense* - SCIE	Catalina Island bedstraw	galcat	Lower winter solstice solar radiation; low elevations (less than 100 m); Alfisols soil (Map Units 183, 185, 421, 422, and 424).
Gambelia speciosa (Galvezia speciosa) - CIE	showy island snapdragon	gamspe	Beach sand (Map Unit 160) and Alfisols (Map Units 83, 185, and 424); lower elevations; low May cloud albedo (peaking at about 16%).
*Genista linifolia**	Mediterranean broom	genlin	Disturbed or developed soils (Map Unit 451), alluvium soils (Map Units 190 and 191), and a variety of other soil types (Map Units 181, 182, 400, 411, 422, and 423); moderate winter solstice solar radiation; wetter sites; flat to steep slopes.
Gilia nevinii - CIE	Nevin's gilia	gilnev	Occurs on all soil parent material but more likely on intrusive volcanic rocks (Tmi) and Catalina Schist with biotite and garnet schist (Jcsa); occurs on all aspects but more likely on northerly-facing slopes; occurs on all soil

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Most Important Features of Predictive Env. Variables
			types but more likely on certain soil types (Map Units 182 and 424).
Heteromeles arbutifolia	toyon	hetarb	Occurs at all elevations but more likely below 100 m and above 400 m; higher productivity sites; flat areas or mid-slope locations between ridges and valleys.
Hordeum intercedens	vernal barley	horint	Moderate solar radiation at the winter solstice; low productivity sites; more likely on Alfisols (Map Units 157, 181, 184, 191, 411, 412, 420, 421, 422, 423, and 424).
Isocoma menziesii var. *menziesii*	Menzie's goldenbush	isomen	Low productivity sites; more likely on certain soil types (Map Units 156, 411, 422, and 423).
Jepsonia malvifolia - CIE	island jepsonia	jepmal	Low solar radiation at the winter solstice; more likely on certain soil types (Map Units 156, 182, 183, 191, 411, 422, 423, and 424).
Lepechinia fragrans	fragrant pitcher sage	lepfra	Low July cloud albedo (peaking at 9%); wetter sites; higher elevations.
Leptosyne gigantea (Coreopsis gigantea)	giant coreopsis	lepgig	Low elevations (below 100 m); low to moderate July cloud albedo (peaking at 17%); low productivity sites; Entisols (Map Units 160 and 191), and certain other soil types (Map Units 157, 400, 424, and 427).
Lycium californicum	California boxthorn	lyccal	High July cloud albedo (peaking at 21%), associated with the western, windward shoreline; low elevations (less than 200 m); low to moderate slopes and very steep cliffs; low productivity; Entisols (Map Units 160 and 191) and Alfisols (420, 421, 422, 423, and 427).
Lyonothamnus floribundus ssp. *floribundus* - SCIE	Catalina Island ironwood	lyoflo	Low winter solstice solar radiation; more likely on certain soil types (Map Units 157, 185, 422, 424, and 427); less likely on southerly-facing slopes.
Malacothamnus fasciculatus var. *catalinensis* - SCIE	Catalina Island bushmallow	malfascat	High equinox solar radiation; low to moderate May Cloud Albedo (15 to 18%); all aspects but more likely on east- to south-facing slopes; on a variety of soil types but more likely on certain soil types (Map Units 156, 157, 160, 183, 191, 411, 422, and 423).
Malosma laurina	laurel sumac	mallau	More likely on soils with volcanic parent material (Map Units 157, 182, 400, 407, and 411); occurs on all slopes but more likely on southerly-facing slopes and steeper slopes; most likely on sites with high solar radiation on summer solstice.
Muhlenbergia microsperma	littleseed muhly	muhmic	More likely on flat to moderate, and southerly-facing slopes; low to moderate productivity sites; occurs on all soils but more likely on certain soil types (Map Units 157, 183, 190, 400, and 422).
Opuntia littoralis	coastal prickly pear	opulit	Higher winter solstice solar radiation; lower productivity sites; occurs on all aspects but more common on southerly-aspects and drier sites; occurs on all soil types but more likely on certain soil types (Map Units 183, 411, and 421).
*Pennisetum setaceum**	fountaingrass	penset	Low elevations (below 100 m); low productivity sites.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Most Important Features of Predictive Env. Variables
Peritoma arborea	bladderpod	perarb	Low elevations (below 300 m); gentle to steep slopes; Alifsols soil (Map Unit 423).
*Phalaris aquatica**	Harding grass	phaaqu	Flat to moderate slopes; wetter sites; more likely on northerly-facing slopes; moderate solar radiation at the winter solstice.
Piperia spp.	orchid	pipspp	Low cloud albedo in September (peaking at 9.5%); more likely on alluvial soils (Map Unit 191) and volcanic parent material soils (Map Units 182, 410, 411, and 412) and Ustalfs soils (Map Unit 422).
Plagiobothrys collinus	popcornflower	placol	Near sea level (less than 10 m) and higher elevations (above 200 m); flat to moderate slopes; high solar radiation on the summer solstice; more likely on Alifsols (Map Units 182, 410, 411, 423, and 424).
Prunus ilicifolia ssp. *lyonii* - CIE	Catalina cherry	pruililyo	More likely on certain soil types (Map Units 157, 191, 421, and 422); wetter, more northerly-facing sites; lower elevations.
Quercus pacifica - CIE	island scrub oak	quepac	Less likely on south-facing slopes; occurs on all soil types but more likely on certain soil types (Map Units 156, 157, 412, 422, and 423); occurs at all elevations but increased likelihood above 400 m; occurs on all slopes but more likely on flat to moderately steep slopes.
Quercus tomentella - CIE	island live oak	quetom	Lower September cloud albedo (peaking at 11%); May cloud albedo below 20%; steep slopes and incised valleys; Alfisols (Map Units 181, 182, 400, 407, 411, and 424); more likely on volcanic parent material (Tma, Tmi, Tmqd).
Quercus x macdonaldii - CIE	MacDonald oak	quemac	Drainages and valleys; flat to moderate slopes; more likely on north-facing slopes; more likely on certain soil types (Map Units 156, 157, 181, 182, 191, 411, 412, and 422).
Rhamnus pirifolia - CIE	island redberry	rhapir	Gentle to very steep slopes; mid-slope to ridgelines; occurs on all soil types but more likely on certain soil types (Map Units 156, 157, 407, 410, and 411).
Rhus integrifolia	lemonade berry	rhuint	Occurs at all elevations but more likely below 100 m and above 300 m; gentle to steep slopes; occurs across a wide range of vegetative productivity but most likely at moderate productivity (NDVI peaking at 0.2); drier sites.
Ribes viburnifolium - CIE	Catalina Island currant	ribvib	Entisols (Map Units 160 and 191) and Alfisols soils (Map Units 182, 183, 184, 185, 293, 400, 411, 421, 422, and 424); lower solar radiation on the winter solstice; less likely on south- to east-facing slopes.
Salvia apiana	white sage	salapi	Higher elevations (above 300 m); drier sites; loam, sandy loam, and gravelly loamy sand soils derived from volcanic parent material (Map Units 156, 410, 411, and 412).
Salvia mellifera	black sage	salmel	Higher elevations (above 100 m); Catalina Schist (Jcsb, Jcss), Catalina Island pluton (Tmqd), and andesite volcanic rock (Tma) parent material soils; more likely on certain soil types (157, 182, 407, 412, 423, and 427) southerly-facing slopes.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Most Important Features of Predictive Env. Variables
Sambucus mexicana	blue elderberry	sammex	Occurs on all soil types but more likely on certain soil types (Map Units 407, 421, and 424); occurs on all slope aspects but more likely on flat, south-southwest, and north-northwest orientations; more likely at lower elevations.
Scrophularia villosa - CIE	Catalina Island figwort	scrvil	Lower solar radiation on the winter solstice; occurs on most parent material but more likely on blue or serpentinite Catalina Schist (Jcsb, Jcss), alluvium (Qal), intrusive volcanic rocks (Tmi), and marine sediments (Tms); lower elevations; more likely on certain soil types (Map Units 183, 185, 191, 400, 422, and 424).
Sibara filifolia - CIE	island rockcress	sibfil	More likely between 100 to 300 m in elevation; two soil types (Map Unit 182 and 423); higher solar radiation on the summer solstice.
*Silybum marianum**	milk thistle	silmar	Flat to moderate slopes; drainages and valleys; higher productivity sites.
Solanum wallacei - CIE	Wallace's nightshade	solwal	Low September cloud albedo (peaking at 10%); drainages and valleys; higher productivity sites.
Stipa cernua	nodding needlegrass	sticer	Higher elevations (above 200 m); Flat to moderately steep slopes.
Stipa spp.	needlegrass	stipa	Lower productivity sites (NDVI peaking at 0.17), which are associated with grassland and open upland scrubland; more likely on gentle to moderate slopes; more likely on certain soil types (Map Units 183, 411, 412, 421, 422, and 423).
*Tamarix ramosissima**	saltcedar	tamram	Lower elevations; flat to gentle slopes; low productivity sites.
Trifolium palmeri - CIE	southern island clover	tripal	Low elevations (less than 100 m); more likely on moderate climatic conditions on east- and west-facing slopes.
Typha domingensis	southern cattail	typdom	Wetlands, drainages, and valleys; lower elevations (below 200 m); more likely on gravelly soils (Map Units 191, 412, 421, and 423).
Xylococcus bicolor	Mission manzanita	xylbic	More likely on certain soil types (Map Units 181, 182, 420, 422, and 423); flat and northerly-facing slopes; more likely on moderate slopes.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4 DISCUSSION

4.1 COMPARISON WITH EXISTING OAK MODELS

Franklin and Knapp (2010) employed statistical models to identify the key environmental factors influencing the distribution of two endemic oak species on Catalina Island: *Quercus pacifica* (island scrub oak) and *Q. tomentella* (island live oak). The goal was to pinpoint suitable habitats for restoration efforts and better understanding habitat relationships with environmental variables. The models incorporated both presence/absence and abundance data, employing three distinct modeling techniques: Classification and Regression Trees (CT, RT), Generalized Additive Models (GAM), and Generalized Linear Models (GLM). Predictive maps were generated using ArcView Geographic Information System (GIS) to visualize the results.

Among the models developed, the optimal predictive map for island scrub oak was found to be a GLM with manual variable selection. In contrast, the best-performing model for island live oak was determined to be a GLM with stepwise variable selection.


We compared the MaxEnt models for *Quercus pacifica* and *Q. tomentella* developed in this study and the GLMs established by Franklin and Knapp (2010) for the same species using binary (suitable or not suitable habitat) data above a suitability threshold. The suitability thresholds for the MaxEnt models are presented in Table 6-3. The threshold value for the raster datasets for the GLMs were 0.15 for *Q. pacificai* and 0.10 for *Q. tomentella* (Franklin and Knapp 2010). The raster data utilized for the GLMs was provided by the Conservancy.

4.1.1 ISLAND SCRUB OAK (*QUERCUS PACIFICA*)

The average AUC for the *Q. pacifica* MaxEnt model was 0.64 with a standard deviation of 0.18 (standard deviation). This is better than chance but relatively low compared with the other models developed in this study, and is attributed to habitat generalization, as discussed in Section 3, Results. The AUC for the GLM model was good at 0.89. However, Franklin and Knapp (2010) identify that the GLM model under predicts the distribution of *Q. pacifica*. The GLM model predicted suitability for 17% of the island, compared with the 23% mapped by Knapp (unpublished data provided by the Conservancy), which was developed as part of the 2000 Vegetation Type Map prepared by Knapp (2005).

In comparison, the MaxEnt model predicts suitable habitat for 41% of the island and generally matches the distribution of the GLM prediction (Figure 4-1). Both modeling efforts identify that *Q. pacifica* is more likely on north-facing slopes above 400 meters in elevation or on flat to moderately steep slopes in areas with higher solar radiation. Both models identify preferences for certain substrates. The GLM model used the 1955 soil dataset, and the MaxEnt model used the more recent and systematic 2008 soil dataset classification of soil map units. The MaxEnt model identifies higher likelihood on certain soil types, including Map Units 156, 157, 412, 422, and 423. See Figure 6-13 for the definition of Map Units.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



a. MaxEnt Model

b. General Linear Model (GLM) manual variable selection (Franklin and Knapp 2010)

c. Comparison of the Island Scrub Oak predictions with the MaxEnt predicted suitability in black and the GLM predicted suitability in yellow transparency.

Figure 4-1 Comparison of predicted suitability for Island Scrub Oak with MaxEnt and GLM models.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4.1.2 ISLAND LIVE OAK (*QUERCUS TOMENTELLA*)

The average AUC for the *Q. tomentella* MaxEnt model was good, 0.84 ± 0.21, and the AUC for the GLM was excellent, 0.95. The GLM model predicted suitability for 28.8% of the island, which was very similar to 27.9% of the island for the MaxEnt model. Generally, the distribution of the two suitability models is similar (Figure 4-2). Both models identified that *Q. tomentella* is more likely on volcanic parent material and in locations where solar radiation is lower due to cloud albedo or landscape position, such as steep slopes and incised valleys.

4.2 POTENTIAL VEGETATION COMMUNITIES


The primary objective is to leverage potential vegetation models of dominant and characteristic plant species outlined in the Manual of California Vegetation (MCV) to generate comprehensive maps of potential vegetation communities on Catalina Island. These maps will serve as a valuable resource for guiding whole island habitat restoration efforts.

The classification framework for potential vegetation communities adheres to the hierarchical structure outlined in the Online Edition of the MCV (CNPS 2024). This framework includes hierarchical levels such as Macro Group, Group, Alliance, and Association, and employs the established nomenclature provided in the MCV to ensure consistency and accuracy in the mapping process.

Dominant or characteristic species were selected from those available potential vegetation models in this report to define the distribution of potential vegetation communities. The selection of these potential vegetation communities are hypotheses of the restored state of the island based on our experience in southern California vegetation communities, including Catalina Island, and the existing vegetation maps for the island and relevant publications on the vegetation in the California Channel Islands. Distributions in the map are defined using binary (likely suitable or not) model outputs. The suitability threshold for each species is presented in the Table 6-3. Habitat Suitability Model Performance.

The potential MCV vegetation communities are presented in sections grouped by vegetation types identified by Knapp (2005) in the 2000 Vegetation Map and Junak et al. (2007) in a summary of typical vegetation types of the California Channel Islands: Island Woodland (IW), Island Chaparral (IC), Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS), Coastal Bluff Scrub (CBS), Maritime Cactus Scrub (MCS), Coastal Marsh (CM), Southern Beach and Dune (SBD), Vernal Ponds and Reservoirs (VPR), Grassland (GR), Nonnative Herbaceous (NNH), Nonnative Scrub (NNS).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



a. MaxEnt Model

b. General Linear Model (GLM) stepwise variable selection (Franklin and Knapp 2010)

c. Comparison of the Island Scrub Oak predictions with the MaxEnt predicted suitability in black and the GLM predicted suitability in yellow transparency.

Figure 4-2 Comparison of predicted suitability for Island Live Oak with MaxEnt and GLM models.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

The following three Vegetation Types are not included in this discussion because there was insufficient training data for the related dominant species: Southern Riparian Woodland (SRW), Riparian Herbaceous (RH), and Mulefat Scrub (MFS). While these three vegetation types represent only 0.3%, 0.1%, and less than 0.1% of the land area respectively, their association with riparian habitat gives them more value to the island ecology than the land area suggests. More detailed investigation focused on these island riparian systems would benefit management of associated wildlife, such as bats and the Catalina Island Shrew. Given the limited land area, these riparian systems can be censused as part of a future survey effort, as needed.

4.2.1 Island Woodland

Californian Broadleaf Forest and Woodland Group

Three potential woodland associations were identified (Figure 4-3):

a. **Island Live Oak Woodland and Forest** (*Quercus tomentella* Forest & Woodland Association) is defined by dominance by *Quercus tomentella* in the tree canopy.

b. **Catalina Ironwood Woodland and Forest** (*Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus* Forest & Woodland Association) is defined by dominance by *Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus* in the tree canopy.

c. **Catalina Cherry Woodland and Forest** (*Prunus ilicifolia subsp. lyonii* Forest & Woodland Association) is defined by *Prunus ilicifolia* subsp. *lyonii* in the tree canopy.

4.2.2 Island Chaparral


California Maritime Chaparral Group

Two potential maritime chaparral associations were identified (Figure 4-4):

a. **Santa Catalina Island Manzanita Chaparral** (*Arctostaphylos catalinae* Shrubland Association) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Arctostaphylos catalinae* in the shrub layer.

b. **Island Scrub Oak Chaparral** (*Quercus pacifica* Shrubland Association) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Quercus pacifica* in the shrub layer.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



a. *Quercus tomentella* **b.** *Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus* **c.** *Prunus ilicifolia* subsp. *lyonii*

d. Combined Potential Natural Vegetation Models for Island Woodland (IW).

Figure 4-3 Potential Natural Vegetation Binary Predictions of Three Dominant Species in the Californian Broadleaf Forest and Woodland Group.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 4-4 Potential Natural Vegetation Binary Predictions of Seven Dominant Species in the California Chaparral Macro Group.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

CALIFORNIA XERIC CHAPARRAL GROUP

Five potential xeric chaparral alliances or associations were identified (Figure 4-4):

c. **Mission Manzanita – Lemonadeberry Chaparral** (*Xylococcus bicolor - Rhus integrifolia* Shrubland Association) is defined by co-dominance of *Xylococcus bicolor and Rhus integrifolia* in the shrub layer.

d. **Chamise – Sage Chaparral** (*Adenostoma fasciculatum - Salvia* spp. Shrubland Alliance) is defined by co-dominance of *Adenostoma fasciculatum* and *Salvia* spp. (e.g., *S. mellifera*).

e. **Island Ceanothus Chaparral** (*Ceanothus megacarpus* var. *insularis* Shrubland Association) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Ceanothus megacarpus* var. *insularis* in the shrub layer.

f. **Felt-Leaf Ceanothus Chaparral** (*Ceanothus arboreus* Shrubland Association) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Ceanothus arboreus* in the shrub layer.

g. **Big-Pod Ceanothus Chaparral** (*Ceanothus megacarpus* Shrubland Alliance) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Ceanothus megacarpus* var. *megacarpus* in the shrub layer.

4.2.3 COASTAL SAGE SCRUB

CENTRAL AND SOUTH COASTAL CALIFORNIAN COASTAL SAGE SCRUB (CSS) GROUP

Six potential CSS alliances or associations were identified (Figure 4-5):

a. **California Sagebrush – Coast Prickly Pear Scrub** (*Artemisia californica - Opuntia littoralis* Shrubland Association) is defined by co-dominance of *Artemisia californica* and *Opuntia littoralis* in the shrub layer.

b. **California Sagebrush Scrub** (*Artemisia californica* Shrubland Alliance) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Artemisia californica* in the shrub layer.


c. **Island Buckwheat Scrub** (*Eriogonum grande* var. *grande* Shrubland Association) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Eriogonum grande* var. *grande* in the shrub layer.

d. **California Brittle Bush Scrub** (*Encelia californica* Shrubland Association) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Encelia californica* in the shrub layer.

e. **White Sage Scrub** (*Salvia apiana* Shrubland Alliance) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Salvia apiana* in the shrub layer.

f. **Black Sage Scrub** (*Salvia mellifera* Shrubland Alliance) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Salvia mellifera* in the shrub layer.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



g. Combined Potential Natural Vegetation Models for Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS).

Figure 4-5 Potential Natural Vegetation Binary Predictions of Six Dominant Species in the Central and South Coastal Californian CSS Group.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4.2.4 COASTAL BLUFF SCRUB

COASTAL BAJA CALIFORNIA NORTE MARITIME SUCCULENT SCRUB GROUP

Five potential succulent scrub alliances or associations were identified (Figure 4-6):

a. Giant Coreopsis Scrub (*Leptosyne gigantea* Shrubland Alliance) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Leptosyne gigantea* in the shrub layer.

b. Coast Prickly Pear Scrub (*Opuntia littoralis – Opuntia oricola – Cylindropuntia prolifera* Shrubland Alliance) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Opuntia littoralis* in the shrub layer.

d. Island Tarplant – Saint Catherine's Lace Scrub (*Deinandra clementina – Eriogonum giganteum* var*. giganteum* Shrubland Alliance) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Deinandra clementina* and/or *Eriogonum giganteum* var. *giganteum.*

e. Green Liveforever Succulent Scrub (*Dudleya virens subsp. hassei* Succulent Scrub Association) is defined by dominance by *Dudleya virens subsp. hassei* in the herb layer.

f. Saint Catherine's Lace Scrub (*Eriogonum giganteum* var*. giganteum* Shrubland Association) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Eriogonum giganteum* var*. giganteum* in the shrub layer.

4.2.5 MARITIME CACTUS SCRUB

COASTAL BAJA CALIFORNIA NORTE MARITIME SUCCULENT SCRUB GROUP

One potential succulent scrub alliances or associations was identified, which is in the same MCV Group as the five vegetation communities identified above in the Coastal Bluff Scrub Vegetation Type, but has previously been described as Maritime Cactus Scrub Vegetation Type (Figure 4-6):

c. California Boxthorn Scrub (*Lycium californicum* Shrubland Alliance) is defined by dominance or co-dominance of *Lycium californicum* in the shrub layer.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 4-6 Potential Natural Vegetation Binary Predictions of Six Dominant Species in the Coastal Baja California Norte Maritime Succulent Scrub Group.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4.2.6 Vernal Ponds and Reservoirs

Arid West Freshwater Emergent Marsh Group

One potential marsh alliance was identified (Figure 4-7):

a. Cattail Marshes (*Typha* spp. Herbaceous Alliance) is defined by *Typha* (e.g., *domingensis*) dominant or co-dominant in the herbaceous layer.

Californian Mixed Annual/Perennial Freshwater Vernal Pool/Swale Bottomland Group

One potential vernal pool/swale bottom alliance was identified (Figure 4-7):

b. Clustered Tarplant Fields (*Deinandra fasciculata* Herbaceous Alliance) is defined by *Deinandra fasciculata* dominant or co-dominant with other herbs (e.g., *Hordeum intercedens*).

4.2.7 Coastal Marsh

Temperate Pacific Tidal Salt and Brackish Meadow Group

One potential brackish meadow alliance was identified (Figure 4-7):

c. Salt Grass Flats (*Distichlis spicata* Herbaceous Alliance) is defined by *Distichlis spicata* dominant or co-dominant with other herbs (e.g., *Cressa truxillensis*).

4.2.8 Southern Beach and Dune

Vancouverian/Pacific Dune Mat Group

One potential dune mat association was identified (Figure 4-7):

d. Dune Mat (*Ambrosia chamissonis - Abronia maritima - Cakile maritima Herbaceous Association*) is defined by *Abronia maritima* other perennial herbs, grasses, and low shrubs, often including the invasive plant, *Cakile maritima.*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



e. Combined Potential Natural Vegetation Models for Vernal Ponds and Reservoirs (VPR), Southern Beach and Dune (SBD), and Coastal Marsh (CM).

Figure 4-7 Potential Natural Vegetation Binary Predictions of Four Dominant Species in the Four Different Vegetation Community Groups, Including Fresh Water Marsh, Brackish Meadow, Vernal Pool/Swale, and Dune Mat.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4.2.9 GRASSLAND

SOUTHWESTERN NORTH AMERICAN ALKALI MARSH/SEEP VEGETATION GROUP

One potential alkali marsh/seep association was identified (Figure 4-8):

a. Creeping Wildrye Turfs (*Elymus triticoides* - *Bromus* spp. - *Avena* spp. Herbaceous Association) is defined by *Elymus triticoides* dominant or co-dominant with other herbs (e.g., *Deinandra fasciculata*) or grasses (e.g., *Stipa* spp.), including invasive annual grasses.

CALIFORNIA PERENNIAL GRASSLAND GROUP

One potential perennial grassland alliance was identified (Figure 4-8):

b. Giant Wild Rye Grassland (*Elymus condensatus* Herbaceous Alliance) is defined by *Elymus condensatus* dominant or co-dominant in the herbaceous layer.

WESTERN DRY UPLAND PERENNIAL GRASSLAND GROUP

One potential dry upland perennial grassland alliance was identified (Figure 4-8):

c. California Brome Prairie (*Bromus sitchensis* - *Elymus glaucus* Herbaceous Alliance) is defined by *Bromus sitchensis* and/or *Elymus glaucus* dominant or co-dominant with other herbs (e.g., *Achillea millefolium*).

CALIFORNIA ANNUAL HERB/GRASS GROUP

One potential annual forbland or grassland alliance was identified (Figure 4-8):

d. Fiddleneck – Phacelia FIelds (*Amsinckia* spp. - *Phacelia* spp. Herbaceous Alliance) is defined by *Amsinckia* spp. and/or *Phacelia* spp. dominant or co-dominant with other herbs (e.g., *Deinandra fasciculata*, *Lupinus bicolor*). Emergent shrubs may be present at low cover, such as *Ericameria palmeri.*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 4-8 Potential Natural Vegetation Binary Predictions of Four Dominant Species in the Four Different Grassland Groups.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

4.2.10 NONNATIVE HERBACEOUS

The Nonnative Herbaceous (NNH) Vegetation Type, includes the following invasive species that are managed as part of the Conservancy's invasive plant management program (see CHIRP, Appendix A)

Seven invasive herbaceous flowering plant species were modeled (Figure 4-9), not including grasses which are listed separately below:

- **a.** Black mustard (*Brassica nigra*)
- **b.** Sea rocket (*Cakile maritima*)
- **c.** Italian thistle (*Carduus pycnocephalus*)
- **d.** Bull thistle (*Cirsium vulgare*)
- **e.** Artichoke thistle (*Cynara cardunculus*)
- **f.** Sweet fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*)
- **g.** Milk thistle (*Silybum marianum*)

There are four invasive species that were modeled in the Grasses Family (Poaceae) (Figure 4-10):

- **a.** Giant reed (*Arundo donax*)
- **b.** Pampas grass (*Cortaderia selloana*)
- **c.** Fountaingrass (*Pennisetum setaceum*)
- **d.** Harding grass (*Phalaris aquatica*)

4.2.11 NONNATIVE SCRUB

The Nonnative Scrub (NNS) includes the the following three invasive species, which were modeled, including a significant potential invasive threat from Mediterranean broom (*Genista linifolia*) (Figure 4-11):

- **a.** Red valerian (*Centranthus ruber*)
- **b.** Mediterranean broom (*Genista linifolia*)
- **c.** Saltcedar (*Tamarix ramosissima*)

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 4-9 Potential Distribution of Seven Invasive Herbaceous Flowering Plants (excluding Grasses).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 4-10 Potential Distribution of Four Invasive Grasses.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 4-11 Potential Distribution of Three Invasive Shrubs.

4.3 COMPARISON WITH EXISTING COMPOSITE POTENTIAL NATURAL VEGETATION MAP

The potential vegetation alliances identified in Section 4.2 offer a more detailed understanding of the predicted composition of restored island vegetation communities, expanding upon the approach employed by Longcore et al. (2018). In their study, MaxEnt models were trained for vegetation types using samples from the 2000 Vegetation Map by Knapp (2005), ultimately generating a potential natural vegetation map (Figure 4-12).

The Longcore et al. (2018) approach possesses certain advantages, including more robust predictions for Southern Riparian Woodland, Riparian Herbaceous, and Mulefat Scrub, as our study was constrained by limited training data for characteristic plant species within these vegetation types.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

The vegetation alliances discussed in Section 4.2 present hypothetical distributions of key or dominant species, providing valuable insights for the development of nuanced restoration plans. These detailed predictions aid in optimizing the likelihood of successful restoration by guiding the reintroduction of plants to the most suitable locations based on species-specific environmental preferences. This enhanced understanding of potential vegetation alliances will ultimately contribute to more effective restoration strategies for Catalina Island's unique ecosystems.




Figure 4-12 Potential Natural Vegetation Type Map (Longcore et al. 2018).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

5 REFERENCES

Beven, K.J. and M. J. Kirkby. 1979. A physically based, variable contributing area model of basin hydrology, Hydrological Sciences Bulletin, 24:1, 43-69.

Bohannon, R.G., and C. Reiss. 2004. Preliminary Geologic Map of Santa Catalina Island. General geology mapped by J.G. Vedder, S.Q. Boundy-Sanders, H. McClean, and R.G. Bohannon. The schist facies in the central part of the island after Platt (1975). Digitized and modified by B. Coleman and P. Rebl. Provided by the Catalina Island Conservancy.

California Native Plant Society (CNPS). 2024. A Manual of California Vegetation, Online Edition. http://www.cnps.org/cnps/vegetation/; searched on June 30, 2024. CNPS, Sacramento, CA.

Clemesha, R.E., Gershunov, A., Lawson, D.M., Longcore, T., MacDonald, B., Booker, M., Munson, B. and O'Connor, K., 2021. A high-resolution record of coastal clouds and fog and their role in plant distributions over San Clemente Island, California. *Environmental Research Communications*, *3*(10), p.105003.

Egan, D., and E. A. Howell. 2005. The historical ecology handbook: a restorationist's guide to reference ecosystems. Island Press.

Elith, J., S. J. Phillips, T. Hastie, M. Dudík, Y. E. Chee, and C. J. Yates. 2011. A statistical explanation of MaxEnt for ecologists. Diversity and Distributions 17:43–57.

Franklin, J., and D.A. Knapp. 2010. Habitat relationships and potential restoration sties for *Quercus pacifica* and *Q. tomentella* on Catalina Island. Pages 69–94 in D.A. Knapp, editor, Oak ecosystem restoration on Santa Catalina Island, California: proceedings of an on-island workshop, February 2–4, 2007. Catalina Island Conservancy, Avalon, CA.

Fu, P., and P. M. Rich. 2000. The Solar Analyst 1.0 Manual. Helios Environmental Modeling Institute (HEMI), USA.

Fu, P., and P. M. Rich. 2002. "A Geometric Solar Radiation Model with Applications in Agriculture and Forestry." Computers and Electronics in Agriculture 37:25–35.

Junak, S., D. A. Knapp, J. R. Haller, R. Philbrick, A. Schoenherr, T. Keeler-Wolf. 2012. 'The California Channel Islands', in Michael Barbour (ed.), *Terrestrial Vegetation of California*, 3rd edn (Oakland, CA, 2007; online edition, California Scholarship Online, 22 Mar. 2012).

Knapp, D. A. 2005. Vegetation community mapping on Santa Catalina Island using orthorectification and GIS. Pages 193–203 Proceedings of the Sixth California Islands Symposium (DK Garcelon and CA Schwemm, eds.). National Park Service Technical Publication CHIS-05-01. Institute for Wildlife Studies, Arcata, California.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Longcore, T., N. Noujdina, and P. J. Dixon. 2018. Landscape modeling of the potential natural vegetation of Santa Catalina Island, California. *Western North American Naturalist* 78:617–632.

Merow, C., Smith, M.J. and Silander, J.A., Jr. 2013. A practical guide to MaxEnt for modeling species' distributions: what it does, and why inputs and settings matter. Ecography, 36: 1058-1069. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2013.07872.x

Moore, ID., P.E. Gessler, G.A. Nielsen, and G.A. Petersen. 1993. Terrain attributes: estimation methods and scale effects. In *Modeling Change in Environmental Systems*, edited by A.J. Jakeman M.B. Beck and M. McAleer Wiley , London, pp. 189-214.

National Research Council. 1992. Restoration of aquatic ecosystems: science, technology, and public policy. National Academies Press.

Nixon, K. C. 2002. The oak (*Quercus*) biodiversity of California and adjacent regions. In: Standiford, Richard B., et al, tech. editor. Proceedings of the Fifth Symposium on Oak Woodlands: Oaks *in* California''s Challenging Landscape. Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-184, Albany, CA: Pacific Southwest Research Station, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture: 3-20.

Phillips, S. J., R. P. Anderson, M. Dudík, R. E. Schapire, and M. E. Blair. 2017. Opening the black box: an open-source release of Maxent. *Ecography* 40:887–893.

Phillips, S. J., R. P. Anderson, and R. E. Schapire. 2006. Maximum entropy modeling of species geographic distributions. *Ecological Modelling* 190:231–259.

Rich, P. M., R. Dubayah, W. A. Hetrick, and S. C. Saving. 1994. "Using Viewshed Models to Calculate Intercepted Solar Radiation: Applications in Ecology. American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing Technical Papers, 524–529.

Riley, S, Degloria, S, and Elliot, S.D. 1999. A Terrain Ruggedness Index that Quantifies Topographic Heterogeneity. *International Journal of Science*. 5. 23-27.

Soil Conservation Service (SCS). 1955. Soil Data and Map for Santa Catalina Island, Unpublished Data. W. Bushing. Map digitized by ESRI (Redlands, CA) for the Catalina Island Conservancy. Raster data provided by the Conservancy, as used in Franklin and Knapp (2007).

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (USDA NRCS). 2008. Soil survey of Santa Catalina Island, California.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

6 SUPPORTING MATERIALS ATTACHMENT

This section includes additional figures and tables that support the conclusions of the report and can be used as a reference for the development of site-specific habitat restoration projects.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 6-1. Plants Selected for Species Environmental Niche Modeling.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Fed.	State	CNPS	Life-form	Abundance	Typical Habitat *Typical Locations on Island*
Abronia maritima	red sand verbena	abrmar	---	S3	4.2	P	Scarce	**SBD**, In sand of beaches and dunes. *Pacific shore between Ben Weston Beach and Little Harbor: Ben Weston, Cottonwood Canyon, Shark Harbor, and Little Harbor Beaches; Catalina Harbor.*
Achillea millefolium	common yarrow	achmil	---	---	---	P	Common	**GR/MCS**, Rocky sea bluffs, sunny grassy slopes, and coastal ridges. *Widely distributed, including Pebbly Beach; Avalon; White's (Swain's) Landing; Little Harbor; Isthmus.*
Acmispon argophyllus	silver birds foot trefoil	acmarg	---	---	---	P	Common	**CSS/IC**, Dry, open, sunny, rocky slopes. *Widely scattered, including Pebbly Beach, Avalon, Swain's, Cape, Middle Ranch, and Cottonwood Canyons; above Empire Landing; Isthmus; Cherry Valley.*
Acmispon grandifloras	large leaved lotus	acmgra	---	---	---	P	Scarce	**CSS/IC/B**, Shaly banks. *Emerald Bay (Johnson's Landing) on shrubby stream bottom, shaly bank; North slope of Black Jack Mountain along Summit Road on shaly bank; Airport Fire Burn Area; Boushey, Cottonwood, Goat Harbor, and Parsons Landing, Canyons; Upper Buffalo oral Reservoir; Wild Boar Gully.*
Adenostoma fasciculatum	chamise	adefas	---	---	---	P	Common	**IC**, Dry, rocky clay slopes, and ridges, primarily on leeward channel-facing side. *Avalon, Hamilton, Gallagher's, Swain's, Middle Ranch, and Bulrush Canyons; East Mountain; Fox Landing (Buttonshell Beach); slopes of Black Jack Mountain; Ironwood Gully at Isthmus; Fourth of July Cove.*
Anemopsis californica	yerba mansa	anecal	---	---	---	P	Scarce	**VPR/RH**, Freshwater aquatic and alkali marsh *Stream in Little Springs Canyon; Big Springs Canyon; below dam in Cottonwood Canyon; along Empire Landing Road; lower Buffalo Springs Reservoir.*

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Fed.	State	CNPS	Life-form	Abundance	Typical Habitat *Typical Locations on Island*
Aphanisma blitoides	aphanisma	aphbli	---	S2	1B.2	A	Rare	**MCS/CBS**, Rocky bluffs. *Rocky bluffs on leeward channel-facing side of island; Catalina Harbor; China Point.*
Arctostaphylos catalinae - SCIE	Catalina Island manzanita	arccat	---	S2	1B.2	S-T	Abundant	**IC**, Uplands of central part of island. *Haypress; Boushey Canyon; north of Silver Peak; upper end of Gallaher's Canyon; ridge south of Bulrush Canyon; east slope of Black Jack Mountain; Swain's Canyon.*
Artemisia californica	California sagebrush	artcal	---	---	---	S	Abundant	**CSS**, Dry slopes and hilltops, sea bluffs, openings in chaparral canopy, and rocky or grassy canyon slopes. *Lookout Point; Avalon Valley; White's Landing; east slope of Black Jack Mountain; Shark Harbor; Isthmus; Howland's Landing.*
*Arundo donax**	giant reed	arudon	---	---	---	P	Scarce	**NNH**, Disturbed freshwater riparian. *Avalon Canyon; lower Cottonwood Canyon; Isthmus area.*
Asclepias fascicularis	narrowleaf milkweed	ascfas	---	---	---	P	Scarce	**VPR/IC/GR**, Temporary ponds, freshwater riparian, and grassy slopes on leeward channel-facing side. *Locally abundant in temporary ponds formed in Steatite (Soapstone) Quarries near Arrow Point above Parsons Landing; Cherry Valley; Sliver Canyon; Grand Canyon.*
Atriplex coulteri	Coulter's saltbush	atrcou	---	S1S2	1B.2	P-A	Occasional	**MCS**, Bare, dry, clayey or rock ridges and reservoir margins throughout the island. *Bulrush Ridge; Haypress Reservoir; Eagle's Nest; Cottonwood Canyon; Isthmus.*
Atriplex pacifica	South Coast saltscale	atrpac	---	S2	1B.2	A	Occasional	**SBD/B/CSS**, Dry, open slopes. *Middle Ranch, Bulrush, and Cottonwood Canyons; East End Road; Echo Lake.*
Baccharis pilularis	coyote bush	bacpil	---	---	---	S	Common	**CSS/IC**, Rocky, clay or sandy soils on slopes and ridges, or margin of reservoirs and dry stream beds.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Fed.	State	CNPS	Life-form	Abundance	Typical Habitat *Typical Locations on Island*
								Widely distributed including Wrigley Reservoir, Haypress, Little Springs, Swain's, Middle Ranch, and Fern Canyons, above Empire Landing, and Parsons Slump.
Bergerocactus emoryi - CIE	velvet cactus	beremo	---	S2	2B.2	S	Scarce	**MCS**, Pacific sea-bluffs. *Salta Verde to Catalina Harbor and Isthmus.*
Bothriochloa barbinodis	cane bluestem	botbar	---	---	---	P	Occasional	**IC/CBS/MCS**, Dry, rocky hillsides. *Scattered on West End; Avalon Canyon; between Cherry Valley and Howland's Landing; south of Salta Verde Road.*
*Brassica nigra**	black mustard	branig	---	---	---	A	Occasional	**NNH**, Disturbed clayey soils and roadsides. *Avalon; White's Landing; roadsides between Middle Ranch and Cottonwood Canyons, Little Harbor to Catalina Harbor; Parsons Slump.*
Bromus sitchensis (carinatus)	California brome	brocar	---	---	---	P	Common	**IC/CBS/RH**, North-facing slopes, coastal bluffs, and creek beds. *North-facing slope of Bulrush Canyon; Upper Cape Canyon below reservoir; creek bed in Middle Canyon; below Eagle's Nest; coastal bluffs of Toyon Bay; cliffs near Jewfish Point.*
*Cakile maritima**	sea rocket	cakmar	---	---	---	P	Scarce, Locally Common	**SBD**, Sandy beaches. *White's Landing; Howland's Landing; Rippers Cove; Toyon Bay; Parsons Landing; Ben Weston and Cottonwood Canyon Beaches; Shark and Little Harbors.*
*Carduus pycnocephalus**	Italian thistle	carpyc	---	---	---	A	Occasional	**SRW/IC/VPR**, Roadside, riparian areas and reservoir edges. *Widely distributed including Empire Landing; Buffalo Springs Reservoir; Cottonwood, Grand, and Bulrush Canyons; West End along roads and leeward coast.*
Ceanothus arboreus - CIE	felt-leaf ceanothus	ceaarb	---	---	---	S-T	Common, Locally Abundant	**IC**, Leeward, channel-facing slopes and protected canyons of windward side where protected from invasive browsers.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Fed.	State	CNPS	Life-form	Abundance	Typical Habitat *Typical Locations on Island*
								Pebbly Beach, Big Wash, Hamilton, Swain's, and Grand Canyons; Farnsworth Loop; slopes of Black Jack and Orizaba Mountains; Fourth of July Cove; Cherry Valley; ridge between Howland's and Johnson's Canyons.
Ceanothus megacarpus var. *insularis* - CIE	island ceanothus	ceamegins	---	S4	4.3	S	Occasional	**IC**, High elevation dry, rocky slopes and ridges in rocky clay soil on eastern half of island. *Salta Verde; upper Cape Canyon; upper Coffee Pot Canyon; East End; slopes of Black Jack Mountain; upper Swain's Canyon; east of the airport.*
Ceanothus megacarpus var. *megacarpus*	bigpod ceanothus	ceamegmeg	---	---	---	S	Occasional	**IC**, Dry, shrubby slopes, ridges, and canyons. *Avalon Canyon; slopes of Black Jack Mountain; Cape Canyon; East End; Renton Pass Canyon; Silver Peak Area; Swain's Canyon; Wild Board Gully.*
*Centranthus ruber**	red valerian	cenrub	---	---	---	S	Scarce, Locally Common	**NNS**, Disturbed slopes, roadsides, and drainages. *Widely scattered but locally common in Avalon Canyon; Silver Canyon; Stage Road; upper Toyon Road.*
Cercocarpus traskiae - SCIE	Catalina Island mountain-mahogany	certra	E	E	1B.1	T	Rare	**IC**, Occurs where protected from invasive browsers. *Wild Boar Gully; planted at airport; Buffalo Springs Canyon; Pebbly Beach Canyon; Black Jack Mountain.*
Chlorogalum pomeridianum	soap plant	chlpom	---	---	---	P	Occasional	**GR/B**, Thin soils on very rocky ridges and slopes, or heavily eroded clayey slopes. Possibly natural forblands dominated by bulb plants, or remnant shrubland or perennial grassland soils that have been degraded. *Cape Canyon Reservoir; Black Jack Mountain; mouth of Cholla Canyon (in Middle Ranch Canyon); Cottonwood Canyon; White's Landing Canyon.*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Fed.	State	CNPS	Life-form	Abundance	Typical Habitat *Typical Locations on Island*
*Cirsium vulgare**	bull thistle	cirvul	---	---	---	P	Common, Locally Abundant	**GR/NNH**, Disturbed areas, near reservoirs. Widely distributed, including Middle Ranch Canyon, reservoirs, and roadside drainages.
Comarostaphylis diversifolia subsp. *planifolia*	summer holly	comdivpla	---	---	---	S-T	Occasional	**IW/IC**, Central interior canyons and high elevation woodlands. *Upper slopes of Mt. Orizaba and Black Jack Mountain; steep north-facing slope of Orizaba Canyon; west-facing slope of Mt. Orizaba near upper end of Escondido Ranch Canyon; Swain's Canyon; upper Sweetwater Canyon; south side of south fork of Fern Canyon; Boushey Canyon to Isthmus; Cottonwood Canyon; south of Salta Verde Ridge Road; central interior canyons.*
*Cortaderia selloana**	pampas grass	corsel	---	---	---	P	Occasional	**NNH**, Widely distributed in drainages, rocky areas, and disturbed areas. *Widely scattered throughout island, including in Avalon Canyon and Hamilton Cove.*
Cressa truxillensis	alkali weed	cretru	---	---	---	P	Occasional	**SBD/CM**, Sandy or gravelly beaches, or other saline locations along the coast. *Avalon, Shark, Little and Catalina Harbors; Howland's and Parsons Landings.*
Crocanthemum greenei - CIE	island rush-rose	crogre	T	S3	1B.2	S	Scarce	**IC/B**, High elevation, central portion of island or open, dry, rocky or eroded, clayey slopes. *Avalon Canyon; Haypress; east slope of Black Jack Mountain; Big Springs, Gallagher's, Cottonwood, Goat Harbor, Swain's, White's Landing, upper Silver, and Wild Boar Canyons; north of Silver Peak; Boushey Canyon Road.*
Crossosoma californicum - CIE/PVP	Catalina Island crossosoma	crocal	---	S3	1B.2	P	Common	**IC/CSS**, Widely scattered throughout island. *Widely scattered throughout the island, including East Peak; Renton Mine; Lookout Point; Avalon Valley; White's Landing; east slope of Black Jack Mountain; Middle Ranch Canyon; Indian Head Point; Isthmus; Fourth of July Cove.*
Cylindropuntia prolifera	coastal cholla	cylpro	---	---	---	S	Scarce	**MCS/CBS**, Windward Pacific slopes and ridges.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Fed.	State	CNPS	Life-form	Abundance	Typical Habitat *Typical Locations on Island*
								Catalina Harbor to Ben Weston Beach; Ribbon Rock.
*Cynara cardunculus**	artichoke thistle	cyncar	---	---	---	P	Rare	**IC/GR**, Disturbed areas. *Cherry Cove; Fourth of July Cove; north of Silver Peak; White's Landing; Lone Tree Road.*
Cyperus (eragrostis, odoratus)	flatsedge	cypspp	---	---	---	A	Scarce	**VPR/RH**, Reservoirs, drainages. *Cape Canyon Reservoir; upper Coffee Pot Canyon; Fern Canyon; Haypress Reservoir; Middle Ranch Canyon; lower Bulrush Canyon; Thompson Reservoir.*
Deinandra clementina - CIE	island tarplant	deicle	---	S4	CNPS 4.3	S	Occasional	**CBS/IC/CSS/B**, Dry, rocky sea cliffs, and rare rocky inland bluffs. *Lookout Point; Avalon Bay; Gallagher's and White's Landing; Cottonwood Canyon; Thompson Reservoir; Little Harbor; Isthmus.*
Deinandra fasciculata	clustered tarplant	deifas	---	---	---	A	Common	**CSS/GR/B**, Common everywhere, often abundant on dry, open, sunny, rocky, grassy, and eroded clayey slopes. *Widely distributed including Avalon, Swain's, Middle Ranch, and Cottonwood Canyons; Little Harbor; Isthmus; Parsons Landing.*
Delphinium parryi subsp. *maritimum*	maritime larkspur	delparmar	---	---	---	P	Occasional	**IC/CSS/GR**, Grassy, clayey, or rocky slopes of leeward, channel-facing slopes. *Widely scattered throughout the island including Pebbly Beach, Avalon, and Gallagher's Canyons; Haypress; north slope of Black Jack Mountain; above Emerald Bay.*
Dendromecon harfordii	Channel Island tree poppy	denhar	---	---	---	S	Abundant	**IC/CSS**, Dry, eroded slopes and ridges of channel slopes, canyon bottoms, road cuts and mine talus where protected from invasive browsers. *Scattered throughout the island, including Renton Mine; Black Jack Mountain; Airport region; West End from Cherry Valley to Johnson's Landing.*
Dichondra occidentalis	western dichondra	dicocc	---	S3S4	4.2	P	Common	**IC/CSS/GR**, Dry open or grassy, semi-shaded slopes.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Fed.	State	CNPS	Life-form	Abundance	Typical Habitat *Typical Locations on Island*
								Widely distributed, including Avalon; Moonstone Cove; east slope of Black Jack Mountain; near head of Swain's Canyon; Cottonwood Canyon; Salta Verde.
Dissanthelium californicum - CIE	Catalina grass	discal	---	S1	1B.2	A	Scarce	**IC/CSS**, Described in 1848 from a Gambel collection from Santa Catalina Island. Impacted by goats and other invasive browsers. Last seen in 1903 until 2005 rediscovered by Jenny McCune in the Airport Burn, White's Landing, and Camp Cactus areas. *Lower Bulrush; upper Cottonwood and White's Landing Canyons; north of East Summit; Deer Valley.*
Dudleya virens ssp. *hassei* - SCIE	Catalina Island dudleya	dudvirhas	---	S2	CNPS 1B.2	P	Occasional	**CBS/IC**, Sea bluffs and dry, rocky slopes mostly near the channel shore. *Lookout Point; Hamilton Beach; mouth of Gallagher's Canyon; White's Landing; Indian Head Point; Salta Verde Point.*
Dudleya virens subsp. *insularis*	island green dudleya	dudvirins	---	S2	1B.2	P	Common	**CBS/MCS/IC**, Sea bluffs and rocky headlands, mostly on windward, Pacific side; and less frequently on dry, rocky inland slopes. *Isthmus to Silver Canyon, including Indian Head Point, Shark Harbor, and Little Harbor; Airport Road; Avalon; White's Landing; Middle Ranch Canyon.*
Elymus (Leymus) condensatus	giant wild rye	elycon	---	---	---	P	Common	**IC/CSS**, Dry, sunny slopes or edge of woodlands and canyon bottoms. *Widely scattered including Pebbly Beach, Hamilton, Toyon, Middle Ranch, and Cottonwood Canyons; Isthmus; Howland's Landing.*
Encelia californica	California sunflower bush	enccal	---	---	---	S	Abundant	**CSS/MCS**, Sea-bluffs and dry, rocky canyon slopes and ridges. *Widely distributed including East Mountain; Lookout Point; Avalon Valley; Bulrush Canyon; Indian Head Point; Little Harbor; White's and*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Fed.	State	CNPS	Life-form	Abundance	Typical Habitat *Typical Locations on Island*
								Empire Landings; Isthmus, Cherry Valley; Parsons Landing.
Ericameria palmeri	Palmer's goldenbush	eripal	---	---	---	S	Occasional	**B/GR**, Sparsely scattered throughout island. *Sparsely scattered, including Airport Road; lower Cottonwood Canyon; Empire Landing; Silver Peak Road on West End.*
Eriodictyon traskiae ssp. *traskiae* - SCIE	Trask's yerba santa	eritra	---	---	---	S	Occasional	**IC/CSS**, On rocky clay or eroded, clay soils. *Vicinity of Black Jack Mountain and Mt. Orizaba on rocky clay or eroded, clay soil; White's Landing, Swain's, Sweetwater, Buffalo Springs, and Cape Canyons; East End; Toyon Junction area.*
Eriogonum giganteum var. *giganteum* - SCIE	St. Catherine's lace	erigig	---	S2	4.3	S	Common	**CSS/IC**, Channel-facing slopes on dry, rocky slopes, ridges and promontories; less common on leeward side of main drainage divide. *Widely distributed including Renton Mine; Lookout Point; Avalon, Hamilton, Gallaher's, Swain's, and Middle Ranch Canyons; White's Landing; east slope of Black Jack Mountain; Isthmus.*
Eriogonum grande var. *grande*	island buckwheat	erigra	---	S4	4.2	S	Abundant	**CBS/SBD/CSS**, Sea-cliffs, beaches, or component of CSS. *Widely distributed around perimeter of island, including Pebbly Beach; Avalon Bay; mouths of Hamilton and Gallagher's Canyons; White's Landing; Ben Weston Beach; Little Harbor; Isthmus; Parsons Landing.*
Eschscholzia ramosa - CIE	Island poppy	escram	---	S4	4.3	A	Common, Locally Abundant	**SBD/CBS/IC/CSS/GR**, Grassy slopes, dry, rocky sea-bluffs and canyon slopes, and along dry streams. *Widely distributed including Pebbly Beach, Gallagher's, Cape, and Cottonwood Canyons; White's Landing; Little Harbor; Isthmus; Goat Harbor Burn Area.*
Euphorbia misera - CIE	cliff spurge	eupmis	---	S2	2B.2	S	Rare	**MCS/CBS**, Rocky shore, sea cliffs. *Lookout Point to Seal Rocks in quarry area; Little Harbor.*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Fed.	State	CNPS	Life-form	Abundance	Typical Habitat *Typical Locations on Island*
*Foeniculum vulgare**	sweet fennel	foevul	---	---	---	P	Common, Locally Abundant	**GR/NNH**, Disturbed places, roadsides, abandoned agriculture fields, rocky sea bluffs. *Widely distributed including Lookout Point;* Avalon, Gallagher's, Swain's, Parson's Landing, and Middle Ranch Canyons.
Frankenia salina	alkali heath	frasal	---	---	---	P-S	Occasional	**CM/SBD**, Salt marsh, beaches, and bases of shore bluffs along coast; inland alkaline soils. *Pebbly, Ben Weston, and Cottonwood Canyon Beaches; Shark, Little, and Catalina Harbors; Indian Head Point; old quarry above Empire Landing; Parsons Landing.*
Galium catalinense ssp. *catalinense* - SCIE	Catalina Island bedstraw	galcat	---	S2	1B.3	P	Common	**CBS/IC/IW**, Coastal bluffs and less common inland on rocky canyon slopes. *Jewfish Point; Avalon Bay; mouth of Gallaher's Canyon; east slope of Black Jack Mountain; below Eagle's Nest in Middle Ranch Canyon; Cottonwood Canyon; Wild Boar Gully; Shark Harbor; Isthmus; Fourth of July Cove; Parsons Landing.*
Gambelia speciosa (Galvezia speciosa) - CIE	showy island snapdragon	gamspe	---	S3	1B.2	S	Occasional	**CBS/CSS**, Rocky sea bluffs of channel-facing side and less frequently inland canyon walls where protected from invasive browsers. *Scattered along coast, including Moonstone Cove; White's Landing; Isthmus; Empire Landing; Fisherman's Cove; Little Harbor; Swain's Canyon; Iron Bound Bay; Johnson's Landing.*
*Genista linifolia**	Mediterranean broom	genlin	---	---	---	S	Common	**NNS**, Highly invasive upland shrub well established on slopes in the Avalon watershed and is actively controlled by the Conservancy throughout the island where occurs on Conservancy land. *Dominant in Avalon area; widely distributed southeast of the Isthmus, especially Buffalo Springs and Cottonwood Canyons; Empire Landing; Toyon Junction area; Boushey Canyon; near Silver Peak.*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Fed.	State	CNPS	Life-form	Abundance	Typical Habitat *Typical Locations on Island*
Gilia nevinii - CIE	Nevin's gilia	gilnev	---	S4	4.3	A	Scarce	**CBS/MCS/CSS**, Rocky headlands and sea cliffs along the coast; rare inland on canyon slopes. *Avalon Canyon; upper Big Springs Canyon; Black Jack Mountain area; Buffalo Springs Canyon; upper Cape Canyon; Goat Harbor Canyon; Hamilton Canyon; Little Harbor; West End; ridge between Moonstone and White's Coves.*
Heteromeles arbutifolia	toyon	hetarb	---	---	---	S-T	Abundant	**IC/IW/CSS**, Canyons, mountain sides and bluffs. *Widely distributed including East Mountain; Salta Verde; Pebbly Beach; Isthmus; Cherry Valley, Parsons Landing; Avalon, Gallagher's, Swain's, Middle Ranch, Bulrush, and Cottonwood Canyons; Moonstone Cove; slopes of Black Jack Mountain and Mr. Orizaba; above Empire Landing.*
Hordeum intercedens	vernal barley	horint	---	S3S4	3.2	A	Common	**GR/VPR/B**, Dry, open slopes. *Widely distributed including Middle Ranch Canyon below Eagle's Nest; dried pool of Steatite (Soapstone) Quarries above Parsons Landing.*
Isocoma menziesii var. *menziesii*	Menzie's goldenbush	isomen	---	S2	1B.2	S	Abundant	**SBD/GR/CSS**, Common on sandy or pebbly beaches, rock cliffs and talus of sea bluffs; less frequent inland on rocky clay or rocky sandy soils. *Widely distributed including Ben Weston Beach; Cottonwood Canyon Beach; Little Harbor; Wrigley Reservoir; Catalina Harbor; Palisades near Jewfish Point.*
Jepsonia malvifolia - CIE	island jepsonia	jepmal	---	S4	4.2	P	Common	**IC/CSS/GR**, Dry, open slopes and ridges; rhizomatous. *Widely distributed including on ridge on the south side of Avalon Valley above Avalon Terrace in oak woodland; Empire Landing; Lookout Point ridge; bluffs between Pebbly Beach and Avalon Bay; Fisherman's Cove; Cherry Valley; Fourth of July Cove Valley; Blue Cavern Point.*
Lepechinia fragrans	fragrant pitcher sage	lepfra	---	S3	4.2	S	Occasional	**IC**, Dry slopes.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Fed.	State	CNPS	Life-form	Abundance	Typical Habitat *Typical Locations on Island*
								Slopes of Black Jack Mountain; near mouth of Cape Canyon; upper end of Cape Canyon; Boushey, Cape, Cottonwood, Middle Ranch, Swain's, and White's Landing Canyons; Twin Rocks area.
Leptosyne gigantea (Coreopsis gigantea)	giant coreopsis	lepgig	---	---	---	S	Occasional, Locally Common	**CBS/IC/CSS**, Sea bluffs and rocky ridges near coast where protected from invasive herbivores. *Pebbly Beach; mouth of Hamilton Canyon, Moonstone Cove; lower Middle Ranch Canyon; Isthmus area; old quarry above Empire Landing, Bird Rock; Parsons Landing; Airport Road.*
Lycium californicum	California boxthorn	lyccal	---	S4	4.2	S	Abundant	**MCS/CBS**, Sea bluffs and headlands and dry, rocky slopes, banks, and ridges. *Salta Verde; Ben Weston beach; below Eagle's Nest; Cottonwood Canyon and Beach; Indian Head Point; Little Harbor; Catalina Harbor; Isthmus Cove.*
Lyonothamnus floribundus ssp. *floribundus* - SCIE	Catalina Island ironwood	lyoflo	---	S2	1B.2	T	Occasional	**IW**, About 110 groves with 50 to 100 clonal tree stems each in canyons and on mountain slopes. *Scattered throughout West End, including north side of West Peak, west of Lion's Head, and Johnson's Canyon; Gallagher's, Toyon (Banning's), Swain's, and lower Bulrush Canyons; east slope of Black Jack Mountain; Ironwood Gully at the Isthmus.*
Malacothamnus fasciculatus var. *catalinensis* - SCIE	Catalina Island bushmallow	malfascat	---	S2	4.2	S	Common	**CSS/IC**, Dry, rocky slopes, road cuts, and dry creek beds. *Widely distributed including Avalon, Gallagher's, Swain's, Middle Ranch, and Bulrush Canyons; White's Landing; Little Harbor; Empire Landing; Isthmus; Parsons Landing.*
Malosma laurina	laurel sumac	mallau	---	---	---	S-T	Abundant	**CSS/IC**, Canyons and rocky or clayey, slopes. *Widely distributed including Pebbly Beach, Avalon, and Middle Ranch Canyons; Black Jack Mountain; Parsons Landing.*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Fed.	State	CNPS	Life-form	Abundance	Typical Habitat *Typical Locations on Island*
Muhlenbergia microsperma	littleseed muhly	muhmic	---	---	---	A	Common	**MCS/CSS/IC**, Dry, rocky slopes and sandy, dry stream beds. *Widely distributed including Hamilton, Middle Ranch, and Cottonwood Canyons; Salta Verde; bluff at White's Landing; Cherry Valley.*
Opuntia littoralis	coastal prickly pear	opulit	---	---	---	S	Abundant	**CSS/CBS/MCS**, Dry, rocky slopes and ridges. *Widely distributed across the island and presumably more frequent than would have occurred historically due to resistance to invasive herbivores introduced in the 1800s.*
*Pennisetum setaceum**	fountaingrass	penset	---	---	---	P	Occasional	**GR/B**, Roadside and disturbed slopes *Avalon Canyon, Hamilton Cove, and Pebbly Beach.*
Peritoma arborea	bladderpod	perarb	---	---	---	S	Common	**CBS/MCS/CSS**, Dry, rocky sea bluffs; less common inland on dry, sunny, clayey, or rocky canyon slopes. *Widely scattered including Palisades near Jewfish Point; Lookout Point; Avalon Bay; White's Landing; below Eagle's Nest; Ben Weston Beach; Cottonwood Canyon above dam; above Empire Landing; Isthmus; above Emerald Bay; Parsons Landing.*
*Phalaris aquatica**	Harding grass	phaaqu	---	---	---	P	Common, Locally Abundant	**GR**, Introduced to island for forage in Middle Ranch hayfields and cleared portions of Bulrush Canyon (Knapp 2005); rhizomatous. *Widely distributed including Bulrush, Middle Ranch, and Cottonwood Canyons; Haypress; upper end Gallagher's Canyon; Salta Verde; upper end of Cape Canyon; Hen Cove north of White's Landing.*
Piperia cooperi	orchid	pipspp	---	---	---	P	Occasional	**IC/CSS**, Dry, rocky clay slopes, talus, or disturbed soils. *Avalon, Hamilton, Cottonwood, White's Landing, and Middle Ranch Canyons; sea bluff at Hamilton Beach; Road to Airport from Rancho Escondido; above Fourth of July Cove; east slope of Black Jack*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Fed.	State	CNPS	Life-form	Abundance	Typical Habitat *Typical Locations on Island*
								Mountain; West End Road; Isthmus area; Empire Landing area.
Plagiobothrys collinus	San Diego popcornflower	placol	---	---	---	A	Rare	**GR/Bare**, Hard packed clay soils on island's summit. *Viewpoint near Wrigley Reservoir; Toyon picnic area; slopes of Black Jack Mountain; right fork of Cottonwood Canyon; Rancho Escondido; Goat Harbor Burn area.*
Prunus ilicifolia ssp. *lyonii* - CIE	Catalina cherry	pruililyo	---	---	---	T	Abundant	**IW/IC**, Groves in canyons on channel-facing slope. *Widely distributed including Renton Mine, Avalon, Gallagher's, Swain's, Cape, and Bulrush Canyons; Moonstone Cove; slopes of Black Jack Mountain and Mt. Orizaba; Cherry Valley; Parsons Landing.*
Quercus pacifica - CIE	island scrub oak	quepac	---	S4	4.2	T	Abundant	**ISOC/IC/IW**, Most abundant small tree or large shrub on wooded slopes and ridges across the island; thrives in heavy clay, rocky clay, and coarse loam island soils. *Widely distributed including Pebbly Beach, Avalon, Gallagher's, Swain's, Middle Ranch, Bulrush, Silver, and Cottonwood Canyons; slopes of Black Jack Mountain and Mt. Orizaba peaks; Salta Verde; Isthmus; Cherry Valley; Parsons Landing.*
Quercus tomentella - CIE	island live oak	quetom	---	S3S4	4.2	T	Scarce	**IW**, Groves in several deep and moist canyons on Southeast half of island. *Pebbly Beach, Cherry, Gallagher's, Cape, Howland's Landing, Swain's, Silver, Sweetwater, and Fern Canyons; north slopes of Mt. Orizaba.*
Quercus x macdonaldii - CIE	MacDonald oak	quemac	---	---	---	T	Occasional	**IW/IC**, Hybrid of Valley Oak (*Quercus lobata*) and island scrub oak (*Q. pacifica*) (Nixon 2002). *Widely scattered including Pebbly Beach, Haypress, Middle Ranch, Bulrush, and Cottonwood Canyons; slopes of Black Jack Mountain; southwest of Empire Landing; Isthmus.*
Rhamnus pirifolia - CIE	island redberry	rhapir	---	S4	4.2	S-T	Abundant	**IC/IW**, Rocky canyon slopes and ridges, mostly on channel-facing slope.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Fed.	State	CNPS	Life-form	Abundance	Typical Habitat *Typical Locations on Island*
								Widely distributed including Pebbly Beach, Avalon, Gallagher's, Swain's, Cape, Middle Ranch, Bulrush, and Grand Canyons; Haypress; above Empire Landing; Fourth of July Cove; Cherry Valley; Howland's Landing.
Rhus integrifolia	lemonade berry	rhuint	---	---	---	S	Abundant	**IC/CSS/MCS**, Dry, open to densely wooded slopes, varying from a small shrub on sea bluffs to small trees. *Widely distributed including Seal Rocks, Pebbly Beach, Avalon, Gallagher's, Swain's, and Cottonwood Canyons; Black Jack Mountain and Mt. Orizaba; Ben Weston Beach; Empire Landing; Isthmus; Silver Peak.*
Ribes viburnifolium - CIE	Catalina Island currant	ribvib	---	S2	1B.2	S	Common	**IC/IW**, Shaded slopes and banks, mostly on channel-facing side. *Widely distributed including near East Mountain, Pebbly Beach, Avalon, Gallagher's, Banning's, and Bulrush Canyons; Haypress; east slope of Black Jack Mountain; Fourth of July Cove to Cherry Valley; Johnson's Valley; north of West Peak.*
Salvia apiana	white sage	salapi	---	---	---	S	Common	**CSS/GR**, Dry rock slopes and ridges on southeast half of the island. *Widely distributed on southeast half of the island, including Pebbly Beach, Avalon, Cape, Middle Ranch, and Bulrush Canyons; Stagecoach Road near Wrigley Reservoir; Renton Mine ridge.*
Salvia mellifera	black sage	salmel	---	---	---	S	Abundant	**CSS/IC**, Dry, exposed slopes in clay or rocky clay soils; common component of CSS and understory of IC. *Widely distributed including East Mountain, Pebbly Beach, Avalon, Swain's, Cape, Middle Ranch, and Bulrush Canyons; slopes of Black Jack Mountain; above Empire Landing; Isthmus.*
Sambucus mexicana	blue elderberry	sammex	---	---	---	S-T	Common	**IW/SRW/IC**, Central interior canyons and scattered on channel side.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Fed.	State	CNPS	Life-form	Abundance	Typical Habitat *Typical Locations on Island*
								Pebbly Beach, Avalon, Gallagher's, Swain's, Cape, Middle Ranch, and Bulrush Canyons; old quarry above Empire Landing; Howland's Landing.
Scrophularia villosa - CIE	Catalina Island figwort	scrvil	---	S3	1B.2	P	Common	**IC**. On wooded, brushy, or open canyon slopes and bottoms, mostly on channel-facing slopes. *Widely scattered on channel side from Parsons Landing to Goat Harbor; Avalon area; Haypress; lower Bulrush Canyon; Cape and Cottonwood Canyons; Isthmus area.*
Sibara filifolia - CIE	island rockcress	sibfil	E	S2	1B.1	A	Rare	**CSS**, Sea bluffs. *Cape Canyon; China Point area; Wild Boar Gully.*
*Silybum marianum**	milk thistle	silmar	---	---	---	A	Scarce	**IC/GR**, Scattered on southeast half of the island. *Gallagher's Canyon; above reservoir in lower Cottonwood Canyon; north slopes of Silver Peak; roadside between Cherry Valley and Howland's Landing.*
Solanum wallacei - CIE	Wallace's nightshade	solwal	---	S2	1B.1	S	Occasional	**IC/CSS**, Southeast half of Island on rocky banks and slopes, in washes, and along dry stream beds. *Goat Harbor Canyon to Renton Mine Canyon; central interior canyons, including Coffee Pot, Cottonwood, and Boushey Canyons.*
Stipa cernua	nodding needlegrass	sticer	---	---	---	P	Rare	**IC/CSS/GR**, Dry, eroded, clayey, or grassy slopes *Haypress; hillside along Airport Road before turn-off to Middle Ranch; near viewpoint east of Wrigley Reservoir.*
Stipa (lepida, pulchra)	needlegrass	stipa	---	---	---	P	Common	**IC/CSS/GR/B**, Dry, rocky slopes and ridges. *Widely distributed throughout the island.*
*Tamarix ramosissima**	saltcedar	tamram	---	---	---	P	Occasional	**NNW/BSB/VPR**, Invasive in wetland and riparian areas. *Sparsely scattered throughout island, especially the West End.*
Trifolium palmeri - CIE	southern island clover	tripal	---	S4	4.2	A	Scarce	**CBS/CSS/GR**, Sunny hillsides in a thin layer of red soil over rock. Dry, open, clayey slopes, grassy slopes.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Fed.	State	CNPS	Life-form	Abundance	Typical Habitat *Typical Locations on Island*
								Avalon; upper end of Bulrush Canyon; Little Harbor; Middle Ranch Canyon; slopes above Gallagher's Canyon; west of Isthmus Harbor; slope above Cabrillo Harbor.
Typha domingensis	southern cattail	typdom	---	---	---	P	Occasional, Locally Common	**CM/RH/VPR**, Shallow water or wet mud of streams and ponds. *Scattered throughout including Lower Middle Ranch and Cottonwood Canyons; lower Buffalo Springs Reservoir; Steatite (Soapstone)* Quarries above Parsons Landing.
Xylococcus bicolor	Mission manzanita	xylbic	---	---	---	S	Occasional	**IC/IW**, Slopes on Catalina Schist. *Channel side of West End, including Fourth of July Cove, Cherry Valley, Howland's Landing, and ridge above Johnson's Landing; lower Middle Ranch Canyon; Cottonwood Canyon; lower Bulrush Canyon; Big Springs Canyon; East of Isthmus, north-facing slope of Wild Boar Gully north of Black Ridge.*

**Invasive Plant; SCIE = Santa Catalina Island Endemic; CIE = Channel Island Endemic; PVP = Palos Verdes Peninsula Endemic*
Lifeform abbreviations: A = Annual; P = Perennial Herbaceous; S = Woody Perennial Shrub; T = Tree
The general abundance of the plant species on Catalina Island are described as follows:

- *Rare: Species have only been found in a few locations*
- *Scarce: Species only found in several locations*
- *Occasional: Species found infrequently but more often than uncommon*
- *Common: Species found throughout but not abundant*
- *Abundant: Species found throughout, and abundant within the growth habitat of the species*

The Typical Habitat and Typical Locations on Island data is from compiled from A Flora of Santa Catalina Island (Thorne 1967), CHH2 Herbarium Records, and the draft Catalina Flora provided by the Conservancy. Typical Habitat Type is Classified by Vegetation Communities Identified by Knapp (2005) in the 2000 Vegetation Map and presented below in order of decreasing prevalence on Catalina Island:

- *Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS)*
- *Island Chaparral (IC)*
- *Island Scrub Oak Chaparral (ISOC)*
- *Grassland (GR)*
- *Bare (B)*
- *Developed (D)*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- *Nonnative Herbaceous (NNH)*
- *Island Woodland (IW)*
- *Southern Riparian Woodland (SRW)*
- *Nonnative Scrub (NNS)*
- *Southern Beach and Dune (SBD)*
- *Nonnative Woodland (NNW)*
- *Coastal Bluff Scrub (CBS)*
- *Bare Streambed (BSB)*
- *Vernal Ponds and Reservoirs (VPR)*
- *Riparian Herbaceous (RH)*
- *Coastal Marsh (CM)*
- *Maritime Cactus Scrub (MCS)*
- *Mulefat Scrub (MFS)*

The table uses the following abbreviations for special status designations:

C ***Candidate*** *for Listing (State or Federal governments).*

E ***Endangered*** *(listed by State or Federal governments). "Take" of the species or disturbance of occupied habitat are prohibited unless specifically authorized.*

FP ***Fully Protected*** *by the State of California. These species may not be taken or possessed at any time, although take may be authorized for necessary scientific research.*

T ***Threatened*** *(listed by State or Federal governments). "Take" of the species or disturbance of occupied habitat are prohibited unless specifically authorized.*

PT ***Proposed Threatened****. Species recently proposed to be listed as threatened by State or Federal governments.*

SSC ***Species of Special Concern****. The California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife has designated certain vertebrate species as Species of Special Concern because declining population levels, limited ranges, and/or continuing threats have made them vulnerable to extinction. The goal of designating species as Species of Special Concern is to halt or reverse their decline by calling attention to their plight and addressing the issues of concern early enough to secure their long-term viability.*

California Native Plant Society (CNPS). *The table includes plant taxa assigned the following ranks by CNPS:*

- ***1A****, referring to taxa CNPS presumes to be extirpated in California and either rare or extinct elsewhere.*
- ***1B.1****, referring to taxa CNPS considers to be rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere; seriously threatened in California (over 80% of occurrences threatened / high degree and immediacy of threat).*
- ***1B.2****, referring to taxa CNPS considers to be rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere; moderately threatened in California (20-80% of occurrences threatened / moderate degree and immediacy of threat).*
- ***1B.3****, referring to taxa CNPS considers to be rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere; not very threatened in California (less than 20% of occurrences threatened / moderate degree and immediacy of threat).*
- ***2B.2****, referring to taxa CNPS considers to be rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere; moderately threatened in California (20-80% occurrences threatened / moderate degree and immediacy of threat).*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- ***3**, referring to taxa for which CNPS lacks the necessary information to assign them to one of the other ranks or to reject them; taxonomy is typically uncertain.*

- ***4.1**, referring to taxa of limited distribution or infrequent throughout a broader area in California, whose status should be monitored regularly; moderately threatened in California (>80% occurrences threatened / moderate degree and immediacy of threat).*

- ***4.2**, referring to taxa of limited distribution or infrequent throughout a broader area in California, whose status should be monitored regularly; moderately threatened in California (20-80% occurrences threatened / moderate degree and immediacy of threat).*

- ***4.3**, referring to taxa of limited distribution or infrequent throughout a broader area in California, whose status should be monitored regularly; not very threatened in California (less than 20% of occurrences threatened / low degree and immediacy of threat or no current threats known).*

***NatureServe Element Rankings.** In some cases, species are recognized as ecologically sensitive by the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), which uses a ranking methodology maintained by NatureServe. Species are given a State rank (S-rank) that applies to the taxon's conservation status in California. "Q" denotes questionable taxonomy. Taxa with rankings of S1, S2, or S3 may be considered "sensitive" at the state level, and potentially worthy of special consideration in resource planning. Taxa with higher rankings (S4, S5) are considered "apparently secure" or "secure" at the state level and therefore are not treated as "sensitive" for purposes of this report. NatureServe Element Rankings are identified only for taxa that have no other federal or state special status. NatureServe Ranks:*

- ***S1, Critically Imperiled,** referring to taxa critically imperiled in the state because of extreme rarity (often 5 or fewer populations) or because of factor(s) such as very steep declines making it especially vulnerable to extirpation from the state.*

- ***S2, Imperiled,** referring to taxa imperiled in the state because of rarity due to very restricted range, very few populations (often 20 or fewer), steep declines, or other factors making it very vulnerable to extirpation from the state.*

- ***S3, Vulnerable,** referring to taxa vulnerable in the state due to a restricted range, relatively few populations (often 80 or fewer), recent and widespread declines, or other factors making it vulnerable to extirpation from the state.*

- ***SX,** referring to taxa presumed to be extirpated from the state.*




Figure 6-1 Monthly Mean Cloud Albedo (Proxy for Cloudiness) for 1996 to 2018.

Monthly average layers were provided by UCSD Scripps Institution of Oceanography (Clemesha et al. 2021). These 1-km resolution layers were derived from a time series of Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellites (GOES) imagery spanning from 1996 to 2018.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 6-2 Solar Radiation Received During Winter Solstice.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 6-3 Solar Radiation Received During Equinox.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-4 Solar Radiation Received During Summer Solstice.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-5 Elevation.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-6 Aspect of Slope.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-7 Northeastness Index.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-8 Slope Steepness.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-9 Topographic Position Index.



Figure 6-10 Topographic Wetness Index.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-11 Terrain Ruggedness Index.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-12 Preliminary Geology Map for Catalina Island.
Legend on Next Page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Map Code | Geological Time Period | Rock Types

- Qb | QUARTERNARY | Beach sand deposits
- Qal | QUARTERNARY | Alluvium
- Qls | QUARTERNARY | Landslide deposits
- Qt | QUARTERNARY | Wave-cut bench deposits, marine
- Td | MIOCENE | Dikes and small igneous intrusions, fine grained, basalt to rhyolite in composition
- Tms | MIOCENE | Sediments, marine, fossiliferous
- Tmv | MIOCENE | Volcaniclastic rocks
- Tmb | MIOCENE | Breccia, dacite composition, forms cap to intrusive body at Big Fisherman's Cove
- Tmi | MIOCENE | Intrusive rocks, fine grained, dacite composition, form dikes, plugs and stocks
- Tma | MIOCENE | Mostly andesite, flows and breccia, includes rhyolite near Mount Banning
- Tmqd | MIOCENE | Catalina Island pluton, quartz diorite in composition, includes dike swarm in interior of body
- Tmso | MIOCENE | San Onofre Breccia
- TKf | LATE CRETACEOUS TO OLIGOCENE | Fore-arc sedimentary rocks, marine
- Jcss | JURASSIC | Catalina Schist, serpentinite
- Jcsg | JURASSIC | Catalina Schist, greenschist facies, includes biotite and garnet schist
- Jcsga | JURASSIC | Catalina Schist, garnet-amphibolite blocks
- Jcsb | JURASSIC | Catalina Schist, blueschist facies, includes lawsonite, aragonite, and jadeitic pyroxene schist
- Jcsa | JURASSIC | Catalina Schist, amphibolite facies, includes biotite and garnet schist

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 6-13 Soil Map Units for 2008 NRCS Survey.

See Table 6-2 for Soil Complex Names for the Soil Map Units.

Table 6-2 Soil Complexes with Primary Geology, Soil Series and Soil Texture (2008 Soil Map).

Map Unit Symbol	Soil Map Unit Name Soil Map Complex or Association | Slope Range	Primary Soil Series	Primary Soil Texture	Primary Generalized Geology Map Code | Geological Time Period | Rock Types
160	Beaches-Abaft complex | 0 to 5%	Beach Sand	Sand	Qb | QUARTERNARY | Beach sand
190	Typic Xerofluvents-Riverwash complex | 0 to 8%	Xerofluvents	Sandy loam	Qal | QUARTERNARY | Alluvium
191	Typic Haploxerepts-Xerofluvents-Argixerolls complex | 0 to 8%	Haploxerepts	Very gravelly sand	
184	Dewpoint-Luff association |15 to 45%	Dewpoint	Sandy loam	Qls | QUARTERNARY | Landslide deposits
293	Rock outcrop, coastal cliffs-Nauti-Haploxerepts complex | 50 to 120%	Rock Outcrop	NA	
156	Tongva-Freeboard-Starbright complex | 30 to 55%	Tongva	Loam	Tv | MIOCENE | Volcanic and volcaniclastic rocks
157	Tongva-Pachic Argixerolls-Freeboard complex | 55 to 75%			
181	Haploxerepts-Purser-Rock outcrop complex | 40 to 75%	Haploxerepts	Very gravelly sand	
182	Luff-Haploxerepts-Haploxeralfs complex | 15 to 35%	Luff	Silty loam	
183	Purser-Luff complex | 15 to 35%	Purser	Clay loam	
185	Purser-Rock outcrop complex, coastal cliffs | 45 to 75%			
400	Oboship-Nauti-Bosun complex | 50 to 75%	Oboship	Gravelly loam	Tmqd | MIOCENE | Catalina Island pluton, quartz diorite
407	Nauti-Flyer-Marpol complex | 25 to 55%	Nauti	Loam	
410	Express-Flyer-Loadline complex | 40 to 75%	Express	Sandy loam	
411	Flyer-Loadline-Nauti complex | 15 to 50%	Flyer	Gravelly loamy sand	
412	Flyer, gullied-Express, gullied-Bosun complex | 15 to 50%			
422	Dewpoint-Masthead-Coastwise complex | 20 to 55%	Dewpoint	Sandy loam	Jcs | JURASSIC | Catalina Schist
420	Masthead-Luff complex | 5 to 15%	Masthead	Gravelly silty loam	
421	Masthead-Luff complex | 8 to 30%			
423	Masthead-Coastwise-Dewpoint complex | 20 to 55%			
424	Masthead-Dewpoint-Rock Outcrop complex | 40 to 75%			
427	Masthead-Coastwise-Typic Haploxeralfs complex | 45 to 75%			
425	Coastwise-Masthead complex, cobbly | 40 to 75%	Coastwise	Gravelly sandy loam	

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 6-14 Soil Map Units for 1955 Soil Conservation Service Survey.




Figure 6-15 Soil Depth (1955 Soil Map).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-16 Soil Texture (1955 Soil Map).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-17 Soil Permeability (1955 Soil Map).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-18 Underlying Material (1955 Soil Map).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-19 Average Spring Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) from 2017 to 2022.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-20 Shore Mask for Modeling.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 6-3. Habitat Suitability Model Performance.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Minimum Allowed Distance Between Samples (m)	Number of Samples	Resampling Method	Number of Replicates	AUC Mean ± Standard Deviation	Suitability Threshold
Abronia maritima	red sand verbena	abrmar	10	23	Cross-Validation	30	0.96 ± 0.05	0.360
Achillea millefolium	common yarrow	achmil	200	7	Cross-Validation	30	0.89 ± 0.11	0.482
Acmispon argophyllus	silver birds foot trefoil	acmarg	200	5	Cross-Validation	40	0.56 ± 0.18	0.703
Acmispon grandifloras	large leaved lotus	acmgra	200	22	Cross-Validation	30	0.83 ± 0.25	0.124
Adenostoma fasciculatum	chamise	adefas	200	24	Cross-Validation	20	0.82 ± 0.23	0.363
Anemopsis californica	yerba mansa	anecal	200	15	Cross-Validation	20	0.97 ± 0.06	0.593
Aphanisma blitoides	aphanisma	aphbli	10	28	Cross-Validation	20	0.99 ± 0.02	0.489
Arctostaphylos catalinae - SCIE	Catalina Island manzanita	arccat	200	114	Subsampling	10	0.78 ± 0.04	0.297
Artemisia californica	California sagebrush	artcal	100	81	Subsampling	20	0.77 ± 0.05	0.373
*Arundo donax**	giant reed	arudon	10	15	Cross-Validation	30	0.99 ± 0.02	0.666
Asclepias fascicularis	narrowleaf milkweed	ascfas	10	27	Cross-Validation	30	0.93 ± 0.13	0.221
Atriplex coulteri	Coulter's saltbush	atrcou	200	46	Subsampling	30	0.78 ± 0.05	0.274
Atriplex pacifica	South Coast saltscale	atrpac	200	19	Cross-Validation	30	0.85 ± 0.16	0.292
Baccharis pilularis	coyote bush	bacpil	10	15	Cross-Validation	30	0.89 ± 0.12	0.334
Bergerocactus emoryi - CIE	velvet cactus	beremo	30	16	Subsampling	10	0.97 ± 0.01	0.548
Bothriochloa barbinodis	cane bluestem	botbar	200	23	Cross-Validation	30	0.95 ± 0.08	0.207
*Brassica nigra**	black mustard	branig	10	27	Cross-Validation	30	0.93 ± 0.18	0.334
Bromus sitchensis (*carinatus*)	California brome	brocar	200	23	Subsampling	30	0.64 ± 0.1	0.242
*Cakile maritima**	sea rocket	cakmar	10	30	Subsampling	30	0.97 ± 0.04	0.132
*Carduus pycnocephalus**	Italian thistle	carpyc	200	32	Subsampling	30	0.95 ± 0.03	0.332
Ceanothus arboreus - CIE	felt-leaf ceanothus	ceaarb	200	119	Cross-Validation	40	0.81 ± 0.11	0.300
Ceanothus megacarpus var. *insularis* - CIE	island ceanothus	ceamegins	10	7	Cross-Validation	30	0.83 ± 0.26	0.213

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Minimum Allowed Distance Between Samples (m)	Number of Samples	Resampling Method	Number of Replicates	AUC Mean ± Standard Deviation	Suitability Threshold
Ceanothus megacarpus var. *megacarpus*	bigpod ceanothus	ceamegmeg	100	17	Cross-Validation	30	0.77 ± 0.25	0.326
*Centranthus ruber**	red valerian	cenrub	10	7	Cross-Validation	30	0.94 ± 0.08	0.694
Cercocarpus traskiae - SCIE	Catalina Island mountain-mahogany	certra	10	29	Cross-Validation	40	0.92 ± 0.19	0.091
Chlorogalum pomeridianum	soap plant	chlpom	100	23	Cross-Validation	30	0.93 ± 0.07	0.412
*Cirsium vulgare**	bull thistle	cirvul	200	27	Subsampling	30	0.9 ± 0.04	0.141
Comarostaphylis diversifolia subsp. *planifolia*	summer holly	comdivpla	200	14	Cross-Validation	30	0.86 ± 0.17	0.319
*Cortaderia selloana**	pampas grass	corsel	200	37	Subsampling	30	0.81 ± 0.09	0.156
Cressa truxillensis	alkali weed	cretru	10	28	Cross-Validation	30	0.99 ± 0.03	0.220
Crocanthemum greenei - CIE	island rush-rose	crogre	100	39	Subsampling	30	0.78 ± 0.06	0.269
Crossosoma californicum - CIE/PVP	Catalina Island crossosoma	crocal	200	29	Cross-Validation	40	0.74 ± 0.23	0.338
Cylindropuntia prolifera	coastal cholla	cylpro	100	39	Subsampling	30	0.98 ± 0.01	0.274
*Cynara cardunculus**	artichoke thistle	cyncar	20	19	Cross-Validation	30	0.93 ± 0.19	0.088
Cyperus spp.	flatsedge	cypspp	200	21	Cross-Validation	30	0.88 ± 0.14	0.268
Deinandra clementina - CIE	island tarplant	deicle	50	39	Cross-Validation	30	0.9 ± 0.15	0.137
Deinandra fasciculata	clustered tarplant	deifas	200	8	Cross-Validation	30	0.8 ± 0.24	0.351
Delphinium parryi subsp. *maritimum*	maritime larkspur	delparmar	100	34	Subsampling	30	0.85 ± 0.07	0.201
Dendromecon harfordii	Channel Island tree poppy	denhar	100	51	Subsampling	30	0.76 ± 0.05	0.346
Dichondra occidentalis	western dichondra	dicocc	200	44	Subsampling	30	0.71 ± 0.21	0.328
Dissanthelium californicum - CIE	California dissanthelium	discal	10	17	Cross-Validation	40	0.63 ± 0.32	0.166

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Minimum Allowed Distance Between Samples (m)	Number of Samples	Resampling Method	Number of Replicates	AUC Mean ± Standard Deviation	Suitability Threshold
Dudleya virens ssp. *hassei* - SCIE	Catalina Island dudleya	dudvirhas	200	24	Cross-Validation	40	0.91 ± 0.13	0.108
Dudleya virens subsp. *insularis*	island green dudleya	dudvirins	200	63	Subsampling	30	0.84 ± 0.05	0.268
Elymus (Leymus) condensatus	giant wild rye	elycon	100	31	Subsampling	30	0.81 ± 0.21	0.260
Encelia californica	California sunflower bush	enccal	200	12	Cross-Validation	30	0.92 ± 0.13	0.522
Ericameria palmeri	Palmer's goldenbush	eripal	200	14	Cross-Validation	30	0.84 ± 0.19	0.449
Eriodictyon traskiae ssp. *traskiae* - SCIE	Trask's yerba santa	eritra	10	54	Cross-Validation	40	0.92 ± 0.12	0.142
Eriogonum giganteum var. *giganteum* - SCIE	St. Catherine's lace	erigig	200	103	Cross-Validation	40	0.81 ± 0.12	0.232
Eriogonum grande var. *grande*	island buckwheat	erigra	100	64	Subsampling	30	0.84 ± 0.05	0.160
Eschscholzia ramosa - CIE	Island poppy	escram	30	39	Cross-Validation	40	0.8 ± 0.24	0.146
Euphorbia misera - CIE	cliff spurge	eupmis	200	5	Cross-Validation	5	0.99 ± 0.01	0.699
*Foeniculum vulgare**	sweet fennel	foevul	200	91	Subsampling	30	0.79 ± 0.05	0.252
Frankenia salina	alkali heath	frasal	100	16	Cross-Validation	30	0.78 ± 0.26	0.212
Galium catalinense ssp. *catalinense* - SCIE	Catalina Island bedstraw	galcat	200	39	Subsampling	10	0.85 ± 0.07	0.097
Gambelia speciosa (Galvezia speciosa) - CIE	showy island snapdragon	gamspe	10	27	Cross-Validation	40	0.92 ± 0.15	0.145
*Genista linifolia**	Mediterranean broom	genlin	300	111	Subsampling	30	0.71 ± 0.04	0.241
Gilia nevinii - CIE	Nevin's gilia	gilnev	200	9	Cross-Validation	40	0.71 ± 0.3	0.238
Heteromeles arbutifolia	toyon	hetarb	100	85	Subsampling	30	0.79 ± 0.04	0.362
Hordeum intercedens	vernal barley	horint	200	90	Subsampling	30	0.83 ± 0.03	0.310
Isocoma menziesii var. *menziesii*	Menzie's goldenbush	isomen	200	23	Cross-Validation	30	0.9 ± 0.12	0.375
Jepsonia malvifolia - CIE	island jepsonia	jepmal	200	84	Cross-Validation	40	0.82 ± 0.13	0.239

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Minimum Allowed Distance Between Samples (m)	Number of Samples	Resampling Method	Number of Replicates	AUC Mean ± Standard Deviation	Suitability Threshold
Lepechinia fragrans	fragrant pitcher sage	lepfra	100	47	Cross-Validation	30	0.9 ± 0.03	0.128
Leptosyne gigantea (Coreopsis gigantea)	giant coreopsis	lepgig	10	42	Subsampling	30	0.96 ± 0.03	0.113
Lycium californicum	California boxthorn	lyccal	200	74	Subsampling	30	0.94 ± 0.02	0.298
Lyonothamnus floribundus ssp. *floribundus* - SCIE	Catalina Island ironwood	lyoflo	200	82	Cross-Validation	40	0.79 ± 0.15	0.262
Malacothamnus fasciculatus var. *catalinensis* - SCIE	Catalina Island bushmallow	malfascat	10	29	Cross-Validation	40	0.78 ± 0.19	0.353
Malosma laurina	laurel sumac	mallau	200	43	Subsampling	30	0.73 ± 0.08	0.304
Muhlenbergia microsperma	littleseed muhly	muhmic	200	28	Subsampling	30	0.71 ± 0.08	0.398
Opuntia littoralis	coastal prickly pear	opulit	200	86	Subsampling	30	0.67 ± 0.05	0.404
*Pennisetum setaceum**	fountaingrass	penset	30	43	Subsampling	30	0.97 ± 0.02	0.362
Peritoma arborea	bladderpod	perarb	200	5	Cross-Validation	30	0.86 ± 0.15	0.856
*Phalaris aquatica**	Harding grass	phaaqu	200	68	Subsampling	30	0.85 ± 0.04	0.116
Piperia spp.	orchid	pipspp	100	26	Subsampling	30	0.78 ± 0.08	0.231
Plagiobothrys collinus	popcornflower	placol	100	25	Subsampling	30	0.78 ± 0.1	0.364
Prunus ilicifolia ssp. *lyonii* - CIE	Catalina cherry	pruililyo	200	13	Cross-Validation	40	0.83 ± 0.23	0.280
Quercus pacifica - CIE	island scrub oak	quepac	200	82	Cross-Validation	40	0.64 ± 0.18	0.375
Quercus tomentella - CIE	island live oak	quetom	200	63	Cross-Validation	40	0.84 ± 0.21	0.147
Quercus x macdonaldii - CIE	MacDonald oak	quemac	10	31	Subsampling	30	0.87 ± 0.05	0.341
Rhamnus pirifolia - CIE	island redberry	rhapir	200	22	Cross-Validation	40	0.67 ± 0.32	0.216
Rhus integrifolia	lemonade berry	rhuint	200	80	Subsampling	30	0.73 ± 0.05	0.383
Ribes viburnifolium - CIE	Catalina Island currant	ribvib	200	56	Cross-Validation	40	0.83 ± 0.16	0.412

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	Minimum Allowed Distance Between Samples (m)	Number of Samples	Resampling Method	Number of Replicates	AUC Mean ± Standard Deviation	Suitability Threshold
Salvia apiana	white sage	salapi	200	32	Subsampling	30	0.92 ± 0.05	0.265
Salvia mellifera	black sage	salmel	200	41	Subsampling	30	0.83 ± 0.06	0.213
Sambucus mexicana	blue elderberry	sammex	200	9	Cross-Validation	30	0.75 ± 0.23	0.322
Scrophularia villosa - CIE	Catalina Island figwort	scrvil	200	46	Cross-Validation	40	0.82 ± 0.23	0.209
Sibara filifolia - CIE	island rockcress	sibfil	10	56	Subsampling	30	0.98 ± 0.02	0.296
*Silybum marianum**	milk thistle	silmar	200	73	Subsampling	30	0.91 ± 0.03	0.141
Solanum wallacei - CIE	Wallace's nightshade	solwal	200	39	Cross-Validation	40	0.8 ± 0.21	0.289
Stipa cernua	nodding needlegrass	sticer	200	40	Subsampling	30	0.85 ± 0.05	0.162
Stipa spp.	needlegrass	stipa	200	40	Subsampling	30	0.87 ± 0.03	0.328
*Tamarix ramosissima**	saltcedar	tamram	100	18	Subsampling	30	0.92 ± 0.07	0.134
Trifolium palmeri - CIE	southern island clover	tripal	200	15	Cross-Validation	40	0.97 ± 0.04	0.343
Typha domingensis	southern cattail	typdom	200	28	Subsampling	30	0.88 ± 0.07	0.335
Xylococcus bicolor	Mission manzanita	xylbic	100	41	Subsampling	30	0.84 ± 0.04	0.305

**Invasive Plant; SCIE = Santa Catalina Island Endemic; CIE = Channel Island Endemic; PVP = Palos Verdes Peninsula Endemic*

Minimum Allowed Distance Between Samples *is the distance, in meters (m), that occurrence data was required to be for the model. A minimum distance of 200 m was considered optimal but for rare species that have clustered observations, smaller minimum distances were allowed.*

Number of Samples *are the number of samples used in developing and testing the model, after the source data was reduced by randomly removing occurrence datapoints that were within the minimum distance allowed.*

Resampling Method *is the method used to assess the performance and robustness of the model, either Cross-Validation or Subsampling. Subsampling was performed by using 70% of the occurrence data for calibrating the model and 30% for testing the model.*

Number of Replicates *are the amount of resampling runs or model iterations, either by cross-validation or subsampling, performed during the model training process.*

AUC *is the "Area Under the Curve" for the Cloglog output. It is a threshold-independent measure that assesses the model's ability to discriminate between suitable and unsuitable habitats for a species based on the predicted probability of occurrence. A larger AUC value indicates better model performance, with values ranging from 0.5 (indicating a random prediction) to 1 (indicating a perfect prediction). A model with an AUC close to 1 suggests that it can effectively distinguish between locations where a species is present or absent.*

Suitability Threshold *is established as the "10th Percentile Training Presence Cloglog Threshold". When determining a binary (presence/absence) suitability, any species that falls below this threshold is deemed not suitable.*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-21 Potential Vegetation Map for Red Sand Verbena (*Abronia maritima*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-22 Potential Vegetation Map for Common Yarrow (*Achillea millefolium*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-23 Potential Vegetation Map for Silver Birds Foot Trefoil (*Acmispon argophyllus*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-24 Potential Vegetation Map for Large Leaved Lotus (*Acmispon grandifloras*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-25 Potential Vegetation Map for Chamise (*Adenostoma fasciculatum*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-26 Potential Vegetation Map for Yerba Mansa (*Anemopsis californica*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-27 Potential Vegetation Map for Aphanisma (*Aphanisma blitoides*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-28 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Island Manzanita (*Arctostaphylos catalinae*), a Santa Catalina Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-29 Potential Vegetation Map for California Sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 6-30 Potential Vegetation Map for Giant Reed (*Arundo donax*), an Invasive Plant.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-31 Potential Vegetation Map for Narrowleaf Milkweed (*Asclepias fascicularis*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-32 Potential Vegetation Map for Coulter's Saltbush (*Atriplex coulteri*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-33 Potential Vegetation Map for South Coast Saltscale (*Atriplex pacifica*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-34 Potential Vegetation Map for Coyote Bush (*Baccharis pilularis*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-35 Potential Vegetation Map for Velvet Cactus (*Bergerocactus emoryi*), a Channel Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-36 Potential Vegetation Map for Cane Bluestem (*Bothriochloa barbinodis*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-37 Potential Vegetation Map for Black Mustard (*Brassica nigra*), an Invasive Plant.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-38 Potential Vegetation Map for California Brome (*Bromus sitchensis*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-39 Potential Vegetation Map for Sea Rocket (*Cakile maritima*), an Invasive Plant.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-40 Potential Vegetation Map for Italian Thistle (*Carduus pycnocephalus*), an Invasive Plant.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-41 Potential Vegetation Map for Felt-Leaf Ceanothus (*Ceanothus arboreus*), a Channel Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-42 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Ceanothus (*Ceanothus megacarpus* var. *insularis*), a Channel Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-43 Potential Vegetation Map for Bigpod Ceanothus (*Ceanothus megacarpus* var. *megacarpus*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-44 Potential Vegetation Map for Red Valerian (*Centranthus ruber*), an Invasive Plant.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 6-45 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Island Mountain-Mahogany (*Cercocarpus traskiae*), a Santa Catalina Island Endemic, State and Federally Endangered Plant.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-46 Potential Vegetation Map for Soap Plant (*Chlorogalum pomeridianum*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-47 Potential Vegetation Map for Bull Thistle (*Cirsium vulgare*), an Invasive Plant.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-48 Potential Vegetation Map for Summer Holly (*Comarostaphylis diversifolia* subsp. *planifolia*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-49 Potential Vegetation Map for Pampas Grass (*Cortaderia selloana*), an Invasive Plant.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 6-50 Potential Vegetation Map for Alkali Weed (*Cressa truxillensis*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-51 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Rush-Rose (*Crocanthemum greenei*), a Channel Island Endemic and Federally Threatened Plant.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-52 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Island Crossosoma (*Crossosoma californicum*), Endemic to the Channel Islands and the Palos Verdes Peninsula.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-53 Potential Vegetation Map for Coastal Cholla (*Cylindropuntia prolifera*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-54 Potential Vegetation Map for Artichoke Thistle (*Cynara cardunculus*), an Invasive Plant.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-55 Potential Vegetation Map for Flatsedge (*Cyperus* spp.).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-56 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Tarplant (*Deinandra clementina*), a Channel Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-57 Potential Vegetation Map for Clustered Tarplant (*Deinandra fasciculata*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-58 Potential Vegetation Map for Maritime Larkspur (*Delphinium parryi* subsp. *maritimum*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-59 Potential Vegetation Map for Channel Island Tree Poppy (*Dendromecon harfordii*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-60 Potential Vegetation Map for Western Dichondra (*Dichondra occidentalis*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-61 Potential Vegetation Map for California Dissanthelium (*Dissanthelium californicum*), a Channel Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-62 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Island Dudleya (*Dudleya virens* subsp. *hassei*), a Santa Catalina Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-63 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Green Dudleya (*Dudleya virens* subsp. *insularis*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-64 Potential Vegetation Map for Giant Wild Rye (*Elymus condensatus*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-65 Potential Vegetation Map for California Sunflower Bush (*Encelia californica*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-66 Potential Vegetation Map for Palmer's Goldenbush (*Ericameria palmeri*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-67 Potential Vegetation Map for Trask's Yerba Santa (*Eriodictyon traskiae* ssp. *traskiae*), a Santa Catalina Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-68 Potential Vegetation Map for St. Catherine's Lace (*Eriogonum giganteum var. giganteum*), a Santa Catalina Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-69 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Buckwheat (*Eriogonum grande var. grande*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-70 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Poppy (*Eschscholzia ramosa*), a Channel Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-71 Potential Vegetation Map for Cliff Spurge (*Euphorbia misera*), a Channel Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-72 Potential Vegetation Map for Sweet Fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*), an Invasive Plant.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-73 Potential Vegetation Map for Alkali Heath (*Frankenia salina*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-74 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Island Bedstraw (*Galium catalinense* subsp. *catalinense*), a Santa Catalina Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-75 Potential Vegetation Map for Showy Island Snapdragon (*Gambelia speciosa*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-76 Potential Vegetation Map for Mediterranean Broom (*Genista linifolia*), an Invasive Plant.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-77 Potential Vegetation Map for Nevin's Gilia (*Gilia nevinii*), a Channel Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-78 Potential Vegetation Map for Toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-79 Potential Vegetation Map for Vernal Barley (*Hordeum intercedens*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-80 Potential Vegetation Map for Menzie's Goldenbush (*Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-81 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Jepsonia (*Jepsonia malvifolia*), a Channel Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-82 Potential Vegetation Map for Fragrant Pitcher Sage (*Lepechinia fragrans*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-83 Potential Vegetation Map for Giant Coreopsis (*Leptosyne gigantea*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-84 Potential Vegetation Map for California Boxthorn (*Lycium californicum*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-85 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Island Ironwood (*Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus*), a Santa Catalina Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-86 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Island Bushmallow (*Malacothamnus fasciculatus* var. *catalinensis*), a Santa Catalina Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-87 Potential Vegetation Map for Laurel Sumac (*Malosma laurina*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-88 Potential Vegetation Map for Littleseed Muhly (*Muhlenbergia microsperma*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-89 Potential Vegetation Map for Coastal Prickly Pear (*Opuntia littoralis*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-90 Potential Vegetation Map for Fountaingrass (*Pennisetum setaceum*), an Invasive Plant.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-91 Potential Vegetation Map for Bladderpod (*Peritoma arborea*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-92 Potential Vegetation Map for Harding Grass (*Phalaris aquatica*), an Invasive Plant.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-93 Potential Vegetation Map for Orchid (*Piperia* spp.).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-94 Potential Vegetation Map for Popcornflower (*Plagiobothrys collinus*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-95 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Cherry (*Prunus ilicifolia* ssp. *lyonii*), a Channel Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-96 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Scrub Oak (*Quercus pacifica*), a Channel Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-97 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Live Oak (*Quercus tomentella*), a Channel Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-98 Potential Vegetation Map for MacDonald Oak (*Quercus* x *macdonaldii*), a Channel Island Endemic and a naturally occurring hybrid of *Q. pacifica* and *Q. lobata.*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-99 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Redberry (*Rhamnus pirifolia*), a Channel Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-100 Potential Vegetation Map for Lemonade Berry (*Rhus integrifolia*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-101 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Island Currant (*Ribes viburnifolium*), a Channel Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-102 Potential Vegetation Map for White Sage (*Salvia apiana*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-103 Potential Vegetation Map for Black Sage (*Salvia mellifera*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-104 Potential Vegetation Map for Blue Elderberry (*Sambucus mexicana*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-105 Potential Vegetation Map for Catalina Island Figwort (*Scrophularia villosa*), a Channel Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-106 Potential Vegetation Map for Island Rockcress (*Sibara filifolia*), a Channel Island Endemic and Federally Endangered Plant.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-107 Potential Vegetation Map for Milk Thistle (*Silybum marianum*), an Invasive Plant.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-108 Potential Vegetation Map for Wallace's Nightshade (*Solanum wallacei*), a Channel Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-109 Potential Vegetation Map for Nodding Needlegrass (*Stipa cernua*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-110 Potential Vegetation Map for Needlegrass (*Stipa* spp.).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-111 Potential Vegetation Map for Saltcedar (*Tamarix ramosissima*), an Invasive Plant.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Figure 6-112 Potential Vegetation Map for Southern Island Clover (*Trifolium palmeri*), a Channel Island Endemic.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-113 Potential Vegetation Map for Southern Cattail (*Typha domingensis*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B




Figure 6-114 Potential Vegetation Map for Mission Manzanita (*Xylococcus bicolor*).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 6-4. Environmental Variable Permutation Importance in Models.

			CLIMATE								TOPOGRAPHY							GEOLOGY & SOILS			
Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	May Cloud Albedo	June Cloud Albedo	July Cloud Albedo	August Cloud Albedo	September Cloud Albedo	Winter Solstice Solar Insol.	Equinox Solar Insolation	Summer Solstice Solar Insol.	Elevation	Aspect	Northeastedness	Slope	Topographic Position Index	Terrain Wetness Index	Ruggedness	Geology	2008 Soils	1955 Soils	NDVI | VEG. PRODUCTIVITY
Abronia maritima	red sand verbena	abrmar											0.2	9.2		2.4			9.0		79.2
Achillea millefolium	common yarrow	achmil											9.6	23.1					16.7		50.6
Acmispon argophyllus	silver birds foot trefoil	acmarg								26.4				0.1	19.2			54.3			
Acmispon grandifloras	large leaved lotus	acmgra							0.7		26.6		2.5	29.3				20.2	20.7		
Adenostoma fasciculatum	chamise	adefas										13.7	14.2	0.6				21.6	49.9		
Anemopsis californica	yerba mansa	anecal									0.1		0.9	70.9	17.8				9.1		1.2
Aphanisma blitoides	aphanisma	aphbli					34.9				56.4		4.3						4.4		
Arctostaphylos catalinae - SCIE	Catalina Island manzanita	arccat								47.2		12.3	2.0	4.6	3.4	5.8		13.2	11.5		
Artemisia californica	California sagebrush	artcal		14.1							26.4	27.8		0.6		4.1			27.0		
*Arundo donax**	giant reed	arudon									78.0	1.5		6.7		0.1	0.5		13.2		
Asclepias fascicularis	narrowleaf milkweed	ascfas										0.0		0.0			0.0		79.3		20.7
Atriplex coulteri	Coulter's saltbush	atrcou								32.5	6.2	4.0						14.5	9.8		33.0
Atriplex pacifica	South Coast saltscale	atrpac								9.9	14.2	1.2		5.2		27.2			37.9		4.4
Baccharis pilularis	coyote bush	bacpil	0.2								35.5	3.8						24.2	36.3		
Bergerocactus emoryi - CIE	velvet cactus	beremo									65.8			0.8		0.6	1.1	3.3	28.4		
Bothriochloa barbinodis	cane bluestem	botbar						39.0			44.6			11.2	0.3				4.8		0.1

			CLIMATE								TOPOGRAPHY							GEOLOGY & SOILS			
Scientific Name	Common Name	Code	May Cloud Albedo	June Cloud Albedo	July Cloud Albedo	August Cloud Albedo	September Cloud Albedo	Winter Solstice Solar Insol.	Equinox Solar Insolation	Summer Solstice Solar Insol.	Elevation	Aspect	Northeastedness	Slope	Topographic Position Index	Terrain Wetness Index	Ruggedness	Geology	2008 Soils	1955 Soils	NDVI | VEG. PRODUCTIVITY
*Brassica nigra**	black mustard	branig	22.3								34.3	1.6		1.1	0.9		17.2		22.6		
Bromus sitchensis (*carinatus*)	California brome	brocar							9.9	0.9			6.2			7.2		50.9	24.9		
*Cakile maritima**	sea rocket	cakmar						7.4				5.5		35.6	9.0				42.5		
*Carduus pycnocephalus**	Italian thistle	carpyc									9.1	15.2		24.6	32.3	1.9			16.9		
Ceanothus arboreus - CIE	felt-leaf ceanothus	ceaarb							29.0			13.4	13.4	3.1	7.2	2.5	4.9		26.5		
Ceanothus megacarpus var. *insularis* - CIE	island ceanothus	ceamegins							0.0		24.5	2.8					0.1		72.6		
Ceanothus megacarpus var. *megacarpus*	bigpod ceanothus	ceamegmeg							27.2		22.1	27.3		0.6			0.2		22.6		
*Centranthus ruber**	red valerian	cenrub									7.7				4.9	5.8	4.2		76.9		0.5
Cercocarpus traskiae - SCIE	Catalina Island mountain-mahogany	certra					17.6				3.9	8.6	4.6		5.4		6.4		53.5		
Chlorogalum pomeridianum	soap plant	chlpom				66.0								17.8		0.4		3.0	12.8		
*Cirsium vulgare**	bull thistle	cirvul									0.8	5.9			28.8	0.3	40.3		22.4		1.5
Comarostaphylis diversifolia subsp. *planifolia*	summer holly	comdivpla				24.9							1.7	11.3		0.2			61.9		
*Cortaderia selloana**	pampas grass	corsel					5.6						3.9	1.1		54.4			30.8		4.2
Cressa truxillensis	alkali weed	cretru					3.6			3.2	91.2		0.4			0.6			0.2		0.8

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

			CLIMATE								TOPOGRAPHY							GEOLOGY & SOILS			
Scientific Name	**Common Name**	**Code**	**May Cloud Albedo**	**June Cloud Albedo**	**July Cloud Albedo**	**August Cloud Albedo**	**September Cloud Albedo**	**Winter Solstice Solar Insol.**	**Equinox Solar Insolation**	**Summer Solstice Solar Insol.**	**Elevation**	**Aspect**	**Northeastedness**	**Slope**	**Topographic Position Index**	**Terrain Wetness Index**	**Ruggedness**	**Geology**	**2008 Soils**	**1955 Soils**	**NDVI | VEG. PRODUCTIVITY**
Crocanthemum greenei - CIE	island rush-rose	crogre								9.8	20.4			2.1		4.8	19.6		43.3		
Crossosoma californicum - CIE/PVP	Catalina Island crossosoma	crocal									8.1	12.1		34.4		14.8		19.0	11.6		
Cylindropuntia prolifera	coastal cholla	cylpro					33.1				0.4			3.3					1.3		61.9
*Cynara cardunculus**	artichoke thistle	cyncar					93.1						0.1	2.2		0.3					4.3
Cyperus spp.	flatsedge	cypspp	2.5								1.0	9.1	7.7			1.2		43.6	34.9		
Deinandra clementina - CIE	island tarplant	deicle						1.2			85.1	3.4		0.8					9.5		
Deinandra fasciculata	clustered tarplant	deifas						0.3			11.8	0.5		0.0			51.1		36.3		
Delphinium parryi subsp. *maritimum*	maritime larkspur	delparmar	11.2					18.4			17.2	10.7	5.8			1.9		11.2	20.8		2.8
Dendromecon harfordii	Channel Island tree poppy	denhar		0.7					1.0		22.1	8.6	3.9	3.9		4.9			54.9		
Dichondra occidentalis	western dichondra	dicocc								4.7	0.7	3.1		47.6		6.3			37.6		0.0
Dissanthelium californicum - CIE	California dissanthelium	discal										12.3	10.5	0.9	2.7				73.6		
Dudleya virens ssp. *hassei* - SCIE	Catalina Island dudleya	dudvirhas									89.4		2.4	1.7		0.7	0.1		3.0		2.7
Dudleya virens subsp. *insularis*	island green dudleya	dudvirins						24.5			15.4	6.1	27.8	4.9		2.0	6.9		7.0		5.4
Elymus (Leymus) condensatus	giant wild rye	elycon									12.7	24.4				2.9	3.7	19.9	27.6		8.8

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

			CLIMATE								TOPOGRAPHY							GEOLOGY & SOILS			
Scientific Name	**Common Name**	**Code**	**May Cloud Albedo**	**June Cloud Albedo**	**July Cloud Albedo**	**August Cloud Albedo**	**September Cloud Albedo**	**Winter Solstice Solar Insol.**	**Equinox Solar Insolation**	**Summer Solstice Solar Insol.**	**Elevation**	**Aspect**	**Northeastedness**	**Slope**	**Topographic Position Index**	**Terrain Wetness Index**	**Ruggedness**	**Geology**	**2008 Soils**	**1955 Soils**	**NDVI | VEG. PRODUCTIVITY**
Encelia californica	California sunflower bush	enccal									88.8				9.8				1.4		0.0
Ericameria palmeri	Palmer's goldenbush	eripal										3.3		30.3	2.0	14.5			26.1		23.8
Eriodictyon traskiae ssp. *traskiae* - SCIE	Trask's yerba santa	eritra					37.3				8.6						9.0		45.1		
Eriogonum giganteum var. *giganteum* - SCIE	St. Catherine's lace	erigig	13.8							2.6	26.4			9.6				20.3	27.3		
Eriogonum grande var. *grande*	island buckwheat	erigra												0.1	1.7	1.7	3.6		52.3		40.6
Eschscholzia ramosa - CIE	Island poppy	escram									5.9	9.2		31.0		8.4		26.2	19.3		
Euphorbia misera - CIE	cliff spurge	eupmis										2.1			0.7		7.0	32.0	58.2		
*Foeniculum vulgare**	sweet fennel	foevul					1.7				25.1			7.8	4.8	1.1		12.1	46.4		1.0
Frankenia salina	alkali heath	frasal											2.2	2.0		2.9	4.7		53.7		34.5
Galium catalinense ssp. *catalinense* - SCIE	Catalina Island bedstraw	galcat						41.3			19.4	8.3		11.1			3.9	2.1	13.9		
Gambelia speciosa (Galvezia speciosa) - CIE	showy island snapdragon	gamspe	8.3				4.2				9.5		1.7			0.0			76.3		
*Genista linifolia**	Mediterranean broom	genlin						15.9			2.0	8.6	6.2	13.7		13.1			38.0		2.5
Gilia nevinii - CIE	Nevin's gilia	gilnev										22.9			0.1			20.3	56.7		
Heteromeles arbutifolia	toyon	hetarb		8.5							30.1	7.3	5.6		9.2				9.2		30.1
Hordeum intercedens	vernal barley	horint						52.6				6.7				2.9			12.4		25.4

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

			CLIMATE								TOPOGRAPHY							GEOLOGY & SOILS			
Scientific Name	**Common Name**	**Code**	**May Cloud Albedo**	**June Cloud Albedo**	**July Cloud Albedo**	**August Cloud Albedo**	**September Cloud Albedo**	**Winter Solstice Solar Insol.**	**Equinox Solar Insolation**	**Summer Solstice Solar Insol.**	**Elevation**	**Aspect**	**Northeastedness**	**Slope**	**Topographic Position Index**	**Terrain Wetness Index**	**Ruggedness**	**Geology**	**2008 Soils**	**1955 Soils**	**NDVI | VEG. PRODUCTIVITY**
Isocoma menziesii var. *menziesii*	Menzie's goldenbush	isomen									5.2	3.6	1.2		5.2	1.9			14.6		68.3
Jepsonia malvifolia - CIE	island jepsonia	jepmal						67.2						8.3				8.8	15.7		
Lepechinia fragrans	fragrant pitcher sage	lepfra			31.1						14.7	11.5		13.6		16.2					12.9
Leptosyne gigantea (Coreopsis gigantea)	giant coreopsis	lepgig			11.7			4.6			51.8	3.7		0.1		0.1			12.0		16.0
Lycium californicum	California boxthorn	lyccal			25.2						20.5			17.4		1.8	7.6		10.4		17.1
Lyonothamnus floribundus ssp. *floribundus* - SCIE	Catalina Island ironwood	lyoflo						75.1				4.2	4.1		0.8	1.0			14.8		
Malacothamnus fasciculatus var. *catalinensis* - SCIE	Catalina Island bushmallow	malfascat	13.3						26.5			20.0		6.2				16.7	17.3		
Malosma laurina	laurel sumac	mallau		5.4						15.0	5.6	12.0	6.6	14.7					40.7		
Muhlenbergia microsperma	littleseed muhly	muhmic										10.2		28.1		10.6	8.1	7.1	18.1		17.8
Opuntia littoralis	coastal prickly pear	opulit						37.5				11.6		1.5		5.7			24.5		19.2
*Pennisetum setaceum**	fountaingrass	penset									89.1			2.9	0.1	0.3					7.6
Peritoma arborea	bladderpod	perarb									66.4	2.3		0.0	0.4	0.2	6.7		24.0		
*Phalaris aquatica**	Harding grass	phaaqu						7.7				8.7		69.2		10.6					3.8
Piperia spp.	orchid	pipspp					38.1	10.8			5.4	3.7				2.3			30.3		9.4

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

			CLIMATE								TOPOGRAPHY							GEOLOGY & SOILS			
Scientific Name	**Common Name**	**Code**	**May Cloud Albedo**	**June Cloud Albedo**	**July Cloud Albedo**	**August Cloud Albedo**	**September Cloud Albedo**	**Winter Solstice Solar Insol.**	**Equinox Solar Insolation**	**Summer Solstice Solar Insol.**	**Elevation**	**Aspect**	**Northeastedness**	**Slope**	**Topographic Position Index**	**Terrain Wetness Index**	**Ruggedness**	**Geology**	**2008 Soils**	**1955 Soils**	**NDVI | VEG. PRODUCTIVITY**
Plagiobothrys collinus	popcornflower	placol								9.1	35.4	9.0		0.6		6.2	27.5		12.2		
Prunus ilicifolia ssp. *lyonii* - CIE	Catalina cherry	pruililyo									8.5	8.0	19.5		5.8	1.3			56.9		
Quercus pacifica - CIE	island scrub oak	quepac									17.7	38.9		13.0					30.4		
Quercus tomentella - CIE	island live oak	quetom	11.0				45.5							5.8	5.5		10.8	6.8	14.6		
Quercus x macdonaldii - CIE	MacDonald oak	quemac									4.9	6.7	1.8	14.4	50.5	6.5			10.6		4.6
Rhamnus pirifolia - CIE	island redberry	rhapir										18.0		0.5	8.3		8.6		64.6		
Rhus integrifolia	lemonade berry	rhuint									32.1	4.7	6.8	15.3		8.4			20.4		12.3
Ribes viburnifolium - CIE	Catalina Island currant	ribvib					7.5	19.4				10.6	10.3	16.2	0.1				35.9		
Salvia apiana	white sage	salapi									34.3			2.8		10.2	2.2		46.5		4.0
Salvia mellifera	black sage	salmel									25.7	4.2		0.3		1.2	0.3	19.3	24.6	21.3	3.1
Sambucus mexicana	blue elderberry	sammex									27.3	31.0		6.6			1.4		30.7		3.0
Scrophularia villosa - CIE	Catalina Island figwort	scrvil						20.9			17.1		8.6	13.5				20.3	19.6		
Sibara filifolia - CIE	island rockcress	sibfil								9.4	17.5	0.6		0.3	1.1	0.6	5.6		47.2	14.9	2.8
*Silybum marianum**	milk thistle	silmar								8.8				55.7	21.4						14.1
Solanum wallacei - CIE	Wallace's nightshade	solwal					59.9				5.0	3.1		0.4	14.5		0.3				16.8
Stipa cernua	nodding needlegrass	sticer								0.4	46.1	5.8	3.8	25.7		4.7	0.3		6.6		6.6
Stipa spp.	needlegrass	stipa								3.2	1.7	6.1	3.3	5.2		2.6			7.7		70.2
*Tamarix ramosissima**	saltcedar	tamram									23.7			42.8	4.4						29.1

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

			CLIMATE								TOPOGRAPHY							GEOLOGY & SOILS			
Scientific Name	**Common Name**	**Code**	**May Cloud Albedo**	**June Cloud Albedo**	**July Cloud Albedo**	**August Cloud Albedo**	**September Cloud Albedo**	**Winter Solstice Solar Insol.**	**Equinox Solar Insolation**	**Summer Solstice Solar Insol.**	**Elevation**	**Aspect**	**Northeastedness**	**Slope**	**Topographic Position Index**	**Terrain Wetness Index**	**Ruggedness**	**Geology**	**2008 Soils**	**1955 Soils**	**NDVI | VEG. PRODUCTIVITY**
Trifolium palmeri - CIE	southern island clover	tripal								0.7	94.5		3.2		0.5				1.1		
Typha domingensis	southern cattail	typdom									10.4	3.1		2.6	9.7	4.7	4.9		56.0		8.6
Xylococcus bicolor	Mission manzanita	xylbic									4.9	13.2		4.2	0.6	3.9	9.7		59.8		3.7

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Appendix E

Co-Occurrence Models of Catalina Island Plants

Prepared for

CATALINA ISLAND CONSERVANCY™

708 Crescent Ave.
Avalon, CA 90704

Prepared by

LAND IQ

Travis Brooks, Restoration Ecologist
Rhona McChesney, Staff

JUNE 2024

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary ..... **iv**

1 Introduction **1**

2 Methods **2**

3 Results **5**

4 Discussion **11**

5 References **19**

6 Supporting Materials Attachment **21**

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1. Diagnostic Species Included in the Analysis. 3

Table 3-1. Diagnostic Species Included in the Analysis. 9

Table 4-1. Potential Vegetation Alliance or Associations from Review of Plant Species Co-Occurrence Models. 14

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3-1 Average Agglomerative Clustering. 6

Figure 3-2 Complete Linkage Agglomerative Clustering. 7

Figure 3-3 Ward's Minimum Variance Clustering. 8

Figure 6-1. High Confidence Assemblages (≥95) – *Distichlis spicata* & *Frankenia salina* 22

Figure 6-2. High Confidence Assemblages (≥95) – *Hordeum intercedens* & *Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii* 23

Figure 6-6. High Confidence Assemblages (≥95) – *Cercocarpus traskiae* & *Cercocarpus betuloides* var. *blancheae* 26

Figure 6-7. High Confidence Assemblages (≥95) – *Achillea millefolium* & *Bromus sitchensis* 28

Figure 6-8. High Confidence Assemblages (≥90) – *Hordeum intercedens, Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii, Cylindropuntia prolifera, Deinandra fasciculata, Elymus triticoides, Anemopsis californica, Typha domingensis, Baccharis salicifolia, Distichlis spicata*, & *Frankenia salina* 30

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-9. High Confidence Assemblages (≥90) – *Anemopsis californica* & *Typha domingensis* 33

Figure 6-10. High Confidence Assemblages (≥90) – *Anemopsis californica*, *Distichlis spicata*, *Frankenia salina*, & *Typha domingensis* 35

Figure 6-8. High Confidence Assemblages (≥90) – *Hordeum intercedens, Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii, Cylindropuntia prolifera, Deinandra fasciculata,* & *Elymus triticoides* 37

Figure 6-12. High Confidence Assemblages (≥90) – *Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus* & *Quercus x macdonaldii* 40

Figure 6-13. High Confidence Assemblages (≥90) – *Dendromecon harfordii* & *Opuntia littoralis* 42

Figure 6-14. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Achillea millefolium* & *Bromus sitchensis* 44

Figure 6-15. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Anemopsis californica,Typha domingensis , Baccharis salicifolia, Distichlis spicata* & *Frankenia salina* 46

Figure 6-16. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Artemisia californica* & *Asclepias fascicularis* 48

Figure 6-17. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Astragalus trichopodus* var. *lonchus, Eriodictyon traskiae* subsp. *traskiae,* & *Malosma laurina* 49

Figure 6-18. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Ceanothus megacarpus* var. *insularis, Cercocarpus traskiae,*& *Cercocarpus betuloides* var. *blancheae* 51

Figure 6-19. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Deinandra clementina, Cleomella arborea,* & *Stipa lepida* 53

Figure 6-20. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Dudleya virens* subsp. *hassei* & *Eriogonum giganteum* var. *giganteum* 55

Figure 6-21. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Elymus condensatus, Lepechinia fragrans, Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus* &*Quercus x macdonaldii* 57

Figure 6-22. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Elymus condensatus* & *Lepechinia fragrans* 59

Figure 6-23. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Elymus glaucus, Elymus condensatus*, & *Lepechinia fragrans* 61

Figure 6-24. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Ericameria palmeri* var. *pachylepis* & *Leptosyne gigantea* 63

Figure 6-25. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Eriodictyon traskiae* subsp. *traskiae* & *Malosma laurina* 64

Figure 6-26. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Cleomella arborea, Deinandra clementina, Lycium californicum, Euphorbia misera,* & *Stipa lepida* 65

Figure 6-27. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Heteromeles arbutifolia* & *Rhus ovata* 66

Figure 6-28. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Quercus tomentella, Achillea millefolium* & *Bromus sitchensis* 67

Figure 6-26. Average Agglomerative Clustering vs. Complete Linkage Agglomerative Clustering 69

Figure 6-30. Average Agglomerative Clustering vs. Ward's Minimum Variance Clustering 70

Figure 6-28. Complete Linkage Agglomerative Clustering vs. Ward's Minimum Variance Clustering 71

Figure 6-32. Pairwise Comparison Results 72

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-33. Outliers - *Abronia maritima* 73
Figure 6-34. Outliers - *Arctostaphylos catalinae* 74
Figure 6-35. Outliers - *Astragalus trichopodus* var. *lonchus* 76
Figure 6-36. Outliers - Baccharis salicifolia 77
Figure 6-37. Outliers - *Ceanothus megacarpus* var. i*nsularis* 80
Figure 6-38. Outliers - *Cylindropuntia prolifera* 82
Figure 6-36. Outliers - *Deinandra fasciculata* 85
Figure 6-40. Outliers - *Elymus condensatus* 88
Figure 6-41. Outliers - *Elymus glaucus* 90
Figure 6-42. Outliers - *Elymus triticoides* 92
Figure 6-43. Outliers - *Encelia californica* 95
Figure 6-44. Outliers - *Eriogonum grande* var. *grande* 97
Figure 6-45. Outliers - *Lepechinia fragrans* 98
Figure 6-46. Outliers - *Quercus pacifica* 100
Figure 6-47. Outliers - Quercus tomentella 102
Figure 6-48. Outliers - *Xylococcus bicolor* 104
Figure 6-49. Outliers - *Genista linifolia* 106

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The introduction of invasive ungulates has led to considerable alterations in the distribution and composition of native communities on Catalina Island, resulting in a limited understanding of pre-European vegetation communities. While a few high-quality reference habitats exist, most of the island lacks suitable reference sites for determining the plant species composition of a restored ecosystem.

To tackle this challenge, we utilized the Consortium of California Herbaria (CCH2) database, containing 17,428 digitized herbarium records from Catalina Island (1831 to 2022). By examining a subset of these records with reliable geospatial information, we explored co-occurrence frequencies of plant species in the herbarium records, which can indicate ecological relationships. To identify high-likelihood species groups, we employed clustering and network analyses.

Our study focused on 50 native and endemic plant species, along with one invasive species (*Genista linifolia*) that is a significant ecological threat. Throughout the various clustering algorithms, numerous diagnostic species formed highly significant clusters (AU ≥80). Network analysis further elucidated the interconnectedness among plants, providing context for clustering results. Some species did not group neatly due to their wide distribution across multiple vegetation communities or their representation of underrepresented communities.

Based on these groupings, we identified potential vegetation alliances and associations following the Manual of California Vegetation (MCV) classification system. These communities can serve as a valuable resource for developing ecologically suitable plant palettes to restore and preserve Catalina Island's unique habitats and biodiversity.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

1 INTRODUCTION

In the early 19th century (circa 1827), Spanish missionaries introduced novel ranching practices and nonnative hoofed mammals (ungulates) to Catalina Island (Preston 1997), which had a significant impact on the native plant species that evolved without exposure to ungulate browsing pressure (e.g., Knapp 2007). This disturbance led to substantial changes in the island's natural vegetation communities and the wildlife habitat they support, including the following legacy impacts: an overrepresentation of browse-resistant plants, loss of nesting habitat for understory nesting birds, and loss of topsoil due to the denuded vegetation cover caused by overbrowsing. Since the removal of feral goats and pigs by the early 2000s, mule deer have been responsible for most of the browsing pressure, which is especially intense during periods of sustained drought that severely limits available browse in the summer and fall.

Due to the lack of a comprehensive floristic record and vegetation community mapping before this ecological shift, our understanding of the historic (pre-European) vegetation communities on Catalina Island remains limited. Fortunately, a few high-quality existing reference native habitats still exist on the island, primarily in areas less accessible such as steep, wetter sites (e.g., eastern leeward, channel-facing watersheds), coastal bluffs, and deep riparian drainages. However, these reference habitats do not provide insight into suitable restoration targets for plant community composition for most of the island.

The Catalina Island Conservancy, which owns and manages 88% of the island (approximately 170 square km), is planning to remove the invasive mule deer, which will allow for passive habitat recovery and more successful active habitat restoration projects. To better understand historical plant associations to inform island habitat restoration planning, we examined historical herbarium records to determine which island plant species most frequently co-occur.

The Consortium of California Herbaria (CCH2) database (https://www.cch2.org/portal/) includes 17,428 digitized herbarium records from Catalina Island, between 1831 to 2022. Most of the historic island herbarium records do not have reliable location information which could be used for fine-grained spatial analysis, such as in recent ecological studies that analyze high precision measurements of species locations (e.g., Losapio et al. 2019, Minor et al. 2009). However, the frequency of co-occurring species in the herbarium record may be indicators of various interactions and dependencies within the ecosystem (e.g., shared ecological niche, mutualism, competition, facilitation, predator-prey relationships, pollinator and seed dispersal, disturbance regimes). We used clustering and network analysis techniques to analyze the relative association between a selection of co-occurring species, independent of spatial distance, to identify high-likelihood groups of species. These groups can be used to help inform the development ecologically suitable plant palettes for restoration of island vegetation communities.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2 METHODS

A set of 51 plants species (Table 2-1) were selected for analysis that were well represented in the CHH2 database: 50 native species that were either possible indicator species of island habitat types and/or island endemic species and one highly invasive species (*Genistia linifolia*) that has very high potential to spread over large areas of the island plants, especially after fire. These species are referred to as "diagnostic species" for the purposes of our analysis. If the diagnostic species co-occurred with another plant species in the herbarium database at least three times, this association was recorded in a co-occurring species dataset.

The co-occurring species data was transformed to presence/absence data for analysis because this approach provides a more objective and reliable representation of species relationships for the purposes of this study. The frequency of co-occurring species observations recorded by botanists in herbarium specimen records may be subjective and vary based on the observer's focus, sampling effort, or other factors. In contrast, a cumulative presence/absence dataset compiled from multiple records offers a more comprehensive view of species co-occurrences and is less prone to observer bias. By using presence/absence data, we can more accurately assess the likelihood of species co-occurring in the same habitat or ecosystem.

We used clustering analysis to place the diagnostic species (objects) into clusters based on the level of similarity between each object and its co-occurring species. Clustering analysis is a technique used to identify natural groupings or clusters within a larger dataset based on the similarities or distances between different objects. In clustering analysis, each data point or observation that is being analyzed and grouped together with similar data points is treated as an individual object. We used three different clustering algorithms (complete agglomerative, average agglomerative, and ward's minimum variance) to control for algorithm-based variations in results.

To better understand the results of the clustering analysis, multiscale bootstrap resampling was conducted for each of the three results. The number of times each cluster was replicated under each algorithm is then expressed through an approximately unbiased (AU) p-value. A high AU p-value indicates that the cluster is more replicable; a low AU p-value indicates that the cluster is less replicable. Diagnostic species that clustered with an AU p-value of ≥80 were considered significant for this study. In addition, each of the dendrograms resulting from the three clustering algorithms underwent pairwise comparison to help understand which objects clustered consistently and which objects clustered anomalously. Analysis was performed in R using scripts provided by Borcard et al. (2018).

Finally, network analysis was used to demonstrate the degree of association between each diagnostic species and the commonly co-occurring species. This type of analysis is computationally intensive, making it difficult to investigate every diagnostic species cluster produced through the cluster analysis.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 2-1. Diagnostic Species Included in the Analysis.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Family Name	Number of Herbarium Records in Study
Abronia maritima	Red sand verbena	Nyctaginaceae	25
Achillea millefolium	Common yarrow	Asteraceae	43
Anemopsis californica	Yerba mansa / lizard tail	Saururaceae	20
Arctostaphylos catalinae	Santa Catalina Island manzanita	Ericaceae	55
Artemisia californica	California sagebrush	Asteraceae	51
Asclepias fascicularis	Narrowleaf milkweed / Mexican whorled milkweed	Apocynaceae	11
Astragalus trichopodus var. *lonchus*	Santa Barbara milk vetch	Fabaceae	71
Baccharis salicifolia	Mule fat	Asteraceae	34
Bromus sitchensis (*B. carinatus*)	California brome	Poaceae	48
Ceanothus arboreus	Feltleaf ceanothus / island ceanothus / island mountain lilac	Rhamnaceae	110
Ceanothus megacarpus var. *insularis*	Island bigpod ceanothus / Island ceanothus	Rhamnaceae	70
Cercocarpus traskiae	Santa Catalina Island mountain-mahogany / Catalina mahogany	Rosaceae	46
Cercocarpus betuloides var. *blancheae*	Island mountain-mahogany	Rosaceae	140
Cleomella arborea	Bladder pod / bladder pod spiderflower and burro-fat	Cleomaceae	36
Cylindropuntia prolifera	Coastal cholla	Cactaceae	4
Deinandra clementina	Island tarplant	Asteraceae	65
Deinandra fasciculata	Clustered tarplant / fascicled spikeweed	Asteraceae	28
Dendromecon harfordii	Channel Islands tree poppy / Harford's tree poppy	Papaveraceae	61
Distichlis spicata	Desert saltgrass	Poaceae	29
Dudleya virens subsp. *hassei*	Green liveforever / bright green dudleya	Crassulaceae	37
Dudleya virens subsp. *insularis*	Island green dudleya	Crassulaceae	22
Elymus condensatus	Giant wildrye	Poaceae	15
Elymus glaucus	Blue wild rye	Poaceae	25
Elymus triticoides	Creeping wild rye / beardless wild rye	Poaceae	9
Encelia californica	California brittlebush	Asteraceae	50
Ericameria palmeri var. *pachylepis*	Thickbracted goldenbush	Asteraceae	14
Eriodictyon traskiae subsp. *traskiae*	Trask's yerba santa	Namaceae	19
Eriogonum giganteum var. *giganteum*	Saint Catherine's lace	Polygonaceae	56

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Family Name	Number of Herbarium Records in Study
Eriogonum grande var. *grande*	Island Buckwheat	Polygonaceae	24
Euphorbia misera	Cliff spurge / coast spurge	Euphorbiaceae	5
Frankenia salina	Alkali heath / alkali seaheath	Frankeniaceae	38
*Genista linifolia**	Mediterranean broom	Fabaceae	36
Heteromeles arbutifolia	Toyon	Rosaceae	94
Hordeum intercedens	Bobtail barley / vernal barley	Poaceae	79
Isocoma menziesii var. *menziesii*	Menzies' goldenbush	Asteraceae	21
Lepechinia fragrans	Island pitchersage / fragrant pitchersage	Lamiaceae	41
Leptosyne gigantea	Giant coreopsis	Asteraceae	25
Lycium californicum	California boxthorn / California desert-thorn	Solanaceae	21
Lyonothamnus floribundus subsp. *floribundus*	Catalina ironwood	Rosaceae	164
Malosma laurina	Laurel sumac	Anacardiaceae	43
Opuntia littoralis	Coastal prickly pear	Cactaceae	8
Quercus pacifica	Island scrub oak / Channel Island scrub oak / Pacific oak	Fagaceae	145
Quercus tomentella	Island oak / island live oak / Channel Island oak	Fagaceae	99
Quercus x macdonaldii	MacDonald's oak / Macdonald oak	Fagaceae	58
Rhamnus pirifolia	Island redberry	Rhamnaceae	132
Rhus integrifolia	Lemonade berry	Anacardiaceae	69
Rhus ovata	Sugar bush / sugar sumac	Anacardiaceae	33
Salvia mellifera	Californian black sage	Lamiaceae	41
Stipa lepida	Foothill needlegrass	Poaceae	11
Typha domingensis	Southern cattail	Typhaceae	22
Xylococcus bicolor	Mission manzanita	Ericaceae	54

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B


Instead, this study focused on conducting a network analysis for highly replicable clusters of diagnostic species with an AU p-value ≥80. This produced networks of diagnostic species and commonly co-occurring species, where each species makes up a network node. A network is a collection of interconnected elements, and in this context, a node is one of those individual elements. Nodes which frequently co-occur are placed together into modules, which are groups of commonly co-occurring species and can be considered potential natural vegetation communities. In the visualization of this study's results, nodes are connected to other nodes by lines, the length of which represent the relative frequency they are observed together. Modules are enclosed within large bubbles and nodes are color coded to indicate module membership. Each of the high-significance diagnostic species clusters were analyzed with network analysis to (1) validate the relationship between diagnostic species predicted by cluster analysis and (2) to examine the relationship between diagnostic species and the larger database of co-occurring species.

Those diagnostic species that do not cluster consistently between at least two cluster algorithms, as identified by pairwise analysis, are referred to as “outlier” species. These diagnostic outlier species were further analyzed with network analysis within the context of their co-occurring species. To create the dataset for the network analysis, the cluster containing the outlier species with the highest AU p-value was isolated, then all diagnostic species within this cluster were included in the analysis. Occasionally, the list of diagnostic species was made more inclusive if the AU p-value of the next cluster up was within 5 points of the highest AU p-value. Overall, this analysis helped to determine if the species are true outliers in the dataset that cannot be reliably interpreted or if the species are so well connected (e.g., common or keystone plants) that they commonly occur in more than one diagnostic species cluster (i.e., potential vegetation community).

3 RESULTS

Many of the diagnostic species consistently formed clusters with high significance (AU ≥80) (Figure 3-1 to Figure 3-3), and many of these clusters also occurred consistently across clustering algorithms (Table 3-1). These specific clusters underwent network analysis and in each of the resulting figures, one of two general patterns emerged. The diagnostic species either (1) all grouped together within the same module or (2) grouped into different modules, with at least one species occurring in a separate module. The specific placement of each diagnostic species within the network and the degree of connectivity each species exhibits also provide valuable information about the species assemblages but are too varied and complex within each figure to broadly generalize. However, these factors can still be considered while analyzing the network analysis results.


Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Including AU p-values obtained through multiscale bootstrap resampling
Black lines indicate an AU p-value ≥95, yellow boxes indicate AU p-value ≥80

Figure 3-1 Average Agglomerative Clustering.


Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Including AU p-values obtained through multiscale bootstrap resampling
Black lines indicate an AU p-value ≥95, yellow boxes indicate AU p-value ≥80

Figure 3-2 Complete Linkage Agglomerative Clustering.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Including AU p-values obtained through multiscale bootstrap resampling
Black lines indicate an AU p-value ≥95, yellow boxes indicate AU p-value ≥80

Figure 3-3 Ward's Minimum Variance Clustering.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 3-1. Diagnostic Species Included in the Analysis.

*Species groupings and associated AU p-values: ** ≥95, * ≥90*

	MBR Complete AU p-value	MBR Average Unweighted AU p-value	MBR Ward's Minimum Variance AU p-value
Distichlis spicata & Frankenia salina **	97	97	98
Hordeum intercedens & Isocoma menziesii var. menziesii **	98	98	97
Cercocarpus traskiae & Cercocarpus betuloides var. Blancheae **	96	97	97
Achillea millefolium & Bromus sitchensis **	83	95	
Anemopsis californica & Typha domingensis *	91	89	92
Lyonothamnus floribundus ssp. floribundus & Quercus x macdonaldii *	81	90	80
Dendromecon harfordii & Opuntia littoralis *	94	92	92
Distichlis spicata, Frankenia salina, Anemopsis californica & Typha domingensis *		93	
Hordeum intercedens, Isocoma menziesii var. menziesii, Cylindropuntia prolifera , Deinandra fasciculata, Elymus triticoides, Anemopsis californica,Typha domingensis , Baccharis salicifolia, Distichlis spicata & Frankenia salina *			94
Hordeum intercedens, Isocoma menziesii var. menziesii, Cylindropuntia prolifera , Deinandra fasciculata & Elymus triticoides *			92
Elymus glaucus, Elymus condensatus & Lepechinia fragrans	84		
Elymus condensatus & Lepechinia fragrans	82	82	
Artemisia californica & Asclepias fascicularis	86	87	89
Heteromeles arbutifolia & Rhus ovata	82		91
Ceanothus megacarpus var. insularis, Cercocarpus traskiae & Cercocarpus betuloides var. Blancheae	80		
Dudleya virens ssp. hassei & Eriogonum giganteum var. giganteum	84		80
Elymus condensatus, Lepechinia fragrans, Lyonothamnus floribundus ssp. floribundus & Quercus x macdonaldii		85	
Astragalus trichopodus var. lonchus, Eriodictyon traskiae ssp. traskiae, & Malosma laurina		81	82
Eriodictyon traskiae ssp. traskiae & Malosma laurina		85	
Ericameria palmeri var. pachylepis & Leptosyne gigantea			82
Euphorbia misera, Lycium californicum, Deinandra clementina, Cleomella arborea, & Stipa lepida			80
Deinandra clementina, Cleomella arborea, & Stipa lepida			84
Cleomella arborea, & Stipa lepida			81
Quercus tomentella, Achillea millefolium & Bromus sitchensis			82
Achillea millefolium & Bromus sitchensis			87
Anemopsis californica,Typha domingensis , Baccharis salicifolia, Distichlis spicata & Frankenia salina			89

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Distichlis spicata and *Frankenia salina* (Figure 6-1), for example, organized in accordance with the first pattern - both diagnostic species were placed within proximity of one another within the same module. The likelihood of co-occurrence between *Distichlis spicata* and *Frankenia salina* appears to be higher than the average likelihood of co-occurrence with many of the other associated species. Additionally, both *Distichlis spicata* and *Frankenia salina* have connections to every other species in the network, indicating that they are highly connected within the larger set of plants depicted in Figure 6-1.

A different relationship occurs between *Hordeum intercedens* and *Isocoma menziesii var. menziesii*, adhering more closely to the second pattern. In Figure 6-2, *Hordeum intercedens* is placed centrally within the co-occurrence network and is highly connected to species within both modules. *Isocoma menziesii* var*. menziesii*, on the other hand, is isolated within a separate module from *Hordeum intercedens,* has a lower likelihood of co-occurrence with many of the species within this module, and has no direct connections to the module within which *Hordeum intercedens* is placed. This indicates that *Hordeum intercedens* and *Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii* do not actually co-occur together more frequently than they do with the other co-occurring species included in this analysis. However, both *Hordeum intercedens* and *Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii* have similar co-occurring species groupings.

A more nuanced version of the second pattern can be seen in Figure 6-8, showing how *Hordeum intercedens, Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii, Cylindropuntia prolifera, Deinandra fasciculata* and *Elymus triticoides* relate to one another within a broader vegetation community. Once again, *Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii* is isolated on the edge of its module*,* doesn't have a high likelihood of co-occurrence with many of the species within this module, and has no direct connections to species in any other module. However, in this instance, *Cylindropuntia prolifera* is placed within the same module as *Isocoma menziesii* var*. menziesii* and the two species are directly connected to each other. A very similar relationship occurs between *Deinandra fasciculata* and *Elymus triticoides,* where *Elymus triticoides* exhibits a similar intramodular placement to *Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii.* However, even though *Deinandra fasciculata* occurs within the same module as *Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii*, the two species aren't directly connected. Finally, *Hordeum intercedens* is located within a separate module. Evidently, a more complex relationship is expressed within Figure 6-8, where all diagnostic species are part of a broader vegetation community but may not necessarily all co-occur spatially.

The pairwise comparison of the three clustering algorithms identified 17 diagnostic species which clustered anomalously (not consistently) between at least two of the clustering result dendrograms (Figure 6-26 to Figure 6-28). Network analysis was used to explain why these species might have been clustering anomalously and revealed a variety of complex interspecific relationships. According to the results of this analysis, diagnostic species were either (1) centrally located in the species assemblage, with many intermodular connections or (2) isolated, with few to no intermodular connections.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

In Figure 6-36, *Deinandra fasciculata* is positioned centrally within the co-occurrence network and is highly connected to many of the other species both within its own module and within adjacent modules. However, this pattern isn't ubiquitous. *Abronia maritima* (Figure 6-33), for example, is placed on the edge of the species co-occurrence network within an isolated module. Additionally, this species only appears to be connected to species within its own module and has no direct association with co-occurring species in separate modules. *Baccharis salicifolia* (Figure 6-36) exhibits a similar pattern and is located on the edge of its module. However, *Baccharis salicifolia* does have connections to several other species within different modules.

4 DISCUSSION

Each of the results from this analysis should be individually considered. However, each diagnostic species cluster and diagnostic species outlier have associated co-occurrence network analyses from which the broader ecological patterns discussed above can be discerned and placed in the context of existing research.

For example, *Distichlis spicata* and *Frankenia salina* (Figure 6-1) exhibit a strong association with one another and are grouped together closely within the same module. Both *Distichlis spicata* and *Frankenia salina* are distributed along the California coast, having been shown to occur together in high marsh environments (Greer 2014, Tanner et al. 2022). Moreover, a study by Shikuzawa et al. (2024) demonstrates that *Distichlis spicata* and *Frankenia salina* serve different ecosystem functions while being adapted to similar environmental conditions. This could imply that the two species are similar enough to coexist while still occupying separate niches, reducing the threat of competition. This provides evidence for the claim that species which clustered together and appeared within the same module by network analysis, such as *Distichlis spicata* and *Frankenia salina,* might be more likely to co-occur.

While the relationship between *Distichlis spicata* and *Frankenia salina* was represented broadly within the literature, the relationship between many of the other diagnostic species previously discussed is less intensely researched. Literature on the relationship between *Hordeum intercedens* and *Isocoma menziesii var. menziesii*, diagnostic species which weren't placed into the same module through the network analysis (Figure 6-2), is not readily available. However, at least one paper cites that *Hordeum intercedens* and *Lycium californicum* grew near one another. Interestingly, *Lycium californicum* is one of the main species that co-occurs with both diagnostic species in the network analysis (Laskey et al. 2020). As such, species which clustered together yet didn't appear within the same module in the network analysis might be likely to share co-occurring species assemblages but not actually occur together.

When more diagnostic species are included in the network analysis, as was seen in Figure 6-8, the network analysis results get more complicated but likely represents real-word vegetation communities more accurately. In Figure 6-8, each of the diagnostic species are spread out across three modules, with some species grouped together

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

within the same module and other species grouped within different modules. *Isocoma menziesii var. menziesii* is again included within this analysis and is again located in a separate module from *Hordeum intercedens* (as was true in Figure 6-2). However, once more diagnostic species were included in the analysis which produced Figure 6-8, *Isocoma menziesii var. menziesii* grouped together with a different diagnostic species - *Cylindropuntia prolifera*. This indicates that interspecific relationships revealed in these network analyses are restricted by the selection of species included as part of the initial input.

Research involving *Deinandra fasciculata* (Figure 6-36) also elucidates one of the patterns exhibited within the diagnostic outlier species co-occurrence network. Specifically, *Deinandra fasciculata* is likely placed at the center of this network because it is a highly abundant grassland forb (Nabors et al. 2018, Watts et al. 2011). In other words, this species might have been an outlier because its abundance allows for the species to exist within many different vegetation communities. However, both *Abronia maritima* (Figure 6-33) *and Baccharis salicifolia (Figure 6-36)* are also relatively abundant species but don't necessarily occur at the center of their associated co-occurrence networks. This could imply that these species don't commonly co-occur with any of the diagnostic species included within the cluster analysis but might still consistently exist within an assemblage of co-occurring species. In this case, it may be possible that these outlier species are characteristic of a species assemblage not represented within the dataset for this analysis.

Overall, the species co-occurrence network analysis sheds light on connectedness between plants that may not have been initially evident in the clustering analysis. Even though a set of diagnostic species may have initially clustered together, network analysis helps to reveal whether this clustering is because the species co-occurs or if this clustering is because the species share a set of associated species without co-occurring themselves. Moreover, the relationships demonstrated through each network analysis may be restricted by the input dataset; the diagnostic species included in each analysis dictate how the network result is constructed. Additionally, species which don't fit neatly into the clustering analysis results may easily be present because the outlier species is widespread and belongs to a multitude of potential island vegetation communities. In this situation, a diagnostic outlier species might appear centrally within the network analysis. However, not all outliers exhibit this central placement within the respective co-occurrence network, possibly because these species are part a vegetation community not represented within the dataset for this analysis.

Regardless, all figures developed through this analysis depict species co-occurrence patterns and can be placed into the context of different ecological and physiological parameters to provide a more comprehensive view of interspecific interactions. The results of the clustering and network analyses provide a basis for future research which takes into consideration factors such as ecological niche overlap, competition, and variation in terrain and climate to describe vegetation communities on Catalina Island more fully.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

To facilitate the creation of ecologically appropriate habitat restoration plant palettes, we identified vegetation assemblages based on high-likelihood groupings of co-occurring plants. Drawing from the Manual of California Vegetation (MCV) nomenclature and classification system, we present potential Vegetation Alliances or Associations in Table 4-1.

These assemblages can serve as a valuable resource for informing the development of ecologically suitable plant palettes, aiding in the restoration of the island's vegetation communities. By considering the natural co-occurrence patterns of plant species, these groupings will help optimize the selection of species for reintroduction efforts, ultimately enhancing the ecological integrity and resilience of restored habitats on Catalina Island.

.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table 4-1. Potential Vegetation Alliance or Associations from Review of Plant Species Co-Occurrence Models.

Catalina Island 2000 Vegetation Map Classification (Knapp 2005)	Classification by Junak et al. (2007) in Terrestrial Vegetation of California	Potential Macro Group	Potential Vegetation Group	Potential MCV Vegetation Alliance or Association	Modeled Diagnostic Species	Selected Corresponding Network Analysis Figure No.
Island Woodland (IW)	Island woodland	California Forest and Woodland	Californian broadleaf forest and woodland	***Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus* Forest & Woodland Association** (*Quercus tomentella - Lyonothamnus floribundus* Forest & Woodland Alliance)	*Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus*	Figure 6-12 Figure 6-21
Island Woodland (IW)	Island woodland	California Forest and Woodland	Californian broadleaf forest and woodland	***Prunus ilicifolia subsp. lyonii* Forest & Woodland Association** (*Quercus tomentella - Lyonothamnus floribundus* Forest & Woodland Alliance)	*Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus*	Figure 6-12 Figure 6-21
Island Woodland (IW)	Island woodland	California Forest and Woodland	Californian broadleaf forest and woodland	***Quercus tomentella* Forest & Woodland Association** (*Quercus tomentella - Lyonothamnus floribundus* Forest & Woodland Alliance)	*Quercus tomentella*	Figure 6-28 Figure 6-47
Island Chaparral (IC)	Island chaparral	California Chaparral	Californian maritime chaparral	***Arctostaphylos catalinae* Shrubland Association** (*Arctostaphylos* spp. Shrubland Alliance)	*Arctostaphylos catalinae*	Figure 6-34
Island Chaparral (IC)	Island chaparral	California Chaparral	Californian maritime chaparral	***Quercus pacifica* Shrubland Association** (*Quercus dumosa - Quercus pacifica* Shrubland Alliance)	*Cercocarpus betuloides* var. blancheae, *Cercocarpus traskiae, Heteromeles arbutifolia, Quercus pacifica,* and *Quercus* x *macdonaldii*	Figure 6-6 Figure 6-12 Figure 6-19 Figure 6-27 Figure 6-46

Catalina Island 2000 Vegetation Map Classification (Knapp 2005)	Classification by Junak et al. (2007) in Terrestrial Vegetation of California	Potential Macro Group	Potential Vegetation Group	Potential MCV Vegetation Alliance or Association	Modeled Diagnostic Species	Selected Corresponding Network Analysis Figure No.
Island Chaparral (IC)	Island chaparral	California Chaparral	Californian xeric chaparral	***Adenostoma fasciculatum - Salvia* spp. Shrubland Alliance**	*Cercocarpus traskiae, Eriodictyon traskiae* subsp. *traskiae, Lepechinia fragrans,* and *Malosma laurina*	Figure 6-17 Figure 6-18 Figure 6-21 Figure 6-22 Figure 6-23 Figure 6-25 Figure 6-45
Island Chaparral (IC)	Island chaparral	California Chaparral	Californian xeric chaparral	***Ceanothus megacarpus var. insularis* Shrubland Association** (*Ceanothus megacarpus* Shrubland Alliance)	*Ceanothus megacarpus* var. *insularis*	Figure 6-18 Figure 6-37
Island Chaparral (IC)	Island chaparral	California Chaparral	Californian xeric chaparral	***Xylococcus bicolor - Rhus integrifolia* Shrubland Association** (*Xylococcus bicolor* Shrubland Alliance)	*Xylococcus bicolor*	Figure 6-48
Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS)	Coastal sage scrub	California Coastal Scrub	Central and South Coastal Californian coastal sage scrub	***Artemisia californica - Opuntia littoralis* Shrubland Association** (*Artemisia californica* Shrubland Alliance)	*Artemisia californica*	Figure 6-16 Figure 6-20 Figure 6-37
Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS)	Coastal sage scrub	California Coastal Scrub	Central and South Coastal Californian coastal sage scrub	***Encelia californica* Shrubland Association** (*Encelia californica - Eriogonum cinereum* Shrubland Alliance)	*Encelia californica*	Figure 6-43
Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS)	Coastal sage scrub	California Coastal Scrub	Central and South Coastal Californian coastal sage scrub	***Eriogonum grande* var. *grande* Shrubland Association** (*Eriogonum arborescens - Eriogonum grande* Shrubland Alliance)	*Eriogonum grande* var. *grande*	Figure 6-44

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Catalina Island 2000 Vegetation Map Classification (Knapp 2005)	Classification by Junak et al. (2007) in Terrestrial Vegetation of California	Potential Macro Group	Potential Vegetation Group	Potential MCV Vegetation Alliance or Association	Modeled Diagnostic Species	Selected Corresponding Network Analysis Figure No.
Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS)	Coastal sage scrub	California Coastal Scrub	Central and South Coastal Californian coastal sage scrub	***Salvia mellifera* Shrubland Alliance**	*Rhus ovata*	Figure 6-27
Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS)	Coastal sage scrub	California Coastal Scrub	Central and South Coastal Californian coastal sage scrub	***Salvia apiana* Shrubland Alliance**	Astragalus trichopodus var. lonchus	Figure 6-17 Figure 6-35
Coastal Bluff Scrub (CBS)	Coastal bluff scrub	Viscaino-Baja California Desert Scrub	Coastal Baja California Norte maritime succulent scrub	***Deinandra clementina* - *Eriogonum giganteum* Shrubland Alliance**	*Deinandra clementina*	Figure 6-19
Coastal Bluff Scrub (CBS)	Coastal bluff scrub	Viscaino-Baja California Desert Scrub	Coastal Baja California Norte maritime succulent scrub	***Dudleya virens subsp. hassei* Succulent Scrub Association** *(Dudleya greenei - Dudleya spp.* Succulent Scrub Alliance*)*	*Dudleya virens* subsp. *hassei*	Figure 6-20
Coastal Bluff Scrub (CBS)	Coastal bluff scrub	Viscaino-Baja California Desert Scrub	Coastal Baja California Norte maritime succulent scrub	***Leptosyne (Coreopsis) gigantea* Shrubland Alliance**	*Leptosyne gigantea*	Figure 6-24 Figure 6-43
Coastal Bluff Scrub (CBS)	Coastal bluff scrub	Viscaino-Baja California Desert Scrub	Coastal Baja California Norte maritime succulent scrub	***Opuntia littoralis* - *Opuntia oricola* - *Cylindropuntia prolifera* Shrubland Alliance**	*Cleomella arborea, Cylindropuntia prolifera,* and *Stipa lepida*	Figure 6-8 Figure 6-19
Coastal Bluff Scrub (CBS)	Coastal bluff scrub	Viscaino-Baja California Desert Scrub	Coastal Baja California Norte maritime succulent scrub	***Eriogonum giganteum* var. *giganteum* Shrubland Association** (*Deinandra clementina* - *Eriogonum giganteum* Shrubland Alliance)	*Eriogonum giganteum* var. *giganteum*	Figure 6-20

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Catalina Island 2000 Vegetation Map Classification (Knapp 2005)	Classification by Junak et al. (2007) in Terrestrial Vegetation of California	Potential Macro Group	Potential Vegetation Group	Potential MCV Vegetation Alliance or Association	Modeled Diagnostic Species	Selected Corresponding Network Analysis Figure No.
Maritime Cactus Scrub (MCS)	Maritime cactus scrub	Viscaino-Baja California Desert Scrub	Coastal Baja California Norte maritime succulent scrub	***Lycium californicum* Shrubland Alliance**	*Cleomella arborea, Cylindropuntia prolifera, Deinandra clementina, Euphorbia misera, Lycium californicum,* and *Stipa lepida*	Figure 6-8 Figure 6-8 Figure 6-26 Figure 6-38
Mulefat Scrub (MFS)	No Equivalent Classification	Southwestern North American Riparian, Flooded and Swamp Forest	Southwestern North American riparian/wash scrub	***Baccharis salicifolia* Shrubland Alliance**	*Baccharis salicifolia*	Figure 6-36 Figure 6-42 Figure 6-46
Coastal Marsh (CM)	Coastal marsh	North American Pacific Coastal Salt Marsh	Temperate Pacific tidal salt and brackish meadow	***Distichlis spicata* Herbaceous Alliance**	*Cressa truxillensis, Distichlis spicata,* and *Frankenia salina*	Figure 6-2 Figure 6-8 Figure 6-10 Figure 6-15
Southern Beach and Dune (SBD)	Southern beach and dune	Vancouverian Coastal Dune and Bluff	Vancouverian/Pacific dune mat	***Ambrosia chamissonis - Abronia maritima - Cakile maritima* Herbaceous Association** (*Abronia latifolia - Ambrosia chamissonis* Herbaceous Alliance)	*Abronia maritima*	Figure 6-33 Figure 6-44
Vernal Ponds and Reservoirs (VPR)	Freshwater wetland	Western North America Vernal Pool	Californian mixed annual/perennial freshwater vernal pool / swale bottomland	***Deinandra fasciculata* Herbaceous Alliance**	*Hordeum intercedens* and *Deinandra fasciculata*	Figure 6-2 Figure 6-8 Figure 6-8 Figure 6-36 Figure 6-36

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Catalina Island 2000 Vegetation Map Classification (Knapp 2005)	Classification by Junak et al. (2007) in Terrestrial Vegetation of California	Potential Macro Group	Potential Vegetation Group	Potential MCV Vegetation Alliance or Association	Modeled Diagnostic Species	Selected Corresponding Network Analysis Figure No.
Vernal Ponds and Reservoirs (VPR)	Freshwater wetland	Western North American Freshwater Marsh	Arid West freshwater emergent marsh	***Typha* spp. Herbaceous Alliance**	*Anemopsis californica* and *Typha domingensis*	Figure 6-8 Figure 6-9 Figure 6-10 Figure 6-15
Grassland (GR)	Valley and foothill grassland	Warm Semi-Desert/Mediterranean Alkali-Saline Wetland	Southwestern North American alkali marsh/seep vegetation	***Elymus (Leymus) triticoides* - *Bromus* spp. - *Avena* spp. Herbaceous Association** (*Leymus cinereus - Leymus triticoides* Herbaceous Alliance)	*Elymus triticoides* and *Deinandra fasciculata*	Figure 6-8 Figure 6-8 Figure 6-42
Grassland (GR)	Valley and foothill grassland	Western North American Temperate Grassland and Meadow	Western dry upland perennial grassland	***Bromus sitchensis (carinatus)* - *Elymus glaucus* Herbaceous Alliance**	*Achillea millefolium* and *Bromus sitchensis*	Figure 6-7 Figure 6-14 Figure 6-28
Grassland (GR)	Valley and foothill grassland	California Annual and Perennial Grassland	California annual herb/grass	***Amsinckia* spp. - *Phacelia* spp. Herbaceous Alliance**	*Ericameria palmeri var. pachylepis*	Figure 6-24
Grassland (GR)	Valley and foothill grassland	California Annual and Perennial Grassland	California perennial grassland	***Elymus (Leymus) condensatus* Herbaceous Alliance**	*Elymus condensatus*	Figure 6-21 Figure 6-22 Figure 6-23 Figure 6-40
Nonnative Scrub (NNS)	Nonnative vegetation	California Coastal Scrub	Naturalized non-native Mediterranean scrub	***Genista linifolia Shrubland Semi-Natural Association*** *(Cytisus scoparius - Genista monspessulana - Cotoneaster spp. Shrubland Semi-Natural Alliance)*	*Genista linifolia*	Figure 6-49

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

5 REFERENCES

Borcard, Daniel & Gillet, François & Legendre, Pierre. 2011. Numerical Ecology With R. 10.1007/978-1-4419-7976-6.

Greer, K. 2014. Spatial distribution and habitat assessment of *Panoquina errans* (Lepidoptera: Hesperiidae) in San Diego County, California. *The Journal of Research on the Lepidoptera, 47,* 17-27. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/1f57/6b32362558f513ca0b124e168bb0c238d74d.pdf

Junak, S., D. A. Knapp, J. R. Haller, R. Philbrick, A. Schoenherr, T. Keeler-Wolf. 2012. 'The California Channel Islands', in Michael Barbour (ed.), *Terrestrial Vegetation of California*, 3rd edn (Oakland, CA, 2007; online edition, California Scholarship Online, 22 Mar. 2012).

Knapp, D. A. 2007. Changes in oak distribution and density by decade on Santa Catalina Island, 1943 to 2005. *Oak ecosystem restoration on Santa Catalina Island, California. Proceedings of an on-island workshop*, 47-52.

Laskey, H., Crook, E.D., & Kimball, S. 2020. Analysis of Rare Plant Occurrence Data for Monitoring Prioritization. *diversity, 12(11),* 427. https://doi.org/10.3390/d12110427

Losapio, G., de la Cruz, M., Escudero, A., Schmid, B., & Schöb, C. 2018. The assembly of a plant network in alpine vegetation. *J Veg Sci, 29,* 999–1006. https://doi.org/10.1111/jvs.12681

Minor, E.S., Tessel, S.M., Engelhardt, K.A.M. & Lookingbill, T.R. 2009. The role of landscape connectivity in assembling exotic plant communities: a network analysis. *Ecology, 90,* 1802-1809. https://doi.org/10.1890/08-1015.1

Nabors, A.J., Cen, H.J., Hung, K.L.J., Kohn, J.R., & Holway, D. A. 2018. The effect of removing numerically dominant, non-native honey bees on seed set of a native plant. *Oecologia, 186*, 281-289. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-017-4009-y

Preston, W. 1997. Serpent in the Garden: Environmental Change in Colonial California. *California History*, *76(2/3),* 260–298. https://doi.org/10.2307/25161669

Shikuzawa, J., Watson, E.B., Tanner, K., Wilburn, B., Fork, S.K., Larson, S., Fountain, M.C., Thomsen, A., & Wasson, K. 2024. Ecosystem functions of plant diversity: Comparisons from a large-scale marsh restoration experiment in California, USA. *Ecosphere, 15(1),* e4742. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.4742

Tanner, K. E., Wasson, K., & Parker, I. M. 2022. Competition rather than facilitation affects plant performance across an abiotic stress gradient in a restored California salt marsh. *Restoration Ecology, 31(7),* e13746. https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.13746

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Watts, S.M., Dodson, C.D., & Reichman, O.J. 2011. The Roots of Defense: Plant Resistance and Tolerance to Belowground Herbivory. *PLOS One, 6(4),* e18463. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0018463

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B


6 SUPPORTING MATERIALS ATTACHMENT

This section includes additional figures and tables that support the conclusions of the report and can be used as a reference for the development of site-specific habitat restoration projects.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-1. High Confidence Assemblages (≥95) – *Distichlis spicata* & *Frankenia salina*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Diagnostic Species Table: *Distichlis spicata* & *Frankenia salina*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Blue Node)
*Atriplex prostrata**	*Cressa truxillensis*
*Atriplex semibaccata**	*Cynodon dactylon**
Bolboschoenus maritimus subsp. *paludosus*	***Distichlis spicata***
Jaumea carnosa	***Frankenia salina***
*Mesembryanthemum crystallinum**	*Juncus acutus* subsp. *leopoldii*
Opuntia littoralis	*Melilotus indicus**
	*Pennisetum clandestinum**
	*Polypogon monspeliensis**
	Rhus integrifolia
	Xanthium orientale

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-2. High Confidence Assemblages (≥95) – *Hordeum intercedens* & *Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Diagnostic Species Table: *Hordeum intercedens* & *Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii*

Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Blue Node)
Acmispon micranthus	*Ammannia coccinea*
Artemisia californica	*Baccharis pilularis*
Atriplex coulteri	*Bromus rubens**
*Atriplex semibaccata**	*Cylindropuntia prolifera*
*Avena barbata**	*Cynodon dactylon**
*Avena fatua**	*Encelia californica*
Beta vulgaris subsp. *maritima**	*Extriplex californica*
Bloomeria crocea	*Isocoma menziesii*
*Brachypodium distachyon**	***Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii***
*Bromus diandrus**	*Lycium californicum*
*Bromus hordeaceus**	*Opuntia littoralis*
*Bromus madritensis**	*Phalaris aquatica**
Calochortus catalinae	*Polypogon monspeliensis**
*Centaurea melitensis**	*Pseudognaphalium luteoalbum**
Deinandra fasciculata	*Stipa miliacea* var. *miliacea**
*Desmazeria rigida**	*Xanthium spinosum**
*Erodium botrys**	
*Erodium brachycarpum**	
*Erodium cicutarium**	
*Erodium moschatum**	
*Festuca bromoides**	
*Festuca myuros**	
Harpagonella palmeri	
*Hedypnois rhagadioloides**	
Hordeum intercedens	
*Hordeum murinum**	
*Hypochaeris glabra**	
*Lamarckia aurea**	
Lasthenia californica	
Layia platyglossa	
Lepidium nitidum	
Logfia arizonica	
*Logfia gallica**	
Lupinus concinnus	
*Lysimachia arvensis**	
*Medicago polymorpha**	
*Melilotus indicus**	
*Mesembryanthemum nodiflorum**	
Microseris douglasii	
Opuntia littoralis x *oricola*	
Opuntia oricola	
*Phalaris minor**	
*Plantago coronopus**	
Plantago erecta	
Rhus integrifolia	
*Sonchus oleraceus**	
*Spergularia villosa**	
Stebbinsoseris heterocarpa	

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B


Stipa lepida	
Stipa pulchra	
*Torilis nodosa**	
Trifolium albopurpureum	

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-6. High Confidence Assemblages (≥95) – *Cercocarpus traskiae* & *Cercocarpus betuloides* var. *blancheae*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Diagnostic Species Table: *Cercocarpus traskiae; Cercocarpus betuloides* var. *blancheae*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Blue Node)
Adenostoma fasciculatum	*Baccharis pilularis*
Brickellia californica	*Baccharis salicifolia*
Ceanothus megacarpus var. *insularis*	***Cercocarpus betuloides var. blancheae***
Cercocarpus traskiae	*Sambucus mexicana*
Heteromeles arbutifolia	*Symphoricarpos mollis*
Isocoma menziesii	*Toxicodendron diversilobum*
Malosma laurina	
Opuntia littoralis	
Quercus pacifica (previously *Q. dumosa*)	
Rhus integrifolia	
Rhus ovata	
Salvia mellifera	

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-7. High Confidence Assemblages (≥95) – *Achillea millefolium* & *Bromus sitchensis*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B


Diagnostic Species Table: *Achillea millefolium* & *Bromus sitchensis*

Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Blue Node)
Achillea millefolium	*Acmispon americanus* var. *americanus*
Amsinckia intermedia	*Acourtia microcephala*
Artemisia californica	*Adiantum jordanii*
*Bromus diandrus**	*Avena fatua**
*Bromus hordeaceus**	*Baccharis pilularis*
Daucus pusillus	*Bowlesia incana*
Diplacus puniceus	*Brachypodium distachyon**
Epilobium canum subsp. *canum*	*Bromus madritensis**
Erythranthe guttata	***Bromus sitchensis* (*B. carinatus*)**
*Hypochaeris glabra**	*Centaurea melitensis**
Lupinus bicolor	*Chenopodium californicum*
Opuntia littoralis	*Claytonia parviflora*
Opuntia littoralis x oricola	*Eriogonum giganteum* var. *giganteum*
Poa secunda	*Festuca myuros**
Rhamnus pirifolia	*Galium angustifolium*
Rhus integrifolia	*Gamochaeta ustulata*
Salvia apiana	*Lathyrus vestitus* var. *vestitus*
Sanicula arguta	*Logfia gallica**
Thysanocarpus laciniatus	*Lonicera hispidula*
	Malosma laurina
	Melica imperfecta
	Pentagramma triangularis
	Pholistoma racemosum
	Plagiobothrys canescens
	Polypodium californicum
	Pseudognaphalium biolettii
	Quercus pacifica
	Salix lasiolepis
	Sambucus mexicana
	*Silene gallica**
	Solanum douglasii
	Sonchus asper subsp. *asper**
	*Sonchus oleraceus**
	*Torilis nodosa**
	Trifolium depauperatum var. *amplectens*
	Triodanis biflora
	Uropappus lindleyi
	Yabea microcarpa

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-8. High Confidence Assemblages (≥90) – *Hordeum intercedens, Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii, Cylindropuntia prolifera, Deinandra fasciculata, Elymus triticoides, Anemopsis californica, Typha domingensis, Baccharis salicifolia, Distichlis spicata*, & *Frankenia salina*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Diagnostic Species Table: *Hordeum intercedens, Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii, Cylindropuntia prolifera, Deinandra fasciculata, Elymus triticoides, Anemopsis californica, Typha domingensis, Baccharis salicifolia, Distichlis spicata,* & *Frankenia salina*

Green Module (Green Node)	Yellow Module (Light Blue Node)	Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Yellow Node)	Purple Module (Dark Blue Node)
Anemopsis californica	*Ammannia coccinea*	*Acmispon micranthus*	*Artemisia californica*	*Atriplex prostrata**
Beta vulgaris subsp. *maritima**	*Baccharis pilularis*	*Atriplex coulteri*	*Astragalus trichopodus*	***Baccharis salicifolia***
*Cirsium vulgare**	*Bromus rubens**	*Avena barbata**	*Atriplex semibaccata**	*Bolboschoenus maritimus* subsp. *paludosus*
Juncus mexicanus	***Cylindropuntia prolifera***	*Bloomeria crocea*	*Avena fatua**	*Cressa truxillensis*
*Sonchus oleraceus**	*Encelia californica*	*Bromus diandrus**	*Brachypodium distachyon**	*Cynodon dactylon**
	Extriplex californica	*Bromus madritensis**	*Bromus hordeaceus**	***Distichlis spicata***
	Isocoma menziesi	*Desmazeria rigida**	*Centaurea melitensis**	***Frankenia salina***
	Isocoma menziesii var. menziesii	*Erodium botrys**	***Deinandra fasciculata***	*Jaumea carnosa*
	Lycium californicum	*Erodium cicutarium**	***Elymus triticoides***	*Juncus acutus* subsp. *leopoldii*
	Opuntia littoralis	*Erodium moschatum**	*Erodium brachycarpum**	*Melilotus indicus**
	*Phalaris aquatica**	*Festuca bromoides**	*Lactuca saligna**	*Mesembryanthemum crystallinum**
	*Polypogon monspeliensis**	*Festuca myuros**	*Opuntia oricola*	*Nicotiana glauca**
	*Pseudognaphalium luteoalbum**	*Harpagonella palmeri*	*Stipa pulchra*	*Pennisetum clandestinum**
	Stipa miliacea var. *miliacea**	*Hedypnois rhagadioloides**		*Rhus integrifolia*
	*Xanthium spinosum**	***Hordeum intercedens***		***Typha domingensis***
		*Hordeum murinum**		*Xanthium orientale*
		*Hypochaeris glabra**		
		*Lamarckia aurea**		
		Lasthenia californica		
		Layia platyglossa		
		Lepidium nitidum		
		Logfia arizonica		
		*Logfia gallica**		
		Lupinus concinnus		
		*Lysimachia arvensis**		
		*Medicago polymorpha**		

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B


		*Mesembryanthemum nodiflorum**		
		Microseris douglasii		
		Opuntia littoralis x oricola		
		*Phalaris minor**		
		*Plantago coronopus**		
		Plantago erecta		
		*Spergularia villosa**		
		Stebbinsoseris heterocarpa		
		Stipa lepida		
		*Torilis nodosa**		
		Trifolium albopurpureum		

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-9. High Confidence Assemblages (≥90) – *Anemopsis californica* & *Typha domingensis*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Diagnostic Species Table: *Anemopsis californica* & *Typha domingensis*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Blue Node)
Anemopsis californica	*Distichlis spicata*
Baccharis pilularis	*Isocoma menziesii*
Beta vulgaris subsp. *maritima**	*Melilotus indicus**
*Cirsium vulgare**	*Nicotiana glauca**
Juncus mexicanus	*Rhus integrifolia*
*Sonchus oleraceus**	***Typha domingensis***

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-10. High Confidence Assemblages (≥90) – *Anemopsis californica, Distichlis spicata, Frankenia salina*, & *Typha domingensis*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Diagnostic Species Table: *Distichlis spicata, Frankenia salina, Anemopsis californica,* & *Typha domingensis*


Blue Module (Blue Node)	Red Module (Orange Node)
*Atriplex prostrata**	***Anemopsis californica***
*Atriplex semibaccata**	*Baccharis pilularis*
Bolboschoenus maritimus subsp. *paludosus*	*Beta vulgaris* subsp. *maritima**
Cressa truxillensis	*Cirsium vulgare**
*Cynodon dactylon**	*Isocoma menziesii*
Distichlis spicata	*Juncus mexicanus*
Frankenia salina	*Melilotus indicus**
Jaumea carnosa	*Nicotiana glauca**
Juncus acutus subsp. *leopoldii*	*Rhus integrifolia*
*Mesembryanthemum crystallinum**	*Sonchus oleraceus**
Opuntia littoralis	***Typha domingensis***
*Pennisetum clandestinum**	
*Polypogon monspeliensis**	
Xanthium orientale	

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-8. High Confidence Assemblages (≥90) – *Hordeum intercedens, Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii, Cylindropuntia prolifera, Deinandra fasciculata,* & *Elymus triticoides*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Diagnostic Species Table: *Hordeum intercedens, Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii, Cylindropuntia prolifera, Deinandra fasciculata,* & *Elymus triticoides*

Green Module (Light Blue Node)	**Red Module (Orange Node)**	**Purple Module (Green Node)**
Ammannia coccinea	*Acmispon micranthus*	*Artemisia californica*
Baccharis pilularis	*Atriplex coulteri*	*Astragalus trichopodus*
*Bromus rubens**	*Avena barbata**	*Atriplex semibaccata**
Cylindropuntia prolifera	*Beta vulgaris* subsp. *maritima**	*Avena fatua**
*Cynodon dactylon**	*Bloomeria crocea*	*Brachypodium distachyon**
Encelia californica	*Bromus diandrus**	*Bromus hordeaceus**
Extriplex californica	*Bromus madritensis**	*Centaurea melitensis**
Isocoma menziesii	*Calochortus catalinae*	***Deinandra fasciculata***
Isocoma menziesii var. menziesii	*Desmazeria rigida**	***Elymus triticoides***
Lycium californicum	*Erodium botrys**	*Erodium brachycarpum**
Opuntia littoralis	*Erodium cicutarium**	*Lactuca saligna**
*Phalaris aquatica**	*Erodium moschatum**	*Opuntia oricola*
*Polypogon monspeliensis**	*Festuca bromoides**	*Rhus integrifolia*
*Pseudognaphalium luteoalbum**	*Festuca myuros**	*Stipa pulchra*
Stipa miliacea var. *miliacea**	*Harpagonella palmeri*	
*Xanthium spinosum**	*Hedypnois rhagadioloides**	
	Hordeum intercedens	
	*Hordeum murinum**	
	*Hypochaeris glabra**	
	*Lamarckia aurea**	
	Lasthenia californica	
	Layia platyglossa	
	Lepidium nitidum	
	Logfia arizonica	
	*Logfia gallica**	
	Lupinus concinnus	
	*Lysimachia arvensis**	
	*Medicago polymorpha**	
	*Melilotus indicus**	
	*Mesembryanthemum nodiflorum**	
	Microseris douglasii	
	Opuntia littoralis x oricola	
	*Phalaris minor**	
	*Plantago coronopus**	
	Plantago erecta	

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B


	*Sonchus oleraceus**	
	*Spergularia villosa**	
	Stebbinsoseris heterocarpa	
	Stipa lepida	
	*Torilis nodosa**	
	Trifolium albopurpureum	

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-12. High Confidence Assemblages (≥90) – *Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus* & *Quercus x macdonaldii*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Diagnostic Species Table: *Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus* & *Quercus x macdonaldii*


Blue Module (Blue Node)	**Red Module (Orange Node)**
Quercus pacifica (previously *Q. dumosa*)	*Adenostoma fasciculatum*
Quercus x macdonaldii	*Agrostis pallens*
	Baccharis pilularis
	*Bromus diandrus**
	*Bromus madritensis**
	*Bromus rubens**
	Galium nuttallii
	Galium nuttallii subsp. *insulare*
	Keckiella cordifolia
	Lyonothamnus floribundus subsp. floribundus
	Prunus ilicifolia subsp. *lyonii*
	Pseudognaphalium biolettii
	Quercus tomentella
	Rhamnus pirifolia
	Rhus integrifolia
	Ribes viburnifolium
	*Silene gallica**
	Stipa lepida
	Xylococcus bicolor

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-13. High Confidence Assemblages (≥90) – *Dendromecon harfordii* & *Opuntia littoralis*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Diagnostic Species Table: *Dendromecon harfordii* & *Opuntia littoralis*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Blue Node)
Ceanothus arboreus	***Opuntia littoralis***
Dendromecon harfordii	*Rhus integrifolia*

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-14. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Achillea millefolium* & *Bromus sitchensis*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Diagnostic Species Table: *Achillea millefolium & Bromus sitchensis*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Blue Node)
Achillea millefolium	*Acmispon americanus* var. *americanus*
Amsinckia intermedia	*Acourtia microcephala*
Artemisia californica	*Adiantum jordanii*
*Bromus diandrus**	*Avena fatua**
*Bromus hordeaceus**	*Baccharis pilularis*
Daucus pusillus	*Bowlesia incana*
Diplacus puniceus	*Brachypodium distachyon**
Epilobium canum subsp. *canum*	*Bromus madritensis**
Erythranthe guttata	***Bromus sitchensis* (*B. carinatus*)**
*Hypochaeris glabra**	*Centaurea melitensis**
Lupinus bicolor	*Chenopodium californicum*
Opuntia littoralis	*Claytonia parviflora*
Opuntia littoralis x oricola	*Eriogonum giganteum* var. *giganteum*
Poa secunda	*Festuca myuros**
Rhamnus pirifolia	*Galium angustifolium*
Rhus integrifolia	*Gamochaeta ustulata*
Salvia apiana	*Lathyrus vestitus* var. *vestitus*
Sanicula arguta	*Logfia gallica**
Thysanocarpus laciniatus	*Lonicera hispidula*
	Malosma laurina
	Melica imperfecta
	Pentagramma triangularis
	Pholistoma racemosum
	Plagiobothrys canescens
	Polypodium californicum
	Pseudognaphalium biolettii
	Quercus pacifica
	Salix lasiolepis
	Sambucus mexicana
	*Silene gallica**
	Solanum douglasii
	Sonchus asper subsp. *asper**
	*Sonchus oleraceus**
	*Torilis nodosa**
	Trifolium depauperatum var. *amplectens*
	Triodanis biflora
	Uropappus lindleyi
	Yabea microcarpa

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-15. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Anemopsis californica,Typha domingensis , Baccharis salicifolia, Distichlis spicata* & *Frankenia salina*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Diagnostic Species Table: *Anemopsis californica, Typha domingensis, Baccharis salicifolia, Distichlis spicata,* & *Frankenia salina*


Blue Module (Blue Node)	Red Module (Orange Node)
*Atriplex prostrata**	***Anemopsis californica***
*Atriplex semibaccata**	*Baccharis pilularis*
Baccharis salicifolia	*Beta vulgaris* subsp. *maritima**
Bolboschoenus maritimus subsp. *paludosus*	*Cirsium vulgare**
Cressa truxillensis	*Isocoma menziesii*
*Cynodon dactylon**	*Juncus mexicanus*
Distichlis spicata	*Melilotus indicus**
Frankenia salina	*Nicotiana glauca**
Jaumea carnosa	*Rhus integrifolia*
Juncus acutus subsp. *leopoldii*	*Sonchus oleraceus**
*Mesembryanthemum crystallinum**	***Typha domingensis***
Opuntia littoralis	
*Pennisetum clandestinum**	
*Polypogon monspeliensis**	
Xanthium orientale	

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-16. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Artemisia californica* & *Asclepias fascicularis*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Diagnostic Species Table: *Artemisia californica* & *Asclepias fascicularis*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Blue Node)
Artemisia californica	***Asclepias fascicularis***
*Foeniculum vulgare**	*Xanthium spinosum**
Heteromeles arbutifolia	

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-17. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Astragalus trichopodus* var. *lonchus, Eriodictyon traskiae* subsp. *traskiae,* & *Malosma laurina*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Diagnostic Species Table: *Astragalus trichopodus var. lonchus, Eriodictyon traskiae* subsp. *traskiae,* & *Malosma laurina*


Green Module (Blue Node)	Purple Module (Green Node)	Red Module (Orange Node)
Adenostoma fasciculatum	*Astragalus trichopodus*	*Acmispon micranthus*
Diplacus aurantiacus	*Diplacus puniceus*	*Acmispon strigosus*
Eriodictyon traskiae* subsp. *traskiae	*Encelia californica*	***Astragalus trichopodus* var. *lonchus***
Lepechinia fragrans	*Marrubium vulgare**	*Calochortus catalinae*
Malosma laurina	*Nicotiana glauca**	*Hypochaeris glabra**
Rhamnus pirifolia	*Opuntia littoralis*	*Lupinus truncatus*
Rhus integrifolia	*Salvia apiana*	*Navarretia hamata*
Salvia mellifera		

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-18. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Ceanothus megacarpus* var. *insularis, Cercocarpus traskiae,*& *Cercocarpus betuloides* var. *blancheae*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Diagnostic Species Table: *Ceanothus megacarpus* var. *insularis, Cercocarpus traskiae* & *Cercocarpus betuloides* var. *blancheae*


Green Module (Blue Node)	Red Module (Orange Node)	Purple Module (Green Node)
Artemisia californica	*Adenostoma fasciculatum*	*Baccharis salicifolia*
Baccharis pilularis	*Brickellia californica*	***Cercocarpus betuloides var. blancheae***
*Bromus hordeaceus**	***Cercocarpus traskiae***	*Sambucus mexicana*
Ceanothus megacarpus var. insularis	*Heteromeles arbutifolia*	*Symphoricarpos mollis*
Dendromecon rigida	*Isocoma menziesii*	*Toxicodendron diversilobum*
Malosma laurina	*Rhus ovata*	
Opuntia littoralis		
Quercus pacifica (previously *Q. dumosa*)		
Rhus integrifolia		
Salvia mellifera		

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-19. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Deinandra clementina, Cleomella arborea,* & *Stipa lepida*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Diagnostic Species Table*:* *Deinandra clementina, Cleomella arborea,* & *Stipa lepida*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Blue Node)
Artemisia californica	*Cynodon dactylon**
Cleomella arborea	***Deinandra clementina***
Opuntia littoralis	*Malva parviflora**
Stipa lepida	*Opuntia oricola*

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-20. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Dudleya virens* subsp. *hassei* & *Eriogonum giganteum* var. *giganteum*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Diagnostic Species Table: *Dudleya virens* subsp. *hassei* & *Eriogonum giganteum* var. *giganteum*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Blue Node)
Artemisia californica	*Brickellia californica*
*Brachypodium distachyon**	*Crossosoma californicum*
*Bromus diandrus**	*Encelia californica*
Dudleya virens subsp. hassei	***Eriogonum giganteum* var. *giganteum***
Galium angustifolium	*Malosma laurina*
Heteromeles arbutifolia	*Marrubium vulgare**
Malacothrix saxatilis	
Opuntia littoralis	
Rhus integrifolia	

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-21. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Elymus condensatus, Lepechinia fragrans, Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus* &*Quercus x macdonaldii*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Diagnostic Species Table: *Elymus condensatus, Lepechinia fragrans, Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus* & *Quercus x macdonaldii*


Blue Module (Blue Node)	Red Module (Orange Node)
Agrostis pallens	*Adenostoma fasciculatum*
*Bromus madritensis**	*Arctostaphylos crustacea* subsp. *subcordata*
*Bromus rubens**	*Avena barbata**
Galium nuttalli	*Baccharis pilularis*
Galium nuttallii subsp. *insulare*	*Bromus diandrus**
Keckiella cordifolia	*Bromus hordeaceus**
Lyonothamnus floribundus subsp. floribundus	*Ceanothus arboreus*
Prunus ilicifolia subsp. *lyonii*	*Crocanthemum scoparium*
Pseudognaphalium biolettii	*Diplacus puniceus*
Quercus pacifica (previously *Q. dumosa*)	***Elymus condensatus***
Quercus tomentella	***Lepechinia fragrans***
Quercus x macdonaldii	*Marrubium vulgare**
Rhamnus pirifolia	*Opuntia littoralis*
Ribes viburnifolium	*Quercus pacifica*
Stipa lepida	*Rhus integrifolia*
Xylococcus bicolor	*Salvia mellifera*
	*Silene gallica**

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-22. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Elymus condensatus* & *Lepechinia fragrans*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Diagnostic Species Table: *Elymus condensatus* & *Lepechinia fragrans*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Blue Node)
Adenostoma fasciculatum	*Baccharis pilularis*
Arctostaphylos crustacea subsp. *subcordata*	*Bromus diandrus**
*Avena barbata**	***Elymus condensatus***
*Bromus hordeaceus**	*Marrubium vulgare**
Ceanothus arboreus	*Quercus pacifica*
Crocanthemum scoparium	
Diplacus puniceus	
Lepechinia fragrans	
Opuntia littoralis	
Rhus integrifolia	
Salvia mellifera	
*Silene gallica**	

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-23. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Elymus glaucus, Elymus condensatus*, & *Lepechinia fragrans*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Diagnostic Species Table: *Elymus glaucus, Elymus condensatus,* & *Lepechinia fragrans*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Blue Node)
Adenostoma fasciculatum	*Baccharis pilularis*
Arctostaphylos crustacea subsp. *subcordata*	*Bromus diandrus**
*Avena barbata**	***Elymus condensatus***
*Bromus hordeaceus**	***Elymus glaucus***
Ceanothus arboreus	*Marrubium vulgare**
Crocanthemum scoparium	*Quercus pacifica*
Diplacus puniceus	
Lepechinia fragrans	
Opuntia littoralis	
Rhus integrifolia	
Salvia mellifera	
*Silene gallica**	

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-24. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Ericameria palmeri* var. *pachylepis* & *Leptosyne gigantea*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Diagnostic Species Table: *Ericameria palmeri* var. *pachylepis* & *Leptosyne gigantea*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Blue Node)
Artemisia californica	*Croton setiger*
Leptosyne gigantea	***Ericameria palmeri* var. *pachylepis***
Opuntia littoralis	

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-25. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Eriodictyon traskiae* subsp. *traskiae* & *Malosma laurina*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Diagnostic Species Table: *Eriodictyon traskiae* subsp. *traskiae* & *Malosma laurina*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Blue Node)
Adenostoma fasciculatum	*Astragalus trichopodus*
Diplacus aurantiacus	*Diplacus puniceus*
Eriodictyon traskiae* subsp. *traskiae	*Encelia californica*
Lepechinia fragrans	*Marrubium vulgare**
Malosma laurina	*Nicotiana glauca**
Rhamnus pirifolia	*Opuntia littoralis*
Rhus integrifolia	*Salvia apiana*
Salvia mellifera	

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-26. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Cleomella arborea, Deinandra clementina, Lycium californicum, Euphorbia misera,* & *Stipa lepida*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Diagnostic Species Table*: Euphorbia misera, Lycium californicum, Deinandra clementina, Cleomella arborea,* & *Stipa lepida*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Blue Node)
Artemisia californica	*Cynodon dactylon**
*Cakile maritima**	***Deinandra clementina***
Cleomella arborea	*Malva parviflora**
Dudleya virens	*Opuntia oricola*
Euphorbia misera	
Lycium californicum	
Opuntia littoralis	
Stipa lepida	

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-27. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Heteromeles arbutifolia* & *Rhus ovata*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Diagnostic Species Table: *Heteromeles arbutifolia* & *Rhus ovata*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Blue Node)
Heteromeles arbutifolia	*Salvia mellifera*
Quercus pacifica	***Rhus ovata***
Rhus integrifolia	
Malosma laurina	

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-28. High Confidence Assemblages (≥80) – *Quercus tomentella, Achillea millefolium* & *Bromus sitchensis*

Diagnostic Species Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Diagnostic Species Table: *Quercus tomentella, Achillea millefolium* & *Bromus sitchensis*


Purple Module (Green Group)	Red Module (Orange Node)	Green Module (Blue Node)
Comarostaphylis diversifolia	***Achillea millefolium***	*Acmispon americanus* var. *americanus*
Hesperocnide tenella	*Amsinckia intermedia*	*Acourtia microcephala*
Lathyrus vestitus var. *vestitus*	*Artemisia californica*	*Adiantum jordanii*
Melica imperfecta	*Bromus diandrus**	*Avena fatua**
Pholistoma auritum	*Bromus hordeaceus**	*Baccharis pilularis*
Quercus pacifica (previously *Q. dumosa*)	*Daucus pusillus*	*Bowlesia incana*
Quercus tomentella	*Diplacus puniceus*	*Brachypodium distachyon**
Sambucus mexicana	*Epilobium canum* subsp. *canum*	*Bromus madritensis**
Toxicodendron diversilobum	*Erythranthe guttata*	***Bromus sitchensis* (*B. carinatus*)**
Urtica dioica holosericea	*Hypochaeris glabra**	*Centaurea melitensis**
	Lupinus bicolor	*Chenopodium californicum*
	Opuntia littoralis	*Claytonia parviflora*
	Opuntia littoralis x oricola	*Eriogonum giganteum* var. *giganteum*
	Poa secunda	*Festuca myuros**
	Rhamnus pirifolia	*Galium angustifolium*
	Rhus integrifolia	*Gamochaeta ustulata*
	Salvia apiana	*Logfia gallica**
	Sanicula arguta	*Lonicera hispidula*
	Thysanocarpus laciniatus	*Malosma laurina*
		Pentagramma triangularis
		Pholistoma racemosum
		Plagiobothrys canescens
		Polypodium californicum
		Pseudognaphalium biolettii
		Quercus pacifica
		Salix lasiolepis
		*Silene gallica**
		Solanum douglasii
		Sonchus asper subsp. *asper**
		*Sonchus oleraceus**
		*Torilis nodosa**
		Trifolium depauperatum var. *amplectens*
		Triodanis biflora
		Uropappus lindleyi
		Yabea microcarpa

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-26. Average Agglomerative Clustering vs. Complete Linkage Agglomerative Clustering


Black lines indicative of outliers



Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-30. Average Agglomerative Clustering vs. Ward's Minimum Variance Clustering


Black lines indicative of outliers



Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-28. Complete Linkage Agglomerative Clustering vs. Ward's Minimum Variance Clustering

Black lines indicative of outliers



Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-32. Pairwise Comparison Results


Red star indicates that the diagnostic species grouped differently between algorithms

	Complete Linkage vs Average Unweighted	Complete Linkage vs Wards	Average Unweighted vs Wards
Genista linifolia	*	*	*
Baccharis salicifolia	*	*	
Arctostaphylos catalinae	*	*	*
Quercus pacifica	*	*	*
Abronia maritima	*	*	*
Elymus glaucus	*	*	*
Elymus triticoides	*		*
Deinandra fasciculata	*		*
Cylindropuntia prolifera	*		*
Ceanothus megacarpus var. insularis		*	*
Lepechinia fragrans		*	
Elymus condensatus		*	*
Eriogonum grande var. grande		*	*
Encelia californica		*	*
Xylococcus bicolor	*		*
Quercus tomentella	*		*
Astragalus trichopodus var. lonchus	*	*	

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-33. Outliers - *Abronia maritima*

Outlier Figure



Outlier Table: *Abronia maritima*


Green Module (Blue Node)	Purple Module (Green Node)	Red Module (Orange Node)
Artemisia californica	*Brickellia californica*	***Abronia maritima***
Asclepias fascicularis	*Centranthus ruber**	*Atriplex leucophylla*
*Foeniculum vulgare**	*Eriogonum grande* var. *grande*	*Cakile maritima**
Heteromeles arbutifolia	*Malosma laurina*	*Cressa truxillensis*
*Xanthium spinosum**	*Nicotiana glauca**	*Extriplex californica*
		*Mesembryanthemum crystallinum**

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-34. Outliers - *Arctostaphylos catalinae*

Outlier Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Outlier Table: *Arctostaphylos catalinae*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Green Module (Blue Node)	Purple Module (Green Node)
Acmispon micranthus	*Adenostoma fasciculatum*	*Arctostaphylos crustacea* subsp. *subcordata*
Acmispon strigosus	***Arctostaphylos catalinae***	*Avena barbata**
Astragalus trichopodus var. *lonchus*	*Astragalus trichopodus*	*Baccharis pilularis*
Calochortus catalinae	*Diplacus aurantiacus*	*Bromus diandrus**
*Hypochaeris glabra**	*Encelia californica*	*Bromus hordeaceus**
Lupinus truncatus	*Eriodictyon traskiae* subsp. *traskiae*	*Ceanothus arboreus*
Navarretia hamata	*Heteromeles arbutifolia*	*Crocanthemum scoparium*
*Nicotiana glauca**	*Lonicera hispidula*	*Diplacus puniceus*
Salvia apiana	*Malosma laurina*	*Lepechinia fragrans*
	Opuntia littoralis	*Marrubium vulgare**
	Quercus pacifica	*Silene gallica**
	Rhamnus pirifolia	
	Rhus integrifolia	
	Rhus ovata	
	Salvia mellifera	
	Sambucus mexicana	

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-35. Outliers - *Astragalus trichopodus* var. *lonchus*

Outlier Figure



Outlier Table: *Astragalus trichopodus* var. *lonchus*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Purple Module (Green Node)	Green Module (Blue Node)
Acmispon micranthus	*Astragalus trichopodus*	*Adenostoma fasciculatum*
Acmispon strigosus	*Diplacus puniceus*	*Diplacus aurantiacus*
Astragalus trichopodus* var. *lonchus	*Encelia californica*	*Eriodictyon traskiae* subsp. *traskiae*
Calochortus catalinae	*Marrubium vulgare**	*Lepechinia fragrans*
*Hypochaeris glabra**	*Nicotiana glauca**	*Malosma laurina*
Lupinus truncatus	*Opuntia littoralis*	*Rhamnus pirifolia*
Navarretia hamata	*Salvia apiana*	*Rhus integrifolia*
		Salvia mellifera

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-36. Outliers - Baccharis salicifolia

Outlier Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Outlier Table: *Baccharis salicifolia*

Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Green Node)	Green Module (Blue Node)	Purple Module (Yellow Node)
Acmispon micranthus	*Artemisia californica*	*Ammannia coccinea*	*Atriplex prostrata**
Atriplex coulteri	*Astragalus trichopodus*	*Anemopsis californica*	***Baccharis salicifolia***
*Avena barbata**	*Atriplex semibaccata**	*Baccharis pilularis*	*Bolboschoenus maritimus* subsp. *paludosus*
Bloomeria crocea	*Avena fatua**	*Beta vulgaris* subsp. *maritima**	*Cressa truxillensis*
*Bromus diandrus**	*Brachypodium distachyon**	*Bromus rubens**	*Diplacus aurantiacus*
*Bromus madritensis**	*Bromus hordeaceus**	*Cirsium vulgare**	*Distichlis spicata*
Calochortus catalinae	*Centaurea melitensis**	*Cylindropuntia prolifera*	*Frankenia salina*
*Desmazeria rigida**	*Deinandra fasciculata*	*Cynodon dactylon**	*Genista linifolia**
*Erodium botrys**	*Elymus triticoides*	*Encelia californica*	*Heteromeles arbutifolia*
*Erodium cicutarium**	*Erodium brachycarpum**	*Extriplex californica*	*Hordeum marinum* subsp. *gussoneanum**
*Erodium moschatum**	*Lactuca saligna**	*Isocoma menziesii*	*Jaumea carnosa*
*Festuca bromoides**	*Opuntia oricola*	*Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii*	*Juncus acutus* subsp. *leopoldii*
*Festuca myuros**	*Stipa pulchra*	*Lycium californicum*	*Juncus mexicanus*
Harpagonella palmeri		*Melilotus indicus**	*Malosma laurina*
*Hedypnois rhagadioloides**		*Phalaris aquatica**	*Mesembryanthemum crystallinum**
Hordeum intercedens		*Polypogon monspeliensis**	*Nicotiana glauca**
*Hordeum murinum**		*Pseudognaphalium luteoalbum**	*Opuntia littoralis*
*Hypochaeris glabra**		*Sonchus oleraceus**	*Pennisetum clandestinum**
*Lamarckia aurea**		*Stipa miliacea* var. *miliacea**	*Quercus pacifica*
Lasthenia californica		*Xanthium spinosum**	*Rhus integrifolia*
Layia platyglossa			*Rumex conglomeratus**
Lepidium nitidum			*Rumex crispus*
Logfia arizonica			*Salix lasiolepis*
*Logfia gallica**			*Typha domingensis*
Lupinus concinnus			*Xanthium orientale*
*Lysimachia arvensis**			
*Medicago polymorpha**			
*Mesembryanthemum nodiflorum**			
Microseris douglasii			
Opuntia littoralis x oricola			
*Phalaris minor**			
*Plantago coronopus**			
Plantago erecta			
*Spergularia villosa**			

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B


Red Module (Orange Node)	**Blue Module (Green Node)**	**Green Module (Blue Node)**	**Purple Module (Yellow Node)**
Stebbinsoseris heterocarpa			
Stipa lepida			
*Torilis nodosa**			
Trifolium albopurpureum			

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-37. Outliers - *Ceanothus megacarpus* var. *insularis*

Outlier Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Outlier Table: *Ceanothus megacarpus* var. *insularis*


Purple Module (Dark Blue Node)	Yellow Module (Light Blue Node)	Green Module (Green Node)	Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Yellow Node)
Ceanothus arboreus	*Artemisia californica*	*Baccharis pilularis*	*Adenostoma fasciculatum*	*Baccharis salicifolia*
Dendromecon harfordii	*Croton setiger*	*Bromus hordeaceus**	*Brickellia californica*	*Cercocarpus betuloides* var. *blancheae*
	Dudleya virens subsp. *insularis*	*Dendromecon rigida*	***Ceanothus megacarpus* var. *insularis***	*Sambucus mexicana*
	Encelia californica		*Cercocarpus traskiae*	*Symphoricarpos mollis*
	Ericameria palmeri var. *pachylepis*		*Heteromeles arbutifolia*	*Toxicodendron diversilobum*
	*Foeniculum vulgare**		*Isocoma menziesii*	
	Leptosyne gigantea		*Malosma laurina*	
	Malacothamnus fasciculatus		*Quercus pacifica* (previously *Q. dumosa*)	
	Opuntia littoralis		*Rhus ovata*	
	Quercus pacifica			
	Rhus integrifolia			
	Salvia mellifera			

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-38. Outliers - *Cylindropuntia prolifera*

Outlier Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Outlier Table: *Cylindropuntia prolifera*

Purple Module (Dark Blue Node)	Blue Module (Yellow Node)	Red Module (Orange Node)	Yellow Module (Light Blue Node)	Green Module (Green Node)
*Atriplex prostrata**	*Artemisia californica*	*Acmispon micranthus*	*Ammannia coccinea*	*Anemopsis californica*
Baccharis salicifolia	*Astragalus trichopodus*	*Atriplex coulteri*	*Baccharis pilularis*	*Beta vulgaris* subsp. *maritima**
Bolboschoenus maritimus subsp. *paludosus*	*Atriplex semibaccata**	*Avena barbata**	*Bromus rubens**	*Cirsium vulgare**
Cressa truxillensis	*Avena fatua**	*Bloomeria crocea*	***Cylindropuntia prolifera***	*Juncus mexicanus*
*Cynodon dactylon**	*Brachypodium distachyon**	*Bromus diandrus**	*Encelia californica*	*Sonchus oleraceus**
Distichlis spicata	*Bromus hordeaceus**	*Bromus madritensis**	*Extriplex californica*	
Frankenia salina	*Centaurea melitensis**	*Calochortus catalinae*	*Isocoma menziesii*	
Jaumea carnosa	*Deinandra fasciculata*	*Desmazeria rigida**	*Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii*	
Juncus acutus subsp. *leopoldii*	*Elymus triticoides*	*Erodium botrys**	*Lycium californicum*	
*Melilotus indicus**	*Erodium brachycarpum**	*Erodium cicutarium**	*Opuntia littoralis*	
*Mesembryanthemum crystallinum**	*Lactuca saligna**	*Erodium moschatum**	*Phalaris aquatica**	
*Nicotiana glauca**	*Opuntia oricola*	*Festuca bromoides**	*Polypogon monspeliensis**	
*Pennisetum clandestinum**	*Stipa pulchra*	*Festuca myuros**	*Pseudognaphalium luteoalbum**	
Rhus integrifolia		*Harpagonella palmeri*	*Stipa miliacea* var. *miliacea**	
Typha domingensis		*Hedypnois rhagadioloides**	*Xanthium spinosum**	
Xanthium orientale		*Hordeum intercedens*		
		*Hordeum murinum**		
		*Hypochaeris glabra**		
		*Lamarckia aurea**		
		Lasthenia californica		
		Layia platyglossa		
		Lepidium nitidum		
		Logfia arizonica		
		*Logfia gallica**		
		Lupinus concinnus		
		*Lysimachia arvensis**		
		*Medicago polymorpha**		
		*Mesembryanthemum nodiflorum**		

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B


Purple Module (Dark Blue Node)	Blue Module (Yellow Node)	Red Module (Orange Node)	Yellow Module (Light Blue Node)	Green Module (Green Node)
		Microseris douglasii		
		Opuntia littoralis x oricola		
		*Phalaris minor**		
		*Plantago coronopus**		
		Plantago erecta		
		*Spergularia villosa**		
		Stebbinsoseris heterocarpa		
		Stipa lepida		
		*Torilis nodosa**		
		Trifolium albopurpureum		

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-36. Outliers - *Deinandra fasciculata*

Outlier Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Outlier Table: *Deinandra fasciculata*

Purple Module (Dark Blue Node)	Blue Module (Yellow Node)	Yellow Module (Light Blue Node)	Red Module (Orange Node)	Green Module (Green Node)
*Atriplex prostrata**	*Astragalus trichopodus*	*Ammannia coccinea*	*Acmispon micranthus*	*Artemisia californica*
Baccharis salicifolia	*Atriplex semibaccata**	*Anemopsis californica*	*Atriplex coulteri*	*Brickellia californica*
Bolboschoenus maritimus subsp. *paludosus*	*Avena fatua**	*Baccharis pilularis*	*Avena barbata**	*Bromus diandrus**
Cressa truxillensis	*Brachypodium distachyon**	*Beta vulgaris* subsp. *maritima**	*Bloomeria crocea*	*Ceanothus arboreus*
*Cynodon dactylon**	*Bromus hordeaceus**	*Bromus rubens**	*Bromus madritensis**	*Crossosoma californicum*
Distichlis spicata	*Centaurea melitensis**	*Cirsium vulgare**	*Calochortus catalinae*	*Croton setiger*
Frankenia salina	*Deinandra clementina*	*Cylindropuntia prolifera*	*Desmazeria rigida**	*Dendromecon harfordii*
Jaumea carnosa	***Deinandra fasciculata***	*Encelia californica*	*Erodium botrys**	*Dudleya virens* subsp. *hassei*
Juncus acutus subsp. *leopoldii*	*Elymus triticoides*	*Extriplex californica*	*Erodium cicutarium**	*Dudleya virens* subsp. *insularis*
*Mesembryanthemum crystallinum**	*Erodium brachycarpum**	*Isocoma menziesii*	*Erodium moschatum**	*Ericameria palmeri* var. *pachylepis*
*Nicotiana glauca**	*Lactuca saligna**	*Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii*	*Festuca bromoides**	*Eriogonum giganteum* var. *giganteum*
*Pennisetum clandestinum**	*Malva parviflora**	*Juncus mexicanus*	*Festuca myuros**	*Foeniculum vulgare**
Typha domingensis	*Opuntia oricola*	*Lycium californicum*	*Harpagonella palmeri*	*Galium angustifolium*
Xanthium orientale	*Pseudognaphalium luteoalbum**	*Melilotus indicus**	*Hedypnois rhagadioloides**	*Heteromeles arbutifolia*
	Stipa miliacea var. *miliacea**	*Phalaris aquatica**	*Hordeum intercedens*	*Leptosyne gigantea*
	Stipa pulchra	*Polypogon monspeliensis**	*Hordeum murinum**	*Malacothamnus fasciculatus*
		*Sonchus oleraceus**	*Hypochaeris glabra**	*Malacothrix saxatilis*
		*Xanthium spinosum**	*Lamarckia aurea**	*Malosma laurina*
			Lasthenia californica	*Marrubium vulgare**
			Layia platyglossa	*Opuntia littoralis*
			Lepidium nitidum	*Quercus pacifica*
			Logfia arizonica	*Rhus integrifolia*
			*Logfia gallica**	*Salvia mellifera*
			Lupinus concinnus	

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B


Purple Module (Dark Blue Node)	Blue Module (Yellow Node)	Yellow Module (Light Blue Node)	Red Module (Orange Node)	Green Module (Green Node)
			*Lysimachia arvensis**	
			*Medicago polymorpha**	
			*Mesembryanthemum nodiflorum**	
			Microseris douglasii	
			Opuntia littoralis x oricola	
			*Phalaris minor**	
			*Plantago coronopus**	
			Plantago erecta	
			*Spergularia villosa**	
			Stebbinsoseris heterocarpa	
			Stipa lepida	
			*Torilis nodosa**	
			Trifolium albopurpureum	

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-40. Outliers - *Elymus condensatus*

Outlier Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Outlier Table: *Elymus condensatus*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Blue Node)
Adenostoma fasciculatum	*Agrostis pallens*
Arctostaphylos crustacea subsp. *subcordata*	*Bromus madritensis**
*Avena barbata**	*Bromus rubens**
Baccharis pilularis	*Galium nuttallii*
*Bromus diandrus**	*Galium nuttallii* subsp. *insulare*
*Bromus hordeaceus**	*Keckiella cordifolia*
Ceanothus arboreus	*Lyonothamnus floribundus* subsp. *floribundus*
Crocanthemum scoparium	*Prunus ilicifolia* subsp. *lyonii*
Diplacus puniceus	*Pseudognaphalium biolettii*
Elymus condensatus	*Quercus pacifica* (previously *Q. dumosa*)
Elymus glaucus	*Quercus tomentella*
Lepechinia fragrans	*Quercus x macdonaldii*
*Marrubium vulgare**	*Rhamnus pirifolia*
Opuntia littoralis	*Ribes viburnifolium*
Quercus pacifica	*Stipa lepida*
Rhus integrifolia	*Xylococcus bicolor*
Salvia mellifera	
*Silene gallica**	

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-41. Outliers - *Elymus glaucus*

Outlier Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Outlier Table: *Elymus glaucus*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Blue Node)
Adenostoma fasciculatum	*Baccharis pilularis*
Arctostaphylos crustacea subsp. *subcordata*	*Bromus diandrus**
*Avena barbata**	*Elymus condensatus*
*Bromus hordeaceus**	***Elymus glaucus***
Ceanothus arboreus	*Marrubium vulgare**
Crocanthemum scoparium	*Quercus pacifica*
Diplacus puniceus	
Lepechinia fragrans	
Opuntia littoralis	
Rhus integrifolia	
Salvia mellifera	
*Silene gallica**	

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-42. Outliers - *Elymus triticoides*

Outlier Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Outlier Table: *Elymus triticoides*

Blue Module (Yellow Node)	Red Module (Orange Node)	Green Module (Green Node)	Purple Module (Dark Blue Node)	Yellow Module (Light Blue Node)
Artemisia californica	*Acmispon micranthus*	*Anemopsis californica*	*Atriplex prostrata**	*Ammannia coccinea*
Astragalus trichopodus	*Atriplex coulteri*	*Beta vulgaris* subsp. *maritima**	*Baccharis salicifolia*	*Baccharis pilularis*
*Atriplex semibaccata**	*Avena barbata**	*Cirsium vulgare**	*Bolboschoenus maritimus* subsp. *paludosus*	*Bromus rubens**
*Avena fatua**	*Bloomeria crocea*	*Juncus mexicanus*	*Cressa truxillensis*	*Cylindropuntia prolifera*
*Brachypodium distachyon**	*Bromus diandrus**	*Sonchus oleraceus**	*Cynodon dactylon**	*Encelia californica*
*Bromus hordeaceus**	*Bromus madritensis**		*Distichlis spicata*	*Extriplex californica*
*Centaurea melitensis**	*Calochortus catalinae*		*Frankenia salina*	*Isocoma menziesii*
Deinandra fasciculata	*Desmazeria rigida**		*Jaumea carnosa*	*Isocoma menziesii* var. *menziesii*
Elymus triticoides	*Erodium botrys**		*Juncus acutus* subsp. *leopoldii*	*Lycium californicum*
*Erodium brachycarpum**	*Erodium cicutarium**		*Melilotus indicus**	*Opuntia littoralis*
*Lactuca saligna**	*Erodium moschatum**		*Mesembryanthemum crystallinum**	*Phalaris aquatica**
Opuntia oricola	*Festuca bromoides**		*Nicotiana glauca**	*Polypogon monspeliensis**
Stipa pulchra	*Festuca myuros**		*Pennisetum clandestinum**	*Stipa miliacea* var. *miliacea**
	Harpagonella palmeri		*Rhus integrifolia*	*Xanthium spinosum**
	*Hedypnois rhagadioloides**		*Typha domingensi*	
	Hordeum intercedens		*Xanthium orientale*	
	*Hordeum murinum**			
	*Hypochaeris glabra**			
	*Lamarckia aurea**			
	Lasthenia californica			
	Layia platyglossa			
	Lepidium nitidum			
	Logfia arizonica			
	*Logfia gallica**			
	Lupinus concinnus			
	*Lysimachia arvensis**			

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B


Blue Module (Yellow Node)	Red Module (Orange Node)	Green Module (Green Node)	Purple Module (Dark Blue Node)	Yellow Module (Light Blue Node)
	*Medicago polymorpha**			
	*Mesembryanthemum nodiflorum**			
	Microseris douglasii			
	Opuntia littoralis x oricola			
	*Phalaris minor**			
	*Plantago coronopus**			
	Plantago erecta			
	*Spergularia villosa**			
	Stebbinsoseris heterocarpa			
	Stipa lepida			
	*Torilis nodosa**			
	Trifolium albopurpureum			

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-43. Outliers - *Encelia californica*

Outlier Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Outlier Table: *Encelia californica*


Purple Module (Yellow Node)	Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Green Node)	Green Module (Blue Node)
Encelia californica	*Artemisia californica*	*Croton setiger*	*Ceanothus arboreus*
*Foeniculum vulgare**	*Dudleya virens* subsp. *insularis*	*Ericameria palmeri* var. *pachylepis*	*Dendromecon harfordii*
Malacothamnus fasciculatus	*Heteromeles arbutifolia*		
Quercus pacifica	*Leptosyne gigantea*		
	*Mesembryanthemum crystallinum**		
	Opuntia littoralis		
	Rhus integrifolia		
	Salvia mellifera		

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-44. Outliers - *Eriogonum grande* var. *grande*

Outlier Figure



Outlier Table: *Eriogonum grande* var. *grande*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Purple Module (Green Node)	Green Module (Blue Node)
Abronia maritima	*Brickellia californica*	*Artemisia californica*
Atriplex leucophylla	*Centranthus ruber**	*Asclepias fascicularis*
*Cakile maritima**	***Eriogonum grande* var. *grande***	*Foeniculum vulgare**
Cressa truxillensis	*Malosma laurina*	*Heteromeles arbutifolia*
Extriplex californica	*Nicotiana glauca**	*Xanthium spinosum**
*Mesembryanthemum crystallinum**		

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-45. Outliers - *Lepechinia fragrans*

Outlier Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Outlier Table: *Lepechinia fragrans*


Purple Module (Green Node)	Green Module (Blue Node)	Red Module (Orange Node)
Agrostis pallens	*Adenostoma fasciculatum*	*Acmispon micranthus*
*Bromus madritensis**	*Arctostaphylos catalinae*	*Acmispon strigosus*
*Bromus rubens**	*Arctostaphylos crustacea* subsp. *subcordata*	*Astragalus trichopodus* var. *lonchus*
Galium nuttallii	*Astragalus trichopodus*	*Calochortus catalinae*
Galium nuttallii subsp. *insulare*	*Avena barbata**	*Hypochaeris glabra**
Keckiella cordifolia	*Baccharis pilularis*	*Lupinus truncatus*
Lyonothamnus floribundus subsp. *floribundus*	*Bromus diandrus**	*Navarretia hamata*
Prunus ilicifolia subsp. *lyonii*	*Bromus hordeaceus**	*Nicotiana glauca**
Pseudognaphalium biolettii	*Ceanothus arboreus*	*Salvia apiana*
Quercus pacifica (previously *Q. dumosa*)	*Crocanthemum scoparium*	
Quercus tomentella	*Diplacus aurantiacus*	
Quercus x macdonaldii	*Diplacus puniceus*	
Ribes viburnifolium	*Elymus condensatus*	
*Silene gallica**	*Elymus glaucus*	
Stipa lepida	*Encelia californica*	
Xylococcus bicolor	*Eriodictyon traskiae* subsp. *traskiae*	
	Heteromeles arbutifolia	
	Lepechinia fragrans	
	Lonicera hispidula	
	Malosma laurina	
	*Marrubium vulgare**	
	Opuntia littoralis	
	Quercus pacifica	
	Rhamnus pirifolia	
	Rhus integrifolia	
	Salvia mellifera	
	Sambucus mexicana	

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-46. Outliers - *Quercus pacifica*

Outlier Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Outlier Table: *Quercus pacifica*


Purple Module (Yellow Node)	Green Module (Blue Node)	Red Module (Orange Node)	Blue Module (Green Node)
Encelia californica	*Quercus pacifica* (previously *Q. dumosa*)	*Acourtia microcephala*	*Baccharis salicifolia*
*Foeniculum vulgare**	*Artemisia californica*	*Eriogonum giganteum* var. *giganteum*	*Genista linifolia**
Malacothamnus fasciculatus	*Baccharis pilularis*	*Harpagonella palmeri*	*Hordeum marinum* subsp. *gussoneanum**
	Ceanothus arboreus	*Malosma laurina*	*Juncus acutus* subsp. *leopoldii*
	Croton setiger	*Plantago erecta*	*Juncus mexicanus*
	Diplacus aurantiacus	*Salix lasiolepis*	*Nicotiana glauca**
	Diplacus puniceus	*Salvia apiana*	*Phalaris aquatica**
	Dudleya virens subsp. *insularis*		*Rumex conglomeratus**
	Ericameria palmeri var. *pachylepis*		*Rumex crispus**
	Heteromeles arbutifolia		*Typha domingensis*
	Opuntia littoralis		*Xanthium orientale*
	Quercus pacifica		*Xanthium spinosum**
	Rhamnus pirifolia		
	Rhus integrifolia		

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-47. Outliers - Quercus tomentella

Outlier Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Outlier Table: *Quercus tomentella*


Purple Module (Green Node)	Red Module (Orange Node)	Green Module (Blue Node)
Comarostaphylis diversifolia	*Achillea millefolium*	*Acmispon americanus* var. *americanus*
Hesperocnide tenella	*Amsinckia intermedia*	*Acourtia microcephala*
Lathyrus vestitus var. *vestitus*	*Artemisia californica*	*Adiantum jordanii*
Melica imperfecta	*Bromus diandrus**	*Avena fatua**
Pholistoma auritum	*Bromus hordeaceus**	*Baccharis pilularis*
Quercus pacifica (previously *Q. dumosa*)	*Daucus pusillus*	*Bowlesia incana*
Quercus tomentella	*Diplacus puniceus*	*Brachypodium distachyon**
Sambucus mexicana	*Epilobium canum* subsp. *canum*	*Bromus madritensis**
Toxicodendron diversilobum	*Erythranthe guttata*	*Bromus sitchensis* (*B. carinatus*)
Urtica dioica holosericea	*Hypochaeris glabra**	*Centaurea melitensis**
	Lupinus bicolor	*Chenopodium californicum*
	Opuntia littoralis	*Claytonia parviflora*
	Opuntia littoralis x oricola	*Eriogonum giganteum* var. *giganteum*
	Poa secunda	*Festuca myuros**
	Rhamnus pirifolia	*Galium angustifolium*
	Rhus integrifolia	*Gamochaeta ustulata*
	Salvia apiana	*Logfia gallica**
	Sanicula arguta	*Lonicera hispidula*
	Thysanocarpus laciniatus	*Malosma laurina*
		Pentagramma triangularis
		Pholistoma racemosum
		Plagiobothrys canescens
		Polypodium californicum
		Pseudognaphalium biolettii
		Quercus pacifica
		Salix lasiolepis
		*Silene gallica**
		Solanum douglasii
		Sonchus asper subsp. *asper**
		*Sonchus oleraceus**
		*Torilis nodosa**
		Trifolium depauperatum var. *amplectens*
		Triodanis biflora
		Uropappus lindleyi
		Yabea microcarpa

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-48. Outliers - *Xylococcus bicolor*

Outlier Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Outlier Table: *Xylococcus bicolor*


Red Module (Orange Node)	Purple Module (Green Node)	Green Module (Blue Node)
Adenostoma fasciculatum	*Quercus pacifica*	*Agrostis pallens*
Galium catalinense	*Quercus x macdonaldii*	*Baccharis pilularis*
Heteromeles arbutifolia		*Bromus diandrus**
Phacelia lyonii		*Bromus madritensis**
Quercus pacifica (previously *Q. dumosa*)		*Bromus rubens**
Rhus integrifolia		*Galium nuttallii*
Xylococcus bicolor		*Galium nuttallii* subsp. *insulare*
		Keckiella cordifolia
		Lyonothamnus floribundus subsp. *floribundus*
		Prunus ilicifolia subsp. *lyonii*
		Pseudognaphalium biolettii
		Quercus tomentella
		Rhamnus pirifolia
		Ribes viburnifolium
		*Silene gallica**
		Stipa lepida

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Figure 6-49. Outliers - *Genista linifolia*

Outlier Figure



Species within each module are listed on next page.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Outlier Table: *Genista linifolia**

Purple Module (Green Node)	Red Module (Orange Node)	Green Module (Blue Node)
Baccharis salicifolia	*Acourtia microcephala*	*Baccharis pilularis*
Genista linifolia*	*Artemisia californica*	*Ceanothus arboreus*
Hordeum marinum subsp. *gussoneanum**	*Eriogonum giganteum* var. *giganteum*	*Diplacus aurantiacus*
Juncus acutus subsp. *leopoldii*	*Harpagonella palmeri*	*Diplacus puniceus*
Juncus mexicanus	*Malosma laurina*	*Heteromeles arbutifolia*
*Nicotiana glauca**	*Opuntia littoralis*	*Quercus pacifica* (previously *Q. dumosa*)
*Phalaris aquatica**	*Plantago erecta*	*Rhamnus pirifolia*
*Rumex conglomeratus**	*Salix lasiolepis*	*Rhus integrifolia*
*Rumex crispus**	*Salvia apiana*	
Typha domingensis		
Xanthium orientale		
*Xanthium spinosum**		

** nonnative species*

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Appendix F

Habitat Restoration Method Guidelines

Prepared for

CATALINA ISLAND CONSERVANCY™

708 Crescent Ave.
Avalon, CA 90704

Prepared by

LAND IQ

3791 Wade Street
Los Angeles, CA 90066

FEBRUARY 2024

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 Introduction 1

2 Weed Management 1

2.1 Physical Control Methods 3

2.1.1 Mowing/Line Trimming 3

2.1.2 Hand/Mechanical Pulling or Cutting 4

2.1.3 Cut-and-Dig 5

2.1.4 Mechanical Raking/Windrowing 5

2.2 Prescribed Fire 5

2.3 Chemical Control Methods 7

2.3.1 Foliar Spray Treatment 8

2.3.2 Stump Cut and Herbicide Treatment 10

2.3.3 Drill and Fill 11

2.3.4 Basal Bark Treatment 11

2.3.5 Recommended Herbicides for the Control of Nonnative Species 12

2.3.6 Herbicides Approved for Aquatic Use 18

2.4 Weed Seed Handling, Resprout Reduction, and Plant Matter Disposal 18

2.5 Management Methods for Target Invasive Species on Catalina Island 19

3 Erosion Control 21

3.1 Straw Wattles 22

3.2 Fiber Mat 22

3.3 Silt Fences 23

3.4 Straw Hay Bale Check dam 24

3.5 Hydraulically Applied Soil Stabilizers 25

4 Plant Materials 26

4.1 Seed Materials 26

4.1.1 Seed Collection 27

4.1.2 Seed Processing, Cleaning, and Storage 28

4.1.3 Seed Testing 29

5 Seed Addition 30

5.1 Seed Mix Design 31

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

5.1.1 Plant Functional Groups 31
5.1.2 Criteria for Species Selection 32
5.1.3 Pure Live Seed (PLS) Seeding Rates 34
5.1.4 Bulk Seeding Rates 37
5.1.5 Monitoring for Seed Mix Design 38
5.1.6 Seed Mix Adjustments 39
5.1.7 Timing of Seed Installation 40

6 Seeding Methods 40
6.1 Drill Seeding 41
6.1.1 Drill Seeding Implementation 41
6.1.2 Drill Seeding Equipment 43
6.2 Hydroseeding 45
6.2.1 Hydroseeding Implementation 46
6.3 Mechanical Broadcast Seeding 47
6.3.1 Mechanical Broadcast Seeding Implementation 48
6.4 Hand-Broadcast Seeding 49
6.4.1 Hand-Broadcast Seeding Implementation 49
6.5 Imprint Seeding 51
6.6 Seed Ball Broadcast Seeding 52
6.7 Seed Mix Establishment 52

7 Container Plants and Cuttings 53
7.1 Planting Layout 53
7.2 Cuttings 53
7.3 Acorns 54
7.3.1 Acorn Collection 54
7.3.2 Acorn Storage 54
7.3.3 Acorn Planting 55
7.3.4 Acorn Supplemental Irrigation 55
7.4 Nursery-Grown Plants 56
7.5 Plant Installation 57
7.5.1 Soil Amendments 57
7.5.2 Plant Protection 58
7.6 Plant Survivorship 59

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

8 Temporary Irrigation System 59
8.1 Overhead irrigation system 60
8.2 Bubbler Irrigation System 61
8.3 Irrigation System Operation 61
9 On-Going Management 62
9.1 Post-Seeding Weed Management 63
9.1.1 Control of High Priority Invasive Species 64
9.1.2 Remedial Seeding 64
9.1.3 Container Plant Replacement 65
9.1.4 Erosion Control 66
9.1.5 Pest and Disease Control 66
9.1.6 Removal of Trash and Debris 66
10 References 67

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4-1 Sample Seed Test Report for Purple Needlegrass (*Stipa pulchra*) 30

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1. Invasive Plant Species on Catalina Island 20
Table 5-1 Example of Californian Coastal Scrub Seed Mix Design Target Ranges 35

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

1 INTRODUCTION

The following specifications are provided as a general reference to assist the Catalina Island Conservancy (Conservancy) land managers with the development of site-specific habitat enhancement and restoration plans on Catalina Island.

It is important to be mindful that the weed management and native plant material installation methods that are selected for a particular restoration project should be based on "getting to know your site" from field observations, review of existing documentation, and the goals of the project. There may be methods other than those presented in this document that are more appropriate for a particular project or site. The selection of habitat restoration methods will initially be made during the planning phase of the project, but they may change adaptively during implementation of the project after consideration of monitoring observations made during implementation of the project.

2 WEED MANAGEMENT

For most habitat enhancement and restoration efforts in southern California, it is recommended to manage the existing weed seed bank of the degraded area prior to installation of native plant material. Adequately controlling the weed seed bank first allows for the use of more cost-effective weed management methods and increases the likelihood that the native plant material added in the form of seed, cuttings, or nursery container transplants will successfully establish.

Adequate management of the nonnative seed bank may take several years to achieve, depending on the size of the nonnative seed population and the number of "grow-and-kill" events that occur each year. The grow-and-kill method is used to treat (kill) nonnative seedlings and new growth prior to seed set, to deplete the existing weed seed bank and prevent new weed seed from entering the seed bank.

Generally, it is more cost-effective and feasible for the management of large areas to rely solely on natural rainfall-driven grow-and-kill; however, project implementation is at the mercy of unpredictable weather patterns from year-to-year. This necessitates an adaptive weed management approach, which allows for flexibility in the timing and intensity of grow-and-kill events each year. Adaptive weed management is also a necessity because it is difficult and impractical to quantify the size of the nonnative seed bank in the project site during the planning phase; and rather the amount of weed management effort can only be estimated based on prior biological monitoring and experience with similar habitat restoration efforts.

In circumstances where it is important to reduce the amount of time necessary to implement the habitat restoration project, the years needed to manage the nonnative seed bank can be reduced with supplemental irrigation. Supplemental water from a temporary irrigation system can "force" more grow-and-kill events than can be achieved

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

with natural rainfall alone. For example, if three or four grow-and-kill events can be achieved throughout the year with supplemental irrigation instead of only one or two with natural rainfall alone, then weed management can be completed in two to three years in a project site that ultimately needs eight grow-and-kill cycles completed prior to seed addition, instead of four to five years with natural rainfall alone. However, the use of a temporary irrigation system to reduce the number of years of pre-seeding weed management, also commonly referred to as "site preparation" in habitat restoration projects, must be feasible (e.g., a water source is accessible to the project site) and justified by need given the significant cost for the purchase of water and installation of the temporary irrigation system (Brooks et al. 2019).

While most degraded areas targeted for habitat enhancement and restoration on Catalina Island have long histories of disturbance by long-term grazing, browsing, and occupation by nonnative plant populations, there are circumstances where there is little to no nonnative seed bank in the soil prior to native plant material addition (e.g., revegetation of a newly cut slope where virgin soil has been exposed). In these cases, weed management prior to native material addition may not be necessary.

Often coinciding with a history of disturbance (e.g., agriculture or unnatural fire frequency) and nonnative plant introduction, many degraded areas on Catalina are also native seed-limited, meaning that even with adequate weed management there is not sufficient viable native seed populations and/or diversity to restore sustainable native habitat. Therefore, native plant material addition is a necessary second phase in habitat restoration projects, following adequate management of the nonnative plant population.

Even in habitat restoration projects where natural recruitment from existing native seed banks and/or adjacent natural areas is sufficient—adequate weed management remains critical to the successful establishment of native habitat. While it is invaluable to have existing native material and successful natural recruitment on site, the budget for the weed management program must incorporate the additional labor and expertise required to weed around desirable native vegetation. Working around natives in a project site often requires more hand methods (e.g., hand cutting or pulling) and has fewer opportunities for time efficiencies afforded using mechanized equipment, like mowers.

The initial step in weed management typically begins in the fall with a dethatching event, as necessary for an individual site, to allow good germination of the weed seed bank with the first winter rains. The number of years required for weed management will be site-specific and depend on weed density, the type of weed species to control, annual weather patterns, and site-specific variables such as landscape position and soil type. At minimum, for most sites without supplemental irrigation, three consecutive years of site preparation activities should be planned to manage the weed population prior to installing native plant material.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

The selection of weed management methods will depend on the type and density of weed species present, the density of native species, and accessibility. Control methods can include the following, as appropriate:

- Mowing/Cutting – mechanical equipment or hand tools
- Raking/Windrowing – mechanical equipment or hand tools for removal of cut material
- Hand pulling/cutting seedlings/saplings where feasible
- Herbicide application

Each weed control method has advantages and disadvantages, with considerations for the timing of application, the availability of equipment and trained staff, and limitations to site access for equipment. Nonnative seedlings and flowering plants should be controlled prior to the production of viable weed seeds to reduce contributions back to the weed seed bank. If weeding is delayed until after seed development has already occurred, seed material should be cut, bagged, and removed from the site.

Soil disruption should be kept to a minimum to reduce the germination of new weed individuals, injury to native species, and disturbance to biological soil crusts. However, during the weed management phase (i.e., site preparation), in areas with no biological crusts and low native cover, the limited disturbance of the topsoil that occurs from mechanical equipment, such as mowers, can accelerate the germination of weed seed and increase weed control efficiency. Care should be taken to not disturb deep soil layers that would bring up buried weed seed that would not otherwise express itself in the absence of disturbance.

Careful weeding needs to be done by trained crews to avoid damage to native species in areas with significant native cover or sensitive species. Adaptive management is key to success and includes regular monitoring to guide the scheduling and selection of weed control methods.

2.1 PHYSICAL CONTROL METHODS

2.1.1 MOWING/LINE TRIMMING

Mowing with mechanical equipment, such as a rotary mower, flail mower, or mulcher attached to a tractor or skid steer, or hand-operated motorized cutting tools such as line trimmers are generally the most efficient and least disruptive site preparation methods to use in areas dominated by annual grasses and weedy herbaceous species. Mowing is appropriate in larger areas that are flat to moderately sloped. Careful mowing should be implemented to limit injury to native species when cutting. In areas with a steeper slope or with a higher density of natives, walk behind, hand-operated mowers or line trimmers should be used. Line trimming can be accomplished with a gas-powered, hand-operated line trimmer fitted with a string, brush blade, or similar instrument in areas inaccessible to larger equipment.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Like line trimming, a gas-powered, hand-operate, shafted hedge trimmer with an articulating blade can be used to trim weeds above the soil surface from a standing position. Shafted hedge trimmers can be effective for cutting denser patches of broadleaf weeds after they have flowered, such as nonnative filaree (*Erodium* spp.). Line trimmers are more effective for control of nonnative annual grasses than hedge trimmers. Hedge trimmers are most effective in areas that are inaccessible to larger equipment, or when working around dense, existing native vegetation that excludes the use of larger equipment.

Fire prevention measures must also be taken to avoid accidental fires from sparks during machinery operation or line trimming with blades. These measures may include always having a water truck on site near the mowing activity, shovels carried on the mower and water truck, and water fire extinguishers. The weed material should be cut as close to the ground as possible to limit re-sprouting of herbaceous species and ensure removal of bolting crowns of grasses. Care should be taken to not damage biological soil crusts where present.

2.1.2 Hand/Mechanical Pulling or Cutting

Hand-pulling or cutting of weeds is also one of the least disruptive methods of site preparation but is an inefficient method of weed control in dense stands of weed species. Hand-pulling or cutting should be reserved for controlling isolated individuals, targeted control of high priority invasive species, controlling small infestations in areas that are inaccessible to equipment, or where high densities of native or sensitive species are present. Hand-pulling is a very useful manual technique to use on young plants and small patches of weeds.

Hand-cutting can be used to remove the flowering stalks of weeds prior to seed development with tools such as sickles or vinyl knives. The cut material can be left in place if it does not build a significant layer of thatch or placed in a mulch pile. If cut material contains viable seed, then it should be disposed of off-site or placed in a mulch pile that is actively managed for germinating weed species. Target invasive species seed material should always be removed from the site and not left in mulch piles to stop the spread into new areas.

When hand-pulling weeds, the plants should be grasped near the base pulling in the direction the plant is growing to be able to better pull most of the roots out of the ground. Short tugs work better than one long pull to prevent breaking the plant before the main roots are removed. For larger plants, it may be helpful for multiple people to hand-pull simultaneously.

Isolated individuals of select invasive species can be pulled by hand or with a tool such as the Weed Wrench™. Using hand garden tools such as picks, cultivators, weeders, specialized hoes, mattocks, and trowels, can help to loosen the soil around the roots. After loosening the soil, pull vertically from the ground to remove as much of the root system as possible, especially weed species with a long tap root. When using a weed wrench, the clamp should be placed on the lowest point on the trunk as much as

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

possible. The base of the weed wrench should be on the ground, but if it is not touching, rocks or branches can be placed underneath to improve leverage. Using your weight the weed wrench should be pulled toward you and not pushed away or injury could occur.

2.1.3 CUT-AND-DIG

Larger mature invasive species such as pampas grass (*Cortaderia selloana*) can be controlled by cutting the upper foliage of the plant and digging out the root system. Plant foliage can be cut with a handsaw, loppers, axe, or similar tools and removed to allow for better access to the roots. The root material can be dug out and removed with a shovel, mattock, Pulaski, or similar tool. As much of the root material should be removed as possible for effective control. Many plants can readily resprout from remaining roots. Removed root material should be properly disposed of to prevent resprouting. For example, the removed roots of tamarisk or pampas grass can resprout if the roots are touching wet soil. If the plant roots cannot be removed and disposed of offsite, the weeded root material should be placed root-upward on a dry rock or hillside or hung from trees to ensure it does not come in contact with wet soil.

2.1.4 MECHANICAL RAKING/WINDROWING

Following the initial mowing and clearing event of a site, the site should be dethatched by raking the cut material and removing it from the site. Raking and removal of cut material is not necessary in subsequent mowing events unless a significant amount of the weed species has set seed, or it is determined the thickness of the thatch will prevent germination of the next crop of weeds. Additionally, a final removal of thatch material may be necessary prior to seeding activities to ensure good seed-to-soil contact, depending on the seeding method used. For instance, drill seeding and hand-broadcast seeding can be accomplished over mowed plant stubble if the thatch is not too thick. For hydroseeding, it is best to have minimal thatch present on the ground.

Material should be mechanically raked into windrows and the placed into mulch piles within the restoration area, placed in adjacent buffer areas, or removed from the site if necessary. After the dethatching event, there may be a significant amount of weed seed present, in which case, it would be preferable to remove the thatch from the restoration area, either off-site or in buffer areas where it can be further managed during implementation of the restoration project.

An exception to leaving cut biomass in place is when an herbicide that retains the active ingredient in the dead plant material (e.g., clopyralid or imazapyr) is used. In this case, collect and mulch the biomass in a buffer area or remove and properly dispose of the material from the site since this could inadvertently damage native species present.

2.2 PRESCRIBED FIRE

Prescribed fire can be used for weed control and to promote desired vegetation and species, especially fire adapted habitat types such as chaparral with fire obligate seeders, e.g., certain manzanita (*Arctostaphylos* spp.). The purpose of the prescribed

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

fire needs to be clearly defined which will be used as guidance for the temperature and intensity of the fire that is needed. Factors to incorporate into determination of the temperature and intensity of a prescribed fire includes weather, topography, and available fuel of the site. If the fire is to be used primarily for the control of invasive species, the timing of the fire for most effective control is usually prior to seed set or during the earlier stages of development. However, prescribed fire can promote invasive species if the species are also adapted to fire for germination of seed or they are vigorous resprouters after fire or disturbance. The area where a prescribed fire is to occur should be assessed for the presence of invasive species and it should be determined if these types of invasive species are in the prescribed burn area. If possible, treatment of these invasive species should occur prior to the fire (Tu et al. 2001).

To conduct a prescribed burn, since Catalina island is within the State Responsibility Area (SRA) it is subject to obtaining a California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL Fire) burn permit and air quality permits from the local Air Quality Control District, both of which are necessary all year round in Southern California. A Project Type Burn Permit from CAL Fire allows landowners to do prescribed burns on allowable burn days determined by the Air District. The prescribed fire would also be subject to CEQA compliance if the project could have an impact on the environment. CEQA compliance can take the form of a Notice of Exemption (NOE), Negative Declaration (ND), Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), or an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The Conservancy would be fully liable if anything goes wrong with the fire.

A Prescribed Burn Plan should be developed that includes specifications for each burn area describing the burn treatment and project area. The Burn Plan needs to include a description of the project, the objectives for the prescribed burn, the acceptable conditions for doing the burn, e.g., wind speed and relative humidity, equipment lists, emergency assistance sources, and checklists for burn preparation. Within the document an ignition plan, holding plan, and a contingency plan should be fully developed. All necessary approvals for the Burn Plan should be obtained before conducting the burn.

The timing of the burn can affect the outcomes with weed control or target species recovery controlled by warm season versus winter burns. In general, burns will be best done during the warm season when weeds are actively growing and can be controlled and when desirable native species are actively growing. Fire intensity will impact the outcome with fires that are too hot can kill existing plants, and if temperatures are too hot can kill beneficial soil organisms along with native seed (Tu et al. 2001).

General guidelines for prescribed fires are the following: (UCANR Accessed 2023)

- Burn in the early part of the day when temperatures are generally cooler and relative humidity is higher
- Burn when there are no to very light winds

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- Establish "check lines" or fire breaks in fuel continuity that will stop or check a fire. This can be accomplished by separating the fuels, e.g., raking a bare area, or by making a "wet line" by wetting with sufficient water (if available)
- Reduce velocity of a fire or Rate of Spread (ROS) by backing the fire down a steep slope (starting at the top of the slope), and backing the fire into the wind
- Make sure fire safety equipment is readily available for all staff participating in the prescribed burn, e.g., water fire extinguishers, long handled shovels, etc.

An alternative to conducting a prescribed burn themselves, the Conservancy could as an option participate in the CAL Fire Vegetation Management Program. In this case, the Conservancy would need to enter into contract with CALF Fire, and CAL Fire would be responsible for planning and implementing the prescribed burn on the Conservancy's land. Most or all the funding would be provided by CAL Fire, and they would assume liability for the burn. Vegetation Management projects that are in brushlands generally achieve CEQA compliance under the existing Chaparral Management Program EIR through the filling out of the Vegetation Management Program environmental checklist, which is essentially an "Initial Study", and if the checklist reveals no significant adverse impacts, then the project complies with the Chaparral Management Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR). If there are significant adverse impacts then a supplemental environmental analysis, generally an ND or MND, is required (CAL FIRE 2019). A potential drawback to the Vegetation Management Program option is the lead time that is necessary for the planning and the availability of CAL Fire to implement the project.

2.3 CHEMICAL CONTROL METHODS

The following guidelines for chemical control methods follow the Conservancy's Catalina Habitat Improvement and Restoration Program (CHIRP) control techniques that has been implemented since 2003 for target invasive species. The core mission of CHIRP is to ensure that native plant species continue to dominate the ecosystem for the immediate and long-term future. General guidelines for herbicide control of other nonnative weed species are also provided in the following subsections.

Herbicide treatment is specified mainly for dense weed areas with low densities of native species and for control of high priority invasive species that are perennial or may re-sprout from taproots and rhizomes. For effective control of weed populations, these weeds must be controlled before they produce viable seed. Most herbicides are not selective for weeds only (i.e., these herbicides must be applied with the least harmful effect to non-target native species). In general, post-emergent herbicides, which kill plants after they have germinated and are actively growing, are recommended.

Only herbicides registered for use in California and in wildlands should be used judiciously within restoration or enhancement areas. Herbicides that are registered for use in California natural areas are recommended for particular weed species at rates specified on the herbicide labels. The recommended herbicides registered for use in California that are proposed in these guidelines are glyphosate, a non-specific herbicide

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

registered for use on almost all weed species, fluazifop-p-butyl to control weedy grasses, clopyralid for the treatment of thistles in the rosette stage, triclopyr for invasive woody and forb species, aminopyralid for the control of thistles, and imazapyr for highly invasive perennial grass species and tamarisk (*Tamarix ramosissima*).

Either a state licensed Pest Control Advisor (PCA) or those exempt from state pesticide licensing requirements (e.g., landowners such as the Conservancy, and the University of California Cooperative Extension Advisors) can make written herbicide recommendations for Catalina Island. In the case of the former, the herbicide applicator must have a pest control business license that requires at least one individual employed by the business be in possession of a Qualified Applicator's License (QAL). All licenses must be issued by the State of California and be currently registered in the county of work. If a qualified applicator is not present during the herbicide treatment, all applicators must have undergone documented herbicide training.

Personnel must wear all Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) required by law and follow all herbicide label directions and precautions. PPE includes but is not limited to chemical-resistant nitrile gloves, eye protection, chemical protective suits, e.g., Tyvek®, and protective footwear. All re-entry times specified on an herbicide label must be observed and posted. Herbicide preparation must be conducted only in approved staging areas more than 100 feet from a stream course or any body of water. Only herbicides and surfactants approved for aquatic use should be used within 100 feet of a stream course or any body of water.

A colorant or marking dye is recommended to ensure even coverage of herbicide. The material should be a non-toxic material such as Blazon®, Turf Mark®, or equivalent. The dye should be mixed with the herbicide at no more than half the rate specified on the label as it can reduce product performance, especially at lower herbicide application rates.

Herbicide treatment should be conducted only when weather conditions are conducive to effective uptake of the herbicide by target species when plants are at the specified growth stage. Optimal weather includes sunny and dry conditions with ambient temperatures of at least 65 degrees Fahrenheit. Wind conditions should be seven miles per hour or less for herbicide applications that can be subject to drift, e.g., foliar spray methods, to minimize herbicide drift for worker protection and to prevent damage to desirable vegetation.

2.3.1 Foliar Spray Treatment

Foliar spray treatment involves applying a select herbicide at a specified concentration directly to the exposed foliage of the plant to thoroughly wet all leaves. For the foliar spray treatment to be effective, the exposed foliage needs a thorough coating of herbicide, and the plant should be actively growing. The green or photosynthesizing parts of the plant should be sprayed for uptake of the herbicide by the plant. Typically, the foliar spray treatment is best used on smaller plants to ensure adequate cover of the herbicide.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

The disadvantage of the foliar spray treatment is the damage that may be caused to desirable species in the localized area where spraying occurs, especially if a non-selective herbicide like glyphosate is being used. Additionally, the foliar application method is generally ineffective on invasive plants with thick waxy cuticles.

Foliar spray treatment can be implemented either by broadcast application or hand-operated sprayers. Broadcast application can be accomplished using a boom spray attached to a tractor or smaller utility vehicle. This is a highly efficient and cost-effective method but should only be done in areas with a low density of natives to reduce damage to desirable species, especially if a non-selective herbicide such as glyphosate is used. Truck-mounted sprayers with a wand and pressurized line can be used, which will allow for more directed spray to target weed species, while still being efficient.

Backpack sprayers or spray bottles are appropriate in areas with less dense weed species and higher native cover or to spot treat high priority invasive species. However, backpack or bottle spray application is the least efficient and most labor-intensive herbicide control method. For backpack or hand-held application of herbicide, use a low-pressure regulated sprayer with a coarse droplet size and single-nozzle wand. For this type of application use either spray-to-wet applications, or low volume directed spray.

For any type of hand-held applicator, make sure it is fully functional and does not have any leaks. The cap should be securely screwed on and not-cross threaded. For backpack sprayers, the rubber gasket and nipple in the sprayer lid should be regularly lubricated for proper functioning. The applicator should not bend over or lean too far forward. Prior to use, prime the backpack sprayer with 10 to 20 pumps. When traveling between spraying points, be sure to keep your hand off the lever to avoid any inadvertent spraying of herbicide.

To decrease the chances of spraying nontarget plants, preparation before spraying may be needed in areas where weeds are mixed in with native plants. The target plant for control should be separated from natives and if the plant is tall, the plant should be carefully bent downward, away from natives, and the herbicide solution applied. After spraying, the plant should be released slowly and carefully to avoid any herbicide drips or runoff. Be sure to observe what is behind and around the target species and be mindful of wind speed and direction. Nozzle adjustments may be necessary to get the mist pattern for best coverage of the target plant. Larger plants should be sprayed from multiple angles to be sure to cover them completely.

For application to small weeds (e.g., seedling stage) amongst dense native plants, if herbicide application is deemed necessary, the herbicide can be applied by backpack sprayer with a low-pressure regulated wand with the nozzle directed to the weed foliage, thereby avoiding overspray. However, nozzle-to-plant application is time intensive and requires highly trained applicators that can differentiate between native and nonnative plants at the seedling stage; and therefore, it is typically not the most cost-effective weed management method.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2.3.2 STUMP CUT AND HERBICIDE TREATMENT

Treatment of larger and well-established individuals, including high priority invasive species that may re-sprout from taproots or rhizomes, is best accomplished by using the stump cut and herbicide application method. Advantages of the stump-cut treatment compared with foliar application for larger individuals, includes the following:

- Lower quantity of herbicides required to treat the invasive species; and
- Localized application of the herbicides reduces the likelihood of herbicide contact with non-target native species, during application.

Typically, the stump cut and herbicide treatment is used in late summer and early fall when plants are translocating energy reserves to the rootstock and when seed dispersal is not enhanced by weeding activities optimal timing though is dependent on the weed species being treated.

The stump cut treatment method process involves cutting the stump of an invasive species flat at about 8 to 10 inches in height, then **immediately** (within 2 minutes or less) treating the exposed cambium of the cut stump with a select herbicide at a specified concentration. The stump cut treatment should be implemented in the following steps:

Step 1. Plants will be cleanly cut, horizontally, close to the ground (using a saw, rotary brush cutter or similar tool).

- The cut vegetation will be removed from the project area the same day it is cut and properly disposed of off-site or in a designated buffer area.
- Mulching Option: To reduce the cost of disposal, cut material that does not contain significant amounts of viable seed may be stockpiled in-place in compost piles in areas that are devoid of native species and that were previously occupied by the same treated invasive weed species. Do not locate mulch piles in areas that may negatively impact the recruitment or growth of native species (e.g., areas immediately adjacent to existing native habitat).

Step 2. The stumps or stems will be re-cut, cleared of sawdust and immediately painted with the specified herbicide within two minutes of cutting, before the cut surface begins to congeal, to ensure penetration of the herbicide. The herbicide should be applied to the cambium in 60 seconds or less after cutting.

- Apply the herbicide on the cut stump (the percent solution will be dependent on the weed species treated and herbicide used). Apply carefully to avoid any drips or damage to surrounding native species.

Plants generally should be checked about one month after application to determine the success of the herbicide treatment. Any re-growth from the treated stumps should be treated with the foliar herbicide application method in the same growing season or as re-growth appears in the next growing season. Any new seedlings and small saplings

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

observed during follow-up treatments can be hand-pulled, ensuring that the root system is removed. The pulled material should be removed from the project area or chipped and stockpiled for composting, as some species can regenerate when moisture is available.

2.3.3 Drill and Fill

For larger nonnative woody plants or trees, the drill and fill technique can be used in areas that are inaccessible with large cutting equipment, are on steep slopes, or are in remote areas. This can be a benefit to wildlife as the dead material can remain as a snag that could serve as a potential nesting opportunity or a perch for raptors for hunting. Dead trees should not be left in areas where they can become a safety hazard if they were to fall over or lose large limbs. The drill and fill method involves drilling a series of small holes in the bark and injecting a concentration of herbicide in the drilled holes to reach the cambium. The number and size of the holes as well as the concentration of herbicide will depend on the species being controlled and the herbicide being used.

In general, the guidelines for drill and fill should be implemented in the following steps:

Step 1. Drill holes, ideally one inch apart, below the first branches or leaves to a depth of two or three inches.

- The number of holes will depend on the size of the tree and size of the drill bit will depend on the species being controlled. The holes can be staggered "Charlie Brown" style to avoid running into each other. Up to two rows of holes can be drilled for larger trees.
- The holes should be drilled to a depth of two to three inches angled slightly downward to prevent herbicide from spilling out of the hole when applied.

Step 2. Fill each hole with the specified herbicide at the specified rate on the label.

- The holes should be filled with herbicide within 60 seconds of drilling before the hole begins to congeal.
- A spray bottle should be used to fill the holes slowly with the specified herbicide.

2.3.4 Basal Bark Treatment

The basal bark treatment is for use on nonnative woody and tree species. The specified herbicide should be applied at the specified rate per the herbicide label in a band completely encircling the main trunk, suckers, or branches of the plant. When applied to the main trunk the herbicide should be applied in at least a two-foot band around the main trunk. When applied to suckers or branches, the bands should completely cover the smaller branches and suckers up to the leaves. Enough herbicide should be applied so that it glistens on the bark. Application should be slowly in drops or small squirts, starting from the top to the bottom, allowing the herbicide to roll down the bark. Using a mist for application should only be done as a last resort.

Since esters can pass more readily through tree bark compared to salts, ester formulations are usually more effective for basal bark treatments. However, because of

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

the high volatility of esters, basal bark treatments should be applied when the weather is cooler on calm days. Basal bark treatments are usually more effective on small younger trees with smooth bark and can be noneffective on older trees with thick corky bark (Tu et al. 2001).

BASAL BARK GLOVE OF DEATH

A variation of the basal bark treatment is the "Glove of Death" that was developed by The Nature Conservancy (TNC) land stewards (Tu et al. 2001) is a control method that is used by the Conservancy for certain highly invasive species. The intention is for more direct herbicide application with minimal to no runoff in areas with a high density of native species. The method involves wearing a cotton glove over a protective rubber or nitrile glove and spraying herbicide on the cotton glove. Herbicide should be sprayed slowly onto the glove to wet it, avoiding drips. The target weed species should be grabbed by the stem and herbicide applied by squeezing, slowly moving your hand down the stem trying to apply as much herbicide as possible to the stem without allowing for dripping. Gloves can be sprayed with herbicide prior to application and stored in a Ziploc bag with a label to transport it to the treatment location. This limits the need to bring additional spray equipment and the chance for herbicide drift when applying the herbicide to the glove in the field.

2.3.5 RECOMMENDED HERBICIDES FOR THE CONTROL OF NONNATIVE SPECIES

The following subsections provide information and application rates for specific herbicides recommended for use in the restoration and enhancement areas.

Categories of herbicides include pre-emergent and post-emergent. Pre-emergent herbicides are applied to the soil and work by either disrupting plant germination or kill newly germinated weed species and do not harm established plants. Post-emergent herbicides work on established and actively growing weed species. Only post-emergent herbicides are recommended for use in the restoration and enhancement areas. Pre-emergent herbicides should not be used for habitat restoration since they may also affect newly germinated native species preventing natural recruitment or establishment of an applied seed mix. The soil residual life of herbicides, or the amount of time it remains active in the soil, varies by herbicide and can be anywhere from several months to several years before breaking down into inert compounds.

Post-emergent herbicides are either selective (kills specific types of weeds such as grasses or broadleaves) or non-selective (works on all plants). Grass-selective herbicides include Fusilade® DX and Envoy®. Broadleaf-selective herbicides include Clopyralid. Non-selective herbicides include glyphosate, triclopyr, and imazapyr.

Post-emergent herbicides can be broadcast sprayed in areas with a low density of native species or applied with backpack sprayers in areas with a higher density of native species. Selective herbicides can be broadcast sprayed to control the desired weed type with little to no impact on natives of a different plant type. Non-selective herbicides can be more efficient in areas with a mix of grass and broadleaf weed species since they can

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

treat all the weed species present at the site. However, non-selective herbicides can cause the most harm to desirable native species and should only be broadcast sprayed in areas with a low density of natives.

Caution should be taken to prevent overspray and herbicide drift onto the foliage of native species as they can damage or kill the plant(s). Prior to selection and use, the label of each herbicide should be read to determine if the active ingredient can translocate through the soil and cause potential damage to the root system of native species. For example, imazapyr translocates through the soil and its use should be primarily limited to the stump cut treatment method or used sparingly for foliar treatment of hard to treat highly invasive species to reduce the amount of herbicide introduced into the soil and limit herbicide drift.

Fluazifop (Fluazifop-p-butyl Fusilade® DX)

The active ingredient in Fusilade® DX is fluazifop-p-butyl. Fusilade® DX is a selective post-emergent herbicide used for the control of annual and perennial weed grasses. The herbicide is systemic i.e., it is absorbed and moves from the foliage to the roots, rhizomes, stolons, shoots, and meristematic regions of the grasses.

Application Rate

Fusilade® DX application rates for annual and perennial grasses are 16-24 ounces (oz) per acre (4 to 6 oz of active ingredient [a.i.] per acre). For control of seedlings the rate is 8 oz per acre (2 oz a.i. per acre). Add the following spray additives to the herbicide mixture for optimum effectiveness:

- Crop oil concentrate containing 15-20% approved emulsifier at 0.5-1% volume/volume (v/v) (0.5-1 gallon [gal]/100 gal)
- Nonionic surfactant containing at least 75% surface-active agent at 0.25-0.5% v/v (1-2 quarts/100 gal)
- A non-toxic colorant or marking dye to insure even coverage of herbicide. The dye should be mixed with the herbicide at no more than half the rate specified on the label of the dye as it can reduce product performance, especially at lower herbicide application rates.

Weedy grass species should be treated at the appropriate growth stage for optimum effectiveness. Grasses that have tillered (sprouted a shoot from its base), formed seed heads, or exceeded the growth stages listed on the label should not be treated. Target weed grasses should not be under stress (e.g., from moisture, temperature, low soil fertility) for optimum control.

If the treatment area has a mix of weedy grasses, Fusilade application should be implemented when the first grass reaches the specified growth stage for treatment using the highest application rate for the grasses in the mixed population. The optimum growth stage for treatment of annual grasses is when grasses are 2–8 inches tall, but prior to tillering and/or seed head formation. It is important to note that in drought

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

years when available water is limited, nonnative grasses can flower early when plants are less than 8 inches tall. Monitoring of flower production is critical to determine the optimum time for weed control. Thoroughly coat the foliage with herbicide during foliar application, but not to the point of runoff of the herbicide.

No more than 72 fluid ounces of Fusilade per acre a year should be applied to a treatment area. It should not be applied if rainfall is expected within 1 hour of application. Fusilade should not be applied directly to water, where surface water is present, or where runoff into water bodies could occur. To reduce herbicide runoff, avoid applications of herbicide within 48 hours of rainfall. Restrict entry into treated areas as specified on the label.

Visual observations of control can be seen within one week of treatment; however, it is dependent on the grass species and environmental conditions. Growth of treated grasses typically stops soon after application. Signs of herbicide control include loss of vigor, yellowing, reddening, and eventual death.

Glyphosate

Glyphosate (e.g., Roundup Pro® Concentrate or Roundup Pro® Max or Roundup Custom® for aquatic use) is a broad-spectrum post-emergence herbicide for the control of annual, perennial, and woody weed species. The herbicide is systemic and moves from the treated foliage to the root system.

Foliar application should be implemented when the target species are at the appropriate growth stage for optimum effectiveness. Target annual and perennial species should be actively growing. Application to annual species should be prior to seed head formation of grasses and before bud formation in broadleaf weeds. Perennial weeds should be treated after they reach the reproductive stage of growth, seed head formation in grasses and bud formation for broadleaf species. If treatment is necessary prior to perennials reaching the reproductive stage, the higher label application rate should be used.

Application Rate

Most annual and perennial weed species can be effectively treated with a 2% solution of glyphosate when applied during the appropriate growth stage. Follow label directions of the glyphosate product used to mix a 2% solution. Add colorant or marking dyes to the spray solution to aid the applicator in achieving good coverage of target species. The dye should be mixed with the herbicide at no more than half the rate specified on the label as the amount of dye can reduce product performance, especially at lower herbicide application rates. Most glyphosate products contain a surfactant, and no additional surfactant is needed or recommended to add to the mix except for glyphosate products registered for aquatic use. Aquatic glyphosate formulations do not contain a surfactant in the herbicide product. If using an aquatic formulation and a surfactant is added to the mix, follow the directions on the herbicide label. A surfactant approved for aquatic use should be used such as Liberate®. However, it should be noted

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

that in some cases, specific project permits and conditions may not allow use of a surfactant for aquatic applications.

For spray to wet applications, spray coverage should be uniform and complete without spraying to the point of runoff using a 2% solution of glyphosate.

For low volume directed spray applications use a 4 to 8% solution of the glyphosate product for control of annual and perennial weeds. Refer to the herbicide label for species to determine the appropriate application rate. Spray coverage should be uniform with at least 50 to 75% of the foliage treated. For best results the top one half of the plant should be sprayed.

Except where specified on the label, no more than 8 pounds (lbs) of glyphosate acid per acre per year should be applied to a treatment area in California. The total glyphosate acid amount is additive for all glyphosate products used in a given area, so it is important to keep a record of the amount of all glyphosate acid used in a given area per year. Glyphosate products have different acid concentrations and acid equivalents are provided on all product labels.

Herbicide application should not occur if heavy rainfall is expected soon after application. Herbicide should not be applied directly to water or to areas where surface water is present. Restrict entry into treated areas as specified on the label.

Visual observations of control on annual weeds can be seen within 2 to 4 days and 7 days or more for perennial weeds. Signs of herbicide control include wilting and yellowing of foliage advancing to complete browning of above-ground growth and deterioration of root material.

Glyphosate can also be used for the stump cut and drill and frill methods. For the stump cut method, generally a 50% solution is used for treatment and for the drill and frill method a 100% solution. Label directions should be followed for each method and for the species targeted for control.

Clopyralid

Clopyralid is a post-emergence selective broadleaf herbicide. It is particularly effective for the control of thistle and clover species and is considered safe to use with established native grass species. However, immature native grasses prior to tillering and development of a secondary root system may be negatively affected by clopyralid. Clopyralid is the active ingredient in the herbicide Transline®.

Application Rate

Clopyralid should be applied at ¼ to ⅔ pint per acre, depending on the weed species being treated and associated growth stage. Add the following spray additives to the herbicide mixture for optimum effectiveness:

- A non-ionic surfactant at a rate of 1 to 2 gal/100 gal of herbicide mixture.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- A non-toxic colorant or marking dye to insure even coverage of herbicide. The dye should be mixed with the herbicide at no more than half the rate specified on the label of the dye as it can reduce product performance, especially at lower herbicide application rates.

In general, the herbicide is most effective when weeds are small and actively growing. The lower rate should be used only during highly favorable growing conditions and when plants are 3 to 6 inches tall. The higher rates should be used if the plants are stressed or in areas with high weed density. The foliage should be thoroughly coated for effective control.

Application during extreme growing conditions such as drought, freezing conditions, or wet foliage at the time of application may reduce the effectiveness of the herbicide. Herbicide is rainfast within 2 hours of application. Avoid injury to non-target plants by avoiding spray drift. Non-target plants can be affected by direct spray on plant foliage or indirectly by root uptake through the soil. The maximum application rate per year in California during the growing season is ⅔ pint per acre.

Clopyralid should not be applied directly to water, where surface water is present or where runoff into water bodies could occur. Clopyralid should not be used in areas where movement through the soil could contaminate ground water, such as loamy sand, sandy soils or in areas with a shallow water table.

Sprayed material should not be used for composting or mulch as clopyralid may remain for long periods in dead plant tissue and negatively affect future growth and development of non-target species in treated areas.

Triclopyr

Triclopyr (e.g., Garlon 3A, Garlon 4, or Pathfinder® II) is a systemic herbicide used for the control of broadleaf species and grasses. Triclopyr can be used at any time during the growing season and is most effective when used to treat actively growing plants.

Application Rate

For the control of broadleaf species triclopyr should be applied at 1 to 4.5 lbs acid equivalent (a.e.) per acre in a total volume of 20 to 100 gallons of water. The herbicide mixture can be applied at any time of the growing season. Add the following spray additives to the herbicide mixture for optimum effectiveness:

- A non-ionic surfactant at the rate specified on the label of the surfactant. Use the higher recommended concentrations of surfactant when applying lower spray volumes per acre.
- A non-toxic colorant or marking dye to insure even coverage of herbicide. The dye should be mixed with the herbicide at no more than half the rate specified on the label of the dye as it can reduce product performance, especially at lower herbicide application rates.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

The maximum application rate of triclopyr is 9 lbs a.e. per acre per year for Garlon 4 and 8 lbs a.e. per year for Pathfinder® II.

Triclopyr can also be used for the stump cut method and is generally applied with a 20 or 50% solution depending on the target weed species when using Garlon 4. Pathfinder® II is used for the control of woody species using stump cut or basal bark methods. Product label directions should be followed for each method for the life stage of the species targeted for control.

Aminopyralid

Aminopyralid (e.g., Milestone®) is a systemic herbicide used for the control of broadleaf species. It is particularly effective for the control of thistle species and can be used at multiple life stages of target plants. In general, grasses are highly tolerant of aminopyralid and aren't affected by application. Aminopyralid can be used as a preemergent so care should be taken to use it primarily for selective spot treatment of target invasive species and not be used for broadcast application which could inhibit native recruitment.

Application Rate

The maximum application rate of aminopyralid is 0.11 lbs a.e. per acre per year as a result of broadcast, spot, or repeat applications.

Aminopyralid will generally be used for spot foliar spray applications for target invasive species with a 0.3% solution. For certain target species, a 2% solution of glyphosate will be added to the mix for more effective control.

Imazapyr

Imazapyr (e.g., Habitat®) is a non-selective systemic herbicide that is used to treat a wide range of broadleaf and grass species. It can be used at any time of the year and has a formulation that is approved for aquatic use (Habitat®). Care should be taken when using imazapyr products since it can translocate in the soil and harm desirable native species. Imazapyr is best used for direct application, such as the stump cut method, or for spot treatment only for foliar applications. Avoid spraying the ground with imazapyr especially over the rooting zone of native plants. Plant material that has been treated with imazapyr should not be left on site or used as mulch as the active ingredient is retained in the plant material and can pass through into the soil or onto the foliage of plants it is in contact with.

Application Rate

The maximum application rate of Habitat® is 1.5 lbs a.e. imazapyr per acre per year. For foliar treatments, the solution will range from 1 to 2% depending on the target species and life stage. For stump cut use a 10% solution and for drill and frill methods a 100% solution. All product labels should be followed for application rates depending on the method, target species, and growth stage.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Add the following spray additives to the herbicide mixture for optimum effectiveness when using Habitat®:

- Add a nonionic surfactant at the rate of 0.25% volume/volume or higher (see manufacturer's label) of the spray solution. Best results are obtained from using a nonionic surfactant with hydrophilic to lipophilic balance rate between 12 and 17 with at least 70% surfactant in the formulated product.
- Instead of a surfactant, a methylated seed oil or vegetable-based seed oil concentrate may be used at a rate of 1.5 to 2 pints per acre. Uptake of Habitat by plants under moisture or temperature stress may be aided by the use of oils as indicated by research.

2.3.6 Herbicides Approved for Aquatic Use

Only herbicides and surfactants approved for aquatic use should be used in riparian habitats or within 100 feet of a stream course or body of water for treatment of weed species. It is important to note that permits may not allow the use of a surfactant in riparian habitats. The purpose of a surfactant is to provide more uniform coverage and improve penetration of the herbicide into the plant. Approved aquatic herbicides include Round-up® Custom (active ingredient glyphosate), Habitat® (active ingredient imazapyr), and Renovate® 3 (active ingredient triclopyr). Only non-ionic surfactants should be used that are approved for aquatic use. Non-ionic surfactants approved for aquatic use include Liberate® and Rainier®.

2.4 Weed Seed Handling, Resprout Reduction, and Plant Matter Disposal

While the physical removal and chemical treatment of invasive species is a key part of weed management, care must also be taken to reduce the chances of seed spreading, resprouting, and other undesirable consequences of weed control. Preventing the future propagation of weeds will increase the effectiveness of current practices and reduce the severity of later infestation.

Though it is recommended to control weeds before seeds mature, there may be situations where this is not possible. For example, if the weed can seed year-round and monitoring each individual's life stage is too difficult. It is important then to be mindful of the presence of seeds during control events. While the plant itself may be removed, seeds left behind at the site or stuck to clothing or equipment can reduce the effect of management and spread the infestation to other areas.

To reduce the spread of seed, remove any flowering parts or seeds found on plants before cutting, hand-pulling, or herbicide application and place the material in appropriate containers for disposal. Pick up all seeds that remain on the ground and place in containers. After each treatment, ensure that all seeds are removed from clothing and equipment and placed in the disposal containers before leaving the area.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Any storage bin or vehicle used during treatment and for transport of weeded material shall be inspected and all seeds, flower, and root material removed.

In many cases it is possible to leave treated plant matter on site to dry out and decompose. If no flowers or seeds are present, pull the plant and place it on the ground to dry out only if the species is not rhizomatous and there is no potential for re-sprouting. In such cases, it will be important to completely remove all root matter through digging out the roots when mechanical methods are being used, and properly removing and disposing of cut matter off-site. Thatch of plants treated with herbicides that remain in the dead plant material, such as clopyralid and imazapyr should not be used as mulch and if treating large areas, the material should be removed from the site.

If the plant thatch material is to be removed from the site and the conditions are met where there is not seed material present and weeded material is not able to resprout from root material, the thatch can be left to dry out on site for a few days to a week, making it easier for removal since the material will be lighter and easier to work with.

2.5 MANAGEMENT METHODS FOR TARGET INVASIVE SPECIES ON CATALINA ISLAND

The Conservancy's CHIRP program has prescribed treatment methods for select invasive species present on the island. Methods include physical control methods and chemical control methods. Preferred and secondary methods are given and are selected based on time of year, plant life stage, etc. The methods are reviewed and updated annually as needed based on new research and through monitoring control effects in treated populations.

While use of the weed management methods presented above are effective for most nonnative plants, some invasive plant species may require more focused control effort within a habitat restoration area. Many of these invasive species are naturalized, with established populations in the areas under weed management. The goal for a typical habitat restoration project is to control their spread and to reduce their population size to the point where self-sustaining native vegetation communities can be restored. Absolute control is often not feasible or necessary in all cases. The control methods for target invasive species used by the Conservancy are presented in Appendix A.

Separate consideration should be made for control of those invasive plant species that have yet to become common on Catalina Island. These less common invasive plant populations should be managed with an early detection and rapid response (EDRR) management approach, as advocated by the California Invasive Plant Council (Cal-IPC). An EDRR plan for natural areas associated with a habitat restoration project is outside of the scope of this plan but should be considered as a complementary land management activity to habitat restoration efforts.

Table 2-1 shows the selected invasive species and their relative threat to California's natural areas as ranked by Cal-IPC. The Cal-IPC ranking is for the statewide threat; however, keep in mind that on Catalina Island, some of these species may pose a

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

greater or lesser threat. The table also presents species deemed invasive on Catalina that are not ranked by Cal-IPC and are actively controlled.

Table 2-1. Invasive Plant Species on Catalina Island

Scientific Name	Common Name	Cal-IPC Rank
Arctotheca calendula	Capeweed	Moderate
Arundo donax	Giant cane	High
Asparagus asparagoides	Bridal creeper	Moderate
Asphodelus fistulosus	Onionweed	Moderate
Brassica tournefortii	Saharan mustard	High
Caesalpinia spinosa	Tara	None
Cakile maritima	Sea rocket	Limited
Carduus pycnocephalus	Italian thistle	Moderate
Carpobrotus species	Iceplant	Moderate, High
Centaurea solstitialis	Yellow starthistle	High
Centranthus ruber	Jupiter's beard	None
Cirsium vulgare	Bull thistle	Moderate
Cortaderia selloana	Pampas grass	High
Cotoneaster species	Cotoneaster	Moderate
Cynara cardunculus	Artichoke thistle	Moderate
Cytisus scoparius,	Scotch	High
Cytisus striatus	Portuguese broom	Moderate
Delairea odorata	Cape Ivy	High
Eriogonum fasciculatum	California buckwheat	None
Eucalyptus species	Eucalyptus	Watch, Limited
Euphorbia regis-jubae	Milky spurge	None
Euphorbia terracina	Carnation spurge	Limited
Ficus carica	Common fig	Moderate
Foeniculum vulgare	Fennel	Moderate
Genista linifolia	Flax leaf broom	Watch
Genista monspessulana	French broom	High
Genista stenopetala	Sweet broom	None
Hedera helix	English ivy	High
Hypercium androsaemum	Sweet amber	Watch
Lathyrus latifolius, L. odoratus	Everlasting, Sweet pea	Watch
Lepidium draba	Whitetop	Moderate
Malephora crocea	Coppery mesembryanthemum	Watch
Marrubium vulgare	Horehound	Limited
Mesembryanthemum species	Crystalline iceplant	Limited, Moderate

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Scientific Name	Common Name	Cal-IPC Rank
Nicotiana glauca	Tree tobacco	Moderate
Oenothera xenogaura	Dummond's gaura	None
Osteospermum calendulaceum	Stinking Roger	None
Paspalum vaginatum	Seashore Paspalum	Watch
Pennisetum setaceum	Fountain grass	Moderate
Phalaris aquatica	Harding grass	Moderate
Phoenix canariensis	Canary Island Date Palm	Limited
Pinus halepensis	Aleppo pine	None
Pittosporum undulatum	Victorian box	Watch
Ricinus communis	Castorbean	Limited
Salsola tragus	Russian thistle	Limited
Silybum marianum	Milk thistle	Limited
Spartium junceum	Spanish broom	High
Stipa tenuissima	Mexican feathergrass	Watch
Tamarix ramosissima	Tamarisk	High
*Tribulus terrestris**	Puncture Vine	Limited
Vinca major	Periwinkle	Moderate
Washingtonia species	Fan palm	Moderate
Yucca species	Yucca	None

3 EROSION CONTROL

Erosion control measures may be needed for restoration areas on steep slopes or next to roadways or facilities. Erosion control measures include biodegradable straw wattles, erosion control fiber mats, check dams with hay bales, hydraulically applied soil binders, etc.

In the cases where construction activities will trigger the need for a Construction General Permit for Stormwater Discharges that requires the development of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), in California the SWPPP must be prepared by a certified Qualified SWPPP Developer (QSD) to ensure compliance with the National Discharge Elimination System Permit (NPDES). The SWPPP will provide detailed information on Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be used in specific instances for erosion control and provides a monitoring plan to track compliance with permit conditions to be conducted under the supervision of a Qualified SWPPP Practitioner (QSP). A Construction general permit is required when there will be ground disturbance totaling one or more acres in size.

In instances where erosion control is needed but not subject to permit conditions, the following presents general guidelines for erosion control BMPs that could be used for

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

the restoration and enhancement areas presented in this HRMP. For optimum erosion control, a combination of the following erosion control measures may be needed.

3.1 STRAW WATTLES

Straw wattles are an effective erosion control measure to use on steep slopes that are lacking vegetation that will prevent erosion of bare soil surfaces. The wattles interrupt and slow down water flow on steep slopes and capture sediment that may be within the sheet flow. Biodegradable natural wattles of straw or coir rolls, if needed, should be used, and the netting of the wattles should be of non-plastic, biodegradable material that will break down in the environment over time, such as burlap wrap. Plastic netting can be an entanglement hazard for wildlife. General guidelines for straw wattle spacing are as follows:

- 50-feet apart on slopes flatter than 10:1
- 20 feet apart on slopes that are between 4:1 to 10:1
- 15 feet apart for slopes from 2:1 to 4:1
- 10 feet apart for slopes steeper than 2:1

The wattles should be trenched into the ground at a depth of 2 to 4 inches deep and aligned with slope contours. No daylight should be seen under the wattle if installed properly. Ends of the wattles shall be overlapped by 12 inches and not butted end to end to prevent rilling. Wood stakes that are at least 18 inches long and at least one inch in diameter should be placed at each end and every 4 feet on center, driven in the center of the wattle to anchor the wattle to the slope. Two to three inches of the stake should be left protruding above the wattle. Stakes should be driven perpendicular to the slope.

Straw wattles should be inspected regularly after significant rain events and maintained as needed to ensure adequate sediment holding capacity. Generally, removal of accumulated sediment should occur when the accumulated sediment reaches ¾ of the barrier height. Any damaged or missing wattles should be replaced.

3.2 FIBER MAT

A fiber mat, or rolled erosion control netting, is an erosion control measure to use on bare steep slopes to prevent topsoil and sediment movement until vegetation can establish for slope stabilization. It might be best used with other erosion control measures such as straw wattles on steep slopes. If seeding is planned in areas where the fiber mats are placed, the mat should have an open area percentage of 65 percent so that seed may be applied after the netting is put in place. If a product with less open area must be used (e.g., for increased erosion control protection) then a netting with no less than 50 percent open area should be used.

The fiber mat should be made of 100 percent natural biodegradable fiber woven into a matrix (no synthetic materials), a minimum roll width of 6 feet, and weight of about 11.8 ounces per square yard (e.g., BioD-Mat® 40 or Coir Mat 480). The open area

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

percentage of the mat to use will depend on the amount of erosion protection needed with the less open space providing increased erosion control protection.

Fiber mats work best in areas with bare soil that have been graded. The mats need to fit snug to the ground surface to be most effective. If application of seed is to occur in combination with the fiber mat, the seed bed should be prepared which might include loosening the upper couple of inches prior to installation if the soil is compacted. Seeding should occur before installation of the netting. Reseeding in areas that were disturbed during installation may need to occur.

Installation of the fiber mat should begin at the top of the slope and the mat anchored into a 12-inch anchor trench. The mat should be placed in the trench and the trench backfilled and the soil tamped down firmly. The mat should then be rolled down the slope. Adjacent parallel rolls should overlap by 6 inches and anchored with 6-inch-long staples that are degradable (e.g., 11-guage steel wire staple). When the mat must be spliced, the rolls should be placed end over end (shingle style) with 12 inches overlapping. The overlapped area should be secured with two staggard rows of staples 6 inches on center. For slopes that are 2:1 and steeper, a minimum of 2 staples per every square yard is recommended. The end of the mat at the downslope end should be anchored into the ground in a 12 by 6-inch anchor trench. The mat should be placed in the trench, backfilled with soil, and tamped into the ground.

3.3 SILT FENCES

A silt fence is a temporary erosion control measure that is used for capture of sediment on site by intercepting and slowing down the flow of sheet flow runoff. It is made of permeable fabric that captures sediment behind the fence. Silt fences should be placed below areas where sheet flows discharge from the site. Silt fences are most applicable around the perimeter of the project, below the toe of or downslope of exposed and erodible soils, along streams, or around temporary spoil or stockpiles. Silt fences are not appropriate for protection against concentrated flows and are only applicable for sheet flow.

For most effective erosion control silt fences should be used in combination with other erosion control devices, such as straw wattles on steep slopes. The silt fence should be installed offset 3 feet from the toe of slope to be most effective. A trench should be excavated approximately 6 inches wide and 6 inches deep along a level contour. The bottom of the silt fence should be keyed in a minimum of 12 inches, 6 inches deep and 6 inches horizontally in the bottom of the trench. After placing the silt fence fabric material in the trench, it should be backfilled with soil and tamped into the ground.

The silt fence should be secured with posts that are a minimum of 12 to 18 inches below the bottom of the trench and placed a maximum of 6 feet apart. The stakes should be placed on the downslope side of the trench. When fence lengths need to be joined together, the silt fence fabric should be spliced together only at a support post with a minimum of 6 inches of overlap and both ends secured to the post. The fabric should be folded around the stake one full turn for each section and the two stakes placed

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

together and driven tightly together to prevent potential flow through of sediment at the joint. The tops of the stakes should be secured with wire. The fence material should be stapled to the posts and with staples that are 1.75 inches long and be 0.6 inch or heavier wire. The staples used for joining two sections of fence together should be 0.12 inches or heavier wire. A minimum of 4 staples should be used to secure the fabric to the stakes. The end stake should have two stakes and the fabric folded around one full turn and secured with 4 staples. The last 8 feet of the fence should be turned upslope to prevent stormwater from flowing around the fence.

Inspection of silt fences should occur before and after rain events. Repairs should be done as needed, e.g., torn, or weathered fabric should be replaced, and broken posts should be replaced. Inspection after rains should be done to see if sediment removal is necessary to continue to provide adequate sediment holding capacity of the fence. Sediment removal should occur when sediment reaches 1/3 of the barrier height.

3.4 STRAW HAY BALE CHECK DAM

Check dams can be a useful temporary erosion control tool in smaller drainages or deep erosion gullies. They should not be used in flowing channels or streams and are not intended for protection against large storm events. They are designed to reduce debris flow, scour, and erosion. The check dam can prevent undercutting from occurring if installed correctly and can slow down the velocity of water flow in the channel or gully. The general guidelines for design limits of the straw hay bale check dam are the following:

- Slopes 0 to 15% - the maximum drainage area between check dams is 1 acre and maximum slope length is 200 feet
- Slope 15 to 20% - the maximum drainage area between check dams is ½ acre and maximum slope length is 100 feet
- Slope >20% - not recommended

The hay bales should be made of natural material that is certified weed-free that meet the State requirements for noxious and invasive weeds. For more durable straw hay bales, the bale should be bound with either wire or nylon string. Twine binding will break down quicker thereby reducing the integrity of the hay bale. The bales should be placed in rows with the bale ends tightly abutting the adjacent bales. Depending on the size of the erosion control area, multiple straw check dams may be necessary. The number needed will depend on the size of the drainage or gully.

Two rows of hay bales should be installed with the downstream hay bales trenched into the ground so that the top of the row of bales placed on their long, wide side are level with the ground. The top of the bales across the center of the drainage or gully should all be level and set at the same elevation. A trench should be dug immediately upstream of this row so at least 6 inches of each bale is below ground and wide enough to accommodate a row of bales set vertically on their long edge. The trench and the tops of the bales across the center of the channel should be as level as possible so that water

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

will evenly flow across the top. This trench should be continued up slope on either side of the channel so that the last bales are higher than the top of the bales in the center of the channel (USDA 2012).

The hay bales should be anchored in with wooden stakes or #4 rebar that are driven through the bales and into the ground 1 ½ to 2 feet into the ground. The stakes should be angled to drive towards the adjacent previously laid bale, so they are driven towards each other.

For further protection, an energy dissipater of rocks and/or logs can be constructed at the base of the spillway bales. Logs can be anchored in front of the hay bales with bent rebar or rocks can be piled at least two deep against the bales. The energy dissipator should be large enough to receive all the flowing water over the hay bale check dam (USFS 2006).

Monitoring of the check dams should occur before and after rain events and maintenance conducted as needed. The check dam can quickly fill up with sediment after a storm and if the sediment accumulation is one-third of the bale height, it should be cleaned out. Straw hay bales will degrade quickly and may need to be replaced every 3 months, depending on the site conditions and weather. The buildup of sediment over time behind the check dam can allow for establishment of desirable native habitats that can further provide erosion stabilization.

Alternative materials can be used for the construction of check dams that may be preferred, provide greater stabilization and last longer. Other materials include fiber rolls, gravel filled bags, rocks, or logs. The advantage of using alternative materials are they will last longer in the environment since hay bales can quickly degrade and last less than 3 months, especially in areas with high rainfall.

3.5 HYDRAULICALLY APPLIED SOIL STABILIZERS

Hydromulch with soil stabilizers can be an effective erosion control measure on bare erodible slopes, including steep slopes that are between 25 to 50%. It can be used as a temporary measure until vegetation can reestablish on the bare slopes and can be used in combination with seed application to jump start the vegetation recovery process. The mulch will protect the slope from rain drop impact and can reduce sheet flow that might otherwise occur on steep, bare slopes. The mulch can provide favorable conditions for seed germination and establishment by trapping moisture and providing temperature regulation.

Erosion control effectiveness of hydromulch appears to be mainly during the first few months after application and erosion control protection is diminished by higher rainfall amounts and or/intensity (Hubbert et al. 2011). Hydromulch is most effective on slopes with a shorter run length such as road cuts where concentrated flow is diminished (USFS 2006). When using hydromulch, it is recommended to have erosion control measures in place at the toe of the slope such as silt fence.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

There are currently products on the market that can be applied that includes the hydromulch and soil stabilizers all into one, e.g., EarthGuard® Pellets or EarthGuard® Fiber Matrix. If seeding is to be done with hydromulch application, it is recommended to use the Fiber Matrix material. In general, the recommended application rate of the hydromulch is 2,000 pounds per acre. Depending on the steepness of the slope, the manufacturer recommended application rates should be used which depends on slope steepness and annual average rainfall amounts.

4 PLANT MATERIALS

The goal of the Project is to maintain the genetic biodiversity of the plant populations on Catalina Island, so to the extent possible, all plant material collected for seed application and container plant production for restoration projects should be obtained from native plant communities growing on the island. Seed for restoration projects will either be specially collected on the island or obtained from the Conservancy's seed farm facility to ensure genetic integrity of the seed and container plant material. Using sources from the island will also reduce the risk of contamination with unintended genetics and reduce the risk of the introduction of nonnative species that are currently not present on the island that may be inadvertently included in seed purchased from seed vendors/companies.

In some instances, there may not be enough seed available from island sources for projects that require large quantities of seed. For those species that function as erosion control or nurse crop species, do not exist in large enough quantities on the island, or are not being produced at the island seed farm facility, it will be necessary to either (a) use seed stock from a seed collector/supplier that can be verified as collected within Los Angeles County and of similar microclimate regime, or (b) extend the collection area on a species-by-species basis from appropriate sources within Los Angeles County or other appropriate microclimatic regions in Southern California. The seed collection firm shall certify all seed collection locations. Sources for all species and any adjustments to the seeding rate should be approved by the project restoration ecologist/biologist.

When special collection off island is required, the seed material should be collected by a qualified native seed collection firm that has a minimum of five years of experience and holds all the necessary licenses and permits through the term of the project. The selected firm must be approved by the project restoration ecologist/biologist and the Conservancy.

4.1 SEED MATERIALS

Active restoration for the restoration projects will consist mainly of the addition of seed material for restoring native habitats in areas with reduced native seed banks. Seed can either be specially collected from wild populations or grown on seed farms for seed bulking of commonly used native species in the restoration process. Either method will

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

include seed collection activities, seed processing and storage, and seed testing for pure live seed determination.

4.1.1 SEED COLLECTION

Standard industry collection procedures and best practices for seed collection should be followed to maintain genetic integrity, diversity, and variability, which are crucial for project success. This will also ensure the adaptive capacity of the planting material and provide climate change resilience. Planning should begin early for seed collection or seed farm production to allow enough time to be able to obtain the needed seed quantities.

Seed scouting should occur prior to seed collection to make sure the seed is ripe and ready for collection. Seed is ripe when they shake from the pod or seed casing, can be easily removed from the plant, and/or are turning dark in color. Populations should be frequently checked after blooming starts to determine when the seeds will be ready for harvest. In general, once the seeds have turned hard and cannot be punctured with a thumbnail, then it is mature and ready for collection. In general, ripe seed should be collected from the plant and not from material that has already fallen to the ground.

Seed collected in the wild should follow the best practices that includes collecting at the appropriate time of year for each species, collecting a maximum of 5% of the current season seed either on a population or on a per plant basis, and collecting from at least 30 to 50 different plants in a collection area from multiple separate populations in a collection area, e.g., same elevation band or watershed. Separate populations should be at least ¼ mile distance from each other. These practices will ensure genetic variation is collected. Seed collection should be from plants in good condition and not ones with disease, insect infestations, etc. (USFS 1993).

For the collection of species that are federally- or state-listed as rare, threatened, endangered or candidate species, a permit may be needed from either United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). A permit is not required for non-listed native species or plants that have a California Native Plant Society (CNPS) CNPS Rare Plant Rank of 1B, 2B, 3 and 4.

A similar amount of seed should be collected from each individual plant, regardless of seed production of the individual plant. In other words, don't collect more seed from a high seed-bearing plant versus a low seed-bearing plant. If practical the seed collection should be randomly and evenly collected throughout a population (CNPS 2015). Areas with a high density of weeds, in particular invasive weed species, should be avoided for collection to decrease the chances of inadvertently spreading invasive species either through collection or transfer from clothing and equipment.

Seed bags should be clearly labeled with the following information, plant species name, date collected, location, and the name of the collector. A log should be created each day to keep track of all collected seed. The seed log should include the same bag information and include the number of bags of seed for each species collected on that

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

day. Dry seeds should be collected in paper bags and moist fruits collected in plastic bags or containers (CNPS 2015). Seeds that are fleshy should be kept in a cool shady place while collecting since overheating can kill the seed. Fleshy seeds should also be dried in the same day of collection, if possible, by being spread to dry or the seed should be refrigerated if drying is not immediately possible.

Since site preparation weed management will occur for multiple years, ideally seed collection should begin as soon as possible so it can occur for multiple years to be able to collect the quantity of seed needed for a restoration project. Seed production is highly dependent on annual weather conditions with seed produced in each year depending on rainfall timing/amounts and temperature conditions that cue germination. In severe drought years, seed production may be extremely low or viable seed may not be produced. If it seems that seed may not be available for certain species or enough seed might not be able to be collected prior to installation, the seed collectors should be directed to opportunistically collect additional species that may be suitable substitutes or additions for the range of restoration targets for the restoration project.

4.1.2 Seed Processing, Cleaning, and Storage

The collected seed should be dried, cleaned, and placed in proper storage to maintain viability and vigor of the seed to increase seed longevity. Germination declines over time for all seed, but proper storage will slow down the rate of decline.

Seed should be dried well before cleaning and storage to ensure optimal quality. Ideally seeds should be dried immediately after harvesting to prevent any fungal growth or rotting and decomposition of the seed. In general, seed should be dried down to 8 to 10% moisture prior to storage. Drying can be done by laying out the seed in a thin layer on a tarp, screen, cardboard, or anything moveable allowing for good air flow for the seed to dry out. Drying can take several days to a few weeks (Houseal 2007). It is best to dry the seed in a sunny area where it will be protected from insect, bird, or rodent predation with temperatures below 90 degrees F because high temperatures can kill the seed. If nights are going to be cool or wet, the seed should be brought inside to a safe place to prevent it from getting wet, which could start to mildew or rot (USFS 1993).

Cleaning the seed of inert material reduces the chances of rotting or molding of the seed. The amount of seed cleaning that is needed will depend on the harvesting method for the seed, how much inert material is present, the desired purity of the seed, and the seeding method to be used with some methods requiring a higher degree of cleaned seed. For optimal cleaning, a seed cleaning machine should be used.

The first step for cleaning is threshing to dethatch the seed from any flower stalks or seed heads. Many different tools can be used for this process such as mechanical threshers or hammer mills or can also be done by hand methods for smaller quantities of seeds using creatively produced, handheld implements that can remove the seed from stalks. The second step is winnowing or sieving the seed through a series of screens to remove chaff, other plant material, weed seed, and empty seed hulls.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Stored seed should be kept free of pests and predation and in conditions to prevent rot and molding. Seed should be stored in a cool dry place with little to no variation in the temperature and humidity. In general, seed stored in a cool, dry place can remain viable for 1 to 3 years. Seed storage can be longer in climate controlled, (temperature and humidity), storage units and seed can remain viable for 3 to 5 years or longer, depending on the species being stored. For the longest seed storage, if properly dried seeds can be stored in freezer conditions and can last as long as 20 years. However, seed longevity for some seed decreases with cold temperature. Removing seed from freezer storage should be avoided, but if it is necessary, care should be taken when removing seed from freezer storage to prevent any moisture from entering the seed storage container. In some cases, seed longevity is only a matter of months regardless of storage such as for willow species (*Salix* spp.) and certain oak species (*Quercus* spp.) and these seeds need to be planted in the same season as collection.

4.1.3 Seed Testing

Prior to use, the seed should be tested for germination and purity to assure the pure live seed (PLS) pounds (lbs) for each species. Individual seed lots (seed collection in one location or in different years) must be tested for seed viability and purity by a registered seed technologist (RST) or similar qualification from the Society of Commercial Seed Technologists (SCST) or by an independent seed-testing laboratory certified by the Association of Official Seed Analysis (AOSA) and tested according to the rules and procedures of the AOSA.


The seed tests should include the following information for each species: botanical name, seed lot number, percent purity, percent germination, percent total viable seed, percent by weight of inert matter, percent by weight other crop seed (not to exceed 1.5 percent), and percent weight weed seed (not to exceed 1.0 percent and 0.0 percent Noxious or Restricted weed allowed). Seed tests shall not contain any weed species listed as noxious or restricted in the State of California. For more information regarding laws and regulations for invasive species, see the following CDFW website: www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Invasives/Regulations.

Seed tests should be available to the land manager upon request. Seed tests should be performed no more than 12 months before seed application. Retesting for germination may be required if the seeding schedule is delayed and the latest available test date is beyond 12 months.

A sample seed test result is shown in Figure 4-1 for a seed lot of purple needlegrass. The observed germination rate is 82% and the purity rate is 97.43%, and the calculated target PLS is 79.89% excluding the contribution of dormant seed to viability.

It should be noted that in this case testing determined 10% of the seed was dormant. The PLS in the seed report was 89.64% when calculated based on total viability, 92% (82% germination + 10% dormant), and purity, 97.43%.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B



Report Of Seed Analysis

Account No.	Date Received	Date Completed	Lab Number
	10/27/14	11/20/14	14-14107

Sender's Information*

Kind	STIPA PULCHRA
Variety	--
Lot Number	8/20/14
Other	(NASSELLA)

*The information above is provided by the sender.

Purity Analysis			Viability Analysis				
Pure Seed Components		Purity	Days Tested	Germination %	Dormant %	Hard %	Total Viable
STIPA PULCHRA		97.43%	21	82	10	-N-	92
	Crop Seed	0.08%					
	Inert Matter	2.40%					
	Weed Seed	0.09%					

Other Crop Seeds: In 100 grams	# per lb
BROMUS CARINATUS	68

Noxious Weed Seeds: In 100 grams **None Found**
(C) California Noxious, (O) Other Noxious

Other Weed Seeds: In 100 grams	# per lb
BROMUS CATHARTICUS	41
HORDEUM SP.	9
VULPIA MYUROS	9
CHENOPODIUM SP.	5
MELICA SP.	5

Other Determinations:

Live Seed Per Pound	84,651
P.L.S.	89.64 %

Germination Remarks
DORMANT SEED: 10% GERMINATED WHEN PRECHILLED AND GA3 ADDED
Purity Remarks
INERT MATTER: BROKEN SEED, PLANT MATERIAL, SOIL

Tests Requested: Purity, Germination, P.L.S., Live Seed Per Pound. No other tests requested.

WARRANTY: We warrant that the purity and germination test results reported on this form have been carried out in accordance with Association of Official Seed Analysts (AOSA) rules unless otherwise specified. Test results reflect the condition of the submitted sample and may not reflect the condition of the seed lot from which the sample was taken.
DISCLAIMER OF WARRANTIES: WE MAKE NO OTHER WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND, EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Signature:

Page 1 of 1 Printed: 11-20-14 17:02:42

Issued by Registered Member No.67. Society of Commercial Seed Technologies.
Aleta Meyr, RST; Michael Aberle, RST

Figure 4-1 Sample Seed Test Report for Purple Needlegrass (*Stipa pulchra*)

5 SEED ADDITION

Native plant material will be primarily added to the habitat restoration area by seed after it has achieved weed management thresholds. Restoration success is in large part dependent upon proper site preparation during the weed management step. It is very important to gain adequate control of nonnative species prior to installation. Weed management should continue until the weed management threshold is achieved rather than installing plant material too soon.

Seed installation can be achieved by several methods, including drill seeding, imprint seeding, broadcast seeding, hydroseeding, and the seed ball technique. The

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

determination of seeding method will be dependent upon site conditions and accessibility. Larger sites that are accessible by equipment can be efficiently seeded mechanically with a drill seeder, imprint seeder, hydroseeder, or broadcast seeder. Smaller sites, sites with a high density of native species, or with unavoidable populations of sensitive species can be seeded (optimally during the fall season) by hand broadcast or the seed ball technique.

An effective method for seed application on very steep slopes (≥1.5:1) is the hydroseed method as the mulch provides an erosion control blanket when using materials such as Flexterra® FGM™ or EarthGuard® Fiber Matrix™.

5.1 SEED MIX DESIGN

A well-designed seed mix is essential to the establishment of a diverse and sustainable native vegetation community. Seed species should be selected to include the appropriate level of diversity for the target vegetation community and based on the site conditions (e.g., soil type, hydrology, slope, aspect, landscape position). Seed mixes can also be augmented with additional species that are typical of the vegetation communities predicted to be suitable in the future (e.g., Riordan et al. 2018), which will help facilitate potential future shifts in plant assembly.

5.1.1 PLANT FUNCTIONAL GROUPS

Seed mixes can be developed by first identifying the key plant functional groups that are ecologically relevant for the target vegetation community, which may include some of the following:

- Early establishment nurse crop
- Erosion control annuals
- Early successional shrub species
- Mid-story mature shrub canopy species
- Native grasses
- Native herbaceous species (annuals and perennials)
- Native trees

It is important to include species that may not be common in the mature, established vegetation community (such as those observed in reference stands) but are common in the community following a natural disturbance, such as wildfire. These species may be found in any of the plant functional groups but are particularly represented in the early establishment nurse crop and early successional shrub species groups. Including these species not only fortifies the seed bank with components necessary for post-disturbance recovery, but they also provide the same function in the habitat restoration seed mix. In the case of restoration from seed, the disturbance is artificially created by the weed management efforts, which allows the seeded natives to establish from a low thatch, higher bare ground cover condition.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Fast germinating erosion control annuals are often included, especially on slopes to provide a cover crop that will help stabilize erodible soils, compete with annual weeds during the early establishment period, and provide time for the native seed mix to germinate and establish. Erosion control annuals may be selected that are not locally native, but native to California or the western United States, because they readily germinate and quickly mature. However, care must be taken to select species that will not compete with the rest of the native seed mix. Erosion control annuals should be selected that will eventually diminish from the restoration area by year two or three, due to their life history traits.

Native annuals, such as California plantain (*Plantago erecta*) and small fescue *(Festuca microstachys)*, can be effective erosion control species, but factors of site (e.g., soil substrate) and year (e.g., rainfall amounts) will influence germination rates, density, and plant size of species (e.g., Espeland and Rice 2007) and, consequently their relative effectiveness for early erosion control. *Plantago erecta* is a widespread and common species in California, but it can be difficult to make sufficient local wild collections for restoration projects; however, *P. erecta* is available from seed suppliers with commercially bulked seed production fields at reasonable costs. We recommend consulting with species experts to determine if the use of any commercially bulked seed is a threat to local wildlife—and if so, identify a suitable alternative species to perform a similar function in the seed mix.

5.1.2 Criteria for Species Selection

Consider the following factors when selecting the appropriate species to include in the seed mix for each relevant plant functional group:

- Site conditions
- Species traits
- Seed sources
- Seed availability from wild collection, seed farm, or commercial sources
- Seed cost for production or purchase from seed vendor

Site conditions to consider include the following: soil type, soil moisture conditions, hydrology, slope, aspect, landscape position and microclimate of the site. Every plant species has a set of unique traits that determine the environmental conditions needed for survival (i.e., species ecological niche). Selecting species that have suitable traits for the range of environmental conditions at the site will help ensure successful establishment. For example, soil type, including soil texture and organic matter content, are important in determining the available rooting depth, capacity of soil to hold water that is available to plants (i.e., available water capacity), the rate at which water drains through the soil profile (i.e., infiltration rate), and soil chemistry (e.g., pH, nutrient availability, salinity). Depending on soil type and other site conditions (e.g., landscape position, hydrology, slope, aspect, and rainfall), the soil moisture of a site may be classified as hydric (wet), mesic (moderate moisture) or xeric (dry). Hydric soils are

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

poorly drained with standing water for at least part of the growing season and are usually associated with wetland plant species.

The aspect of a slope (i.e., direction it faces) and its slope (i.e., how steep it is) affect the soil moisture as well by influencing how well drained a soil is and the amount of solar radiation it receives. The upper part of a slope is typically drier than the lower part of the slope. South and west facing aspects are relatively more xeric than north and east facing aspects at the same elevation (for the Northern Hemisphere). Consequently, aspect and slope form soil moisture gradients that influence species distribution and assemblages. These differences can often result in striking transitions in vegetation communities, as seen on Catalina island where a north-facing slope with more mesic conditions may be dominated by chaparral plant species with sclerophyllous leaves (i.e., typically evergreen, hard, thick, leathery, small leaves) that form a closed shrub/tree canopy—and on an opposing south-facing slope, the more xeric conditions may support Californian coastal scrub that is dominated by drought-deciduous shrubs with an open canopy.

Species traits to consider after characterizing the site conditions may include the following: geographic range and the population distribution within that range, seed dormancy, life span, growth form, plant height, root morphology, resprouting capacity after disturbance, nutrient requirements (e.g., phosphorus, lime [calcium carbonate]), pH and salinity tolerance, light requirements, and phenology, such as the seasonal timing of seedling emergence and flowering.

Phenology of the species is important to consider. Some plants germinate, grow and flower in fall and spring (i.e., cool-season plants), while others germinate in spring, grow and later flower in summer (i.e., warm-season plants). The lifespan of a plant can be classified as annual, biennial, or perennial. Many of the annuals in a seed mix will be common in the first few years after seed addition, which will provide cover, reduce weed abundance by competing for resources and make contributions to the native seed bank to help facilitate recovery following a future disturbance (e.g., wildfire). As the perennial species germinate and grow, there will be a shift in dominance to perennial species that will provide longer-term structural stability and persistence in the vegetation community. Components from both annuals/biennials and perennials are essential to sustainable habitat restoration, which is why life span is included in the classification of plant functional groups used to design seed mixes (see above).

Identifying appropriate seed sources is an on-going challenge for land managers and restoration specialists. In general, seed from local wild populations in the same bioclimatic region as the restoration site is preferred. In addition to local wildland collection, seed can be obtained from the following sources: a wildland collection from a broader geographic range within a similar bioclimatic profile, first- (F1) or second-generation (F2) nursery bulked seed from special local collections, or commercial seed production fields. Special collections of seed from local wildland can take multiple years, depending on the availability of the specified species each year; therefore, once the seed mix is designed, the seed collection program should start concurrently with the

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

first years of weed management of a restoration site, to ensure that the seed collection is ready and a sufficient amount has been collected (especially for the key target species) by the time installation is planned (e.g., in the fall of year 3 of a project). For seeds produced at the Conservancy seed facility, production should be timed to begin as needed for the seed to be ready at the anticipated time for seed installation.

Sources of seed for rare, sensitive, or protected species, or such species that have critical ecological relationships with wildlife (e.g., food plant species for butterflies) must be selected carefully to maintain the fitness of the plant population based on best available information. Species experts and wildlife agencies should be consulted for guidance on appropriate seed sources in these circumstances.

In general, it is advisable to maximize the diversity of seed mixes within each plant functional group included in the seed mix design to increase the resiliency of the restored habitat to future uncertainties, such as climate change. However, seed availability ultimately controls the number of species that can be included in a seed mix. If commercial seed is to be used, the cost of seed will also be a factor. The commercial price of seed varies based on its annual availability and difficulty to collect, effort to clean and test, viability in storage (e.g., some species lose most of their viability after less than one year in storage) and demand in the marketplace. Deciding on which species to include depends on the goals of the habitat restoration project, planned native vegetation communities, and the balance of seed mix diversity with target seed application rates.

If the restoration area to be seeded has a high probability of developing into more than one different vegetation alliances (e.g., based on habitat suitability model outputs from Appendix D of the HRMP and/or field assessments), consider increasing the diversity of the seed mix and allowing the microsite conditions in the restoration area to determine the appropriate assemblage of species. In this way, we can leverage nature to establish ecologically appropriate vegetation communities.

5.1.3 Pure Live Seed (PLS) Seeding Rates

After species have been selected to represent each plant functional group in the seed mix, then seeding rates for each species need to be specified. The amount of pure live seed (PLS) must take into account seed loss to predators and various time for germination of types of seed. An example of seed mix design is presented in Table 5-1 for the Californian coastal scrub vegetation type. Five plant functional groups have been selected, with a range of species diversity (i.e., number of species) recommended for each plant functional group. For each species, the desired abundance in the area to be seeded (e.g., common, occasional) can be stated to guide seeding rates, which will be specified as PLS per unit area. PLS is the viable seed in a seed collection lot that will readily germinate, excluding inert matter, other crop seed species, weed seed species, and non-viable seed. In the following example, square feet (sqft) is the area used for designing the seed mix, because it is easier to imagine than a larger area, such as an acre of land. It is helpful to determine the amount of seed that will germinate in the first

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

season or two by excluding dormant seed and hard seed from the live seed total for PLS determination. Table 5-1 shows the amount of PLS per sqft using the two different calculations.

Table 5-1 Example of Californian Coastal Scrub Seed Mix Design Target Ranges

Plant Functional Groups	Number of Species	Abundance[1]	PLS/sqft[2]	PLS/sqft[3] +dormant seed
1. Early Establishment Nurse Crop & Erosion Control Annuals	2 or more	Common in First Year, Occasional in Future Years	75–125	75–150
2. Early Successional Shrub Species	1-2 or more	Common in Second Year, Occasional in Future Years	5–10	5–25
3. Mid-story Mature Shrub Canopy	5 or more	Common	10–25	10–50
4. Native Grasses	3 or more	Occasional to Common	10–25	10–35
5. Native Herbaceous Species (Annuals and Perennials)	4 or more	Common in Two Years, Occasional in Future Years	50–75	50–100
TOTAL[4]	**15–20 or more**		**150–260**	**150–350**

1. *Target abundance in the habitat restoration site.*
2. *PLS = Pure Live Seed, as determined by seed testing of purity and germination rate of collected seed species. sqft = square feet*
3. *Includes the contribution of dormant and hard seed, as determined by seed testing.*
4. *Final seed mix amount depends on factors such as species availability, collection cost, seed germination rates, site conditions and weather during the collection period. Poor seed collections can increase costs significantly.*

The seeding rate, expressed as PLS/sqft, is the number of seeds determined to achieve a desired plant density. It is important to note that not all the seed will necessarily germinate in the same season or in the same year. The recommended seeding rate range (PLS/sqft) shown by plant functional group for Californian coastal scrub in Table 5-1 is the sum of the seeding rates for each species selected for that group. The sum of seeding rates (PLS/sqft) for individual species by plant functional group and the sum of seeding rates for all the plant functional groups is the total seeding rate for the seed mix. In Table 5-1 the total recommended seeding rate is a range of 150 to 260 PLS/sqft which will achieve the desired plant density. Establishing the appropriate plant density is important. Excessively high plant densities could cause some species to suffer from higher competition for essential nutrients and water; and, conversely, if plant densities are very low, then there may be insufficient plant densities to compete with weeds and create adequate wildlife habitat. Additionally, if planting densities are high, then overseeding occurred which is a “wasting” of valuable limited seed resources.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Seeding rate recommendations are also provided in Table 5-1 that include the contribution from dormant and hard seeds. Some species will only germinate with specific environmental cues, in which case, they will require some pretreatment (e.g., cold stratification, gibberellic acid application) to intentionally "break" the dormancy before they are seeded—unless these environmental cues are known to exist or can be found in the area to be seeded. Most other seeds readily germinate under typical conditions, assuming the seed is ecologically suitable for the site; however, it is common for a small fraction of the total seed (e.g., 5–10%) to have a higher dormancy. The amount of dormant seed in a seed lot can be quantified by the germination seed test. Dormant seed may need more physical scarification of the seed coat or a more extreme cold stratification to break dormancy, in which case, it may germinate in the future, but it may take more time or unique conditions to occur before doing so. Depending on the species and its role in the seed mix, consider planning for the contribution of dormant seed.

PLS seeding rates can be converted into PLS/acres for each species by multiplying the seeding rate in PLS/sqft by the conversion for acres (43,560 sqft in 1 acre).

$$\frac{Target\ Species\ \#\ of\ PLS}{sqft} \times \frac{43{,}560\ sqft}{1\ acre} = PLS\ per\ acre$$

Total PLS quantities for the restoration area can be calculated by the product of the seeding rate in PLS/acre and the size of the area to be seeded in acres.

$$\frac{Target\ Species\ \#\ of\ PLS}{acre} \times\ Size\ of\ Area\ to\ be\ seeded\ (acre) = Total\ \#\ of\ PLS\ Required$$

To calculate the seeding rate in weight (lbs) of PLS per acre, the number of seeds per pound must be known from previously published information. The number of seeds in one pound will vary significantly by species. For example, there are 5,500,000 seeds of California sagebrush in one pound, compared with 450,000 seeds of California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*) in one pound.

$$\frac{Target\ Species\ \#\ of\ PLS}{sqft} \times \frac{43{,}560\ sqft}{1\ acre} \times \frac{1\ lbs}{Known\ \#\ of\ seeds\ per\ lbs} = lbs\ PLS\ per\ acre$$

For example, based on previously reported data, the average number of purple needlegrass seeds per pound is 110,000. If the target seeding rate is 17 PLS per sqft, then the pounds of PLS per acre would be 6.7, as shown here:

$$\frac{17\ PLS\ of\ Stipa\ pulchra}{sqft} \times \frac{43{,}560\ sqft}{1\ acre} \times \frac{1\ lbs}{110{,}000\ seeds\ per\ lbs} = 6.7\ lbs\ PLS\ per\ acre$$

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

5.1.4 BULK SEEDING RATES

Actual seed collection lots, even after they have been processed and cleaned, are not entirely composed of live seed. Therefore, we need to be able to calculate bulk seed amounts and bulk seed rates. Bulk seed is composed of the seed collected and cleaned, with a small fraction of crop seed (other, non-weed species), weed seed, and inert matter. And the seed collected is not entirely viable, as some of it will not germinate. These amounts are determined from a seed test. Note that the amount of seed material collected in the field, prior to processing and cleaning, will be greater than the cleaned bulk seed amount.

When we need to determine the amount of cleaned bulk seed to be collected for a project, estimates can be made based on the specified PLS seeding rates and past published values for the seed for the following:

- Purity rate (%)
- Germination rate (%)
- Average known number of seeds per bulk pound

For example, based on past seed collection records of purple needlegrass, the typical minimum purity rate is 80% and the minimum germination rate is 90%. PLS is a product of purity and germination (as determined from seed test results) divided by 100.

$$\frac{Purity\ (\%)\ \times\ Germination\ (\%)}{100} = PLS\ (\%)$$

Therefore, the minimum PLS of a purple needlegrass collection is estimated to be 72% or 0.72 in fraction form, as shown here:

$$\frac{80\%\ Purity\ \times\ 90\%\ Germination}{100} = 72\%\ PLS = 0.72\ PLS$$

To calculate the bulk seeding rate, divide the PLS seeding rate in pounds per acre by the PLS percent.

$$\frac{lbs\ PLS\ per\ acre}{PLS\ Fraction} = Bulk\ seeding\ rate\ pe\quad acre$$

If the specified seeding rate for purple needlegrass is 6.7 PLS pounds per acre and an estimated PLS of 72%, then the bulk seeding rate would be calculated as follows:

$$\frac{6.7\ lbs\ PLS\ per\ acre}{0.72} = 9.3\ lbs\ of\ bulk\ seed\ pe\quad acre$$

The total bulk seed quantities required after cleaning can be calculated by the product of the bulk seeding rate in PLS/acre and the size of the area to be seeded in acres.

$$\frac{lbs\ bulk\ seed}{acre} \times\ Size\ of\ Area\ to\ be\ seeded\ (acre) = Total\ lbs\ of\ bulk\ seed\ required$$

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

For the example of purple needlegrass seeded at a bulk rate of 9.3 lbs per acre for a 10-acre site, the total cleaned bulk seed required is estimated to be 93.0 lbs, as shown here:

$$\frac{9.3\ lbs\ bulk\ seed}{acre} \times\ 10\ acres = 93.0\ lbs\ of\ bulk\ seed\ required$$

These calculations should be repeated for each species in the seed mix to determine the total amount of seed to be collected. However, these values are estimates based on past seed collection lots, and the actual germination rate for new seed collection rates can vary significantly. Variance in seed viability (changes in germination rate) from year-to-year is most often seen in wildland collections, as many semi-arid plants exhibit plasticity in reproductive effort in response to rainfall variations (e.g., Ruiru et al. 2015). Commercially farmed seed tends to have consistent germination rates because the plants are grown under a more controlled environment. Therefore, seed should be tested for seed viability and purity to determine the actual percent PLS.

5.1.5 Monitoring for Seed Mix Design

After the habitat restoration plan has been prepared, implementation of the project will begin. Concurrent with the seed collection and production process, weeds will be treated in the restoration area for multiple years as part of the adaptive weed management step. During biological and horticultural monitoring activity that is being conducted to inform the timing and method of weed treatment, the restoration specialist and/or field biologist should take note of conditions at the site, updating observations made during the planning stage that informed seed mix design, as discussed above.

These new observations will provide updated site information to help inform final seed mix specifications for installation at the end of weed management. The information collected during the planning stage may have been limited to field visits during one season prior to manipulation of the vegetation cover therefore, the extended weed management period, which may last three or more years, provides the opportunity to better “know-your-site”. The response of the seed bank and existing perennial species to weed treatments, weather and other dynamic site conditions will better inform our understanding of the ecologically appropriate targets for restoration, including the suitable distribution and diversity of vegetation communities and plant species.

Observations of the emergence of any existing native seed bank can both further inform appropriate restoration targets and be used to adjust seed mix diversity and seeding rates. For example, if during thatch removal and weed management, a restoration area seed bank expresses a sufficient density of an early successional annual herb, such as clustered tarplant (*Deinandra fasciculata*), which was previously specified in the restoration seed mix, then it may be dropped from the mix. Removing the species from the seed mix may reduce seed supply costs, make that seed available for use in another area, and/or provide the opportunity to add another complementary annual

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

herb to increase biodiversity (if the adjustment allows enough lead time to collect or grow the additional species).

This is a significant advantage of implementing longer weed management periods and seed-based restoration because it provides the flexibility to adjust and optimize seed mixes for the restoration area based on observations made over multiple seasons and years.

5.1.6 Seed Mix Adjustments

Seed mix species and/or application rates can be adjusted based on the results of seed testing and/or seed availability, as appropriate, to achieve the desired seed mix performance.

Adjustments to the seed mix and the seed collection/production program can be made, as necessary, throughout the weed management implementation period to best match the conditions in the restoration area. This information comes from the monitoring program that is conducted as part of the feedback loop in the adaptive management process. Other adjustments that will need to be made to the seed mix will be based on the following:

- Seed test results, which indicate the actual percent PLS of the seed lots, versus the estimated PLS rates from the initial planned seed mix; and,
- Seed availability.

Using the sample seed test result for purple needlegrass Figure 4-1 it was determined that the percent PLS of this seed lot is 79.89% (excluding the contribution of dormant seed) based on actual, tested purity and germination rates. This is different than the estimate of a minimum of purple needlegrass collection of 72% PLS calculated during seed mix design using published purity and germination rates (see above). Therefore, to achieve the same design goal of 17 PLS per sqft in the seeded area, less bulk seed will be required. An estimated rate of 9.3 lbs of bulk seed per acre was based on the estimated minimum PLS of 72%.

With an actual PLS of 79.89%, the bulk seeding rate should be adjusted to 8.4 bulk lbs per acre, as shown here:

(6.7 lbs PLS per acre)/0.7989 = 8.4 lbs of bulk seed per acre

This adjustment based on actual PLS from seed test results should be made for each species in the seed mix.

Typically, however, not all the specified seed material is available, and adjustments must be made with available seed. The seed collector may have collected additional suitable seed material that was not included in the specified seed mix that can be used to replace or augment shortfalls in the required seed amounts. Or, for species that are in the same plant functional group in the seed mix design, it may be appropriate to increase the rate of one species to supplement shortfalls in the collection of another species.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

5.1.7 TIMING OF SEED INSTALLATION

Seed installation should occur in the fall after sites have met the appropriate focal weed thresholds (as discussed in Section 4 of the HRMP) to take advantage of the entire rainy season which is particularly important for non-irrigated restoration sites and at the beginning of the active growing season for vegetation communities in Southern California, except for riparian plant communities. For non-irrigated restoration sites, if seed installation cannot occur by the end of December, then it is recommended to postpone seeding until the following fall. While the applied seed mix can remain viable in the soil for several years for most species, it is important to time seeding to capture most of the rainfall in the first season to allow for germination of the seed mix and a sufficient establishment period prior to dry hot summer conditions.

Sites that are ready to be seeded should have little to no thatch. If significant thatch is present, land managers should rake, collect, and remove it prior to seeding because it will inhibit seed-to-soil contact, required for optimal germination rates.

The installation of native plant material will generally be accomplished by seeding the habitat restoration area following adequate control of weed populations through the weed management phase (i.e., site preparation). Restoration success is, in large part, dependent on adequate weed management prior to the addition of native plant material. Weed management should continue until the weed management threshold is achieved rather than installing plant material too soon because weed management after the addition of seed is much more difficult and labor intensive.

6 SEEDING METHODS

The installation of native plant material will be accomplished by seeding the habitat restoration area following adequate control of weed populations during the weed management phase (i.e., site preparation). Restoration success is, in large part, dependent on adequate weed management prior to the addition of native plant material. Additional weed management events should be conducted as necessary, even if it delays seeding to a subsequent year, because weed management after the addition of seed is much more difficult and labor intensive.

For restoration of native habitats, the following seeding methods are options for installation:

- Drill seeding
- Hydroseeding
- Mechanical broadcast seeding
- Hand broadcast seeding
- Imprint seeding
- Seed ball broadcast seeding

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Determination of the appropriate seeding method will depend on site conditions and accessibility. Larger sites that are accessible by equipment can be mechanically seeded with a drill seeder or broadcast seeder. Smaller sites, sites with a high density of native species or sensitive species present can be seeded by hand broadcast or the seed ball broadcast method.

Other seeding methods may be appropriate for a particular habitat restoration project, including hydroseeding and imprint seeding. Hydroseeding requires a water source and is a significantly more expensive method than drill seeding. Imprint seeding is best used in areas where few to no native species are already present. Steep topography, areas of shallow soil and the presence of medium size rocks will limit the use of imprinting. Imprint seeding generally requires the soil to be cleared of thatch and disked prior to imprinting to allow the imprinter to make the specified imprints in the soil. Disking the soil will encourage the germination of weed seed that would not otherwise have germinated. Disking is more appropriate in a condition where there is not a significant weed seed bank, whereas drill seeding is less disruptive to the soil.

6.1 DRILL SEEDING

Range drill seeding is the optimum seeding method for many restoration areas. Drill seeding is efficient, has the highest reliability for applying the seed mix at the desired rate with proper calibration of the equipment and provides good seed-to-soil contact. With a range drill seeder, seed material can be installed with minimal soil disturbance and implemented over mowed plant thatch and equipment can be maneuvered around existing native species to avoid impacts.

Drill seeding is better than broadcast seeding in several ways. Drill seeding provides better seed to soil contact, as the seeds are sown directly into the ground and covered with soil more efficiently than with broadcast seeding methods. Drill seeding applies seed at a more consistently uniform seeding rate and reduces seed loss due to predation and wind scatter. Less seed per acre is required compared to hand-seeding methods thus reducing seed costs and resulting in less “waste” of seed.

However, drill seeding may not be practical in all habitat restoration sites because of the presence of a higher density of native or sensitive species, access limitations for equipment, and incompatible site conditions. For example, if a restoration site has many large rocks on the soil surface, it may not be possible to maneuver the drill seed equipment within the site to seed at a uniform rate. When the drill seeder runs over rocks, it can bounce and not properly create the planting furrows or evenly apply seed.

6.1.1 DRILL SEEDING IMPLEMENTATION

Drill seeding can be used in many habitat restoration projects, where the equipment is able to maneuver based on the slope and where the occurrence of woody native species is relatively low. Range drill seeding can be accomplished over mowed stubble if the thatch is not too thick. In some cases, the thatch may be broken down with light disking

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

prior to drill seeding. A thick thatch may need to be removed prior to seeding (e.g., by mechanical raking and windrowing Section 2.1.4).

One- or Two-Way Drill Seeding

Depending on the terrain of the restoration area, drill seeding can be accomplished in two passes or in a single pass. For drill seeding in two passes, divide the seed mix into two equal parts and apply each half of the seed mix in perpendicular passes across the site forming a grid pattern. Drill seeding with two passes is generally used on flat to very gentle slopes. For steeper slopes, the one pass method should be used and seeding direction is along the contour of the slope such that erosion rills are not encouraged to form following seed application. Seeds should be planted at a depth of not less than ¼ inch and no greater than ½ inch. Drill seeding equipment should be maneuvered around groups of dense native or sensitive species.

Drill seeding will apply the specified seed mix at the same time through separate seed boxes, with light seeds and heavy seeds divided into separate seed boxes. Wheat bran will be added to facilitate seeding. The bran helps to keep the seeds evenly dispersed in the seed box and produce uniform seeding of different sized seeds (St. John et al. 2012).

Materials to be applied during drill seeding include:

- Specified seed mixes.
- Bran at ¼ the weight of the specified bulk seed.
- Soil Amendments, e.g., arbuscular mycorrhiza (AM) fungi

The seed mixes should be supplied in pre-mixed bulk amounts in 50-pound bags and contain the appropriate amount of wheat bran. All bags should have seed tags declaring each species' bulk weight, pure live seed weight, purity and germination, weight of wheat bran, and total weight of contents.

Drill seeding can also incorporate specified AM fungi amendments, if appropriate and specified at the same time through a separate seed box.

MODIFIED DESIMONE METHOD

When seed is limited and it is preferable to distribute seed across the maximum area possible, while maintaining the specified seeding rates for the seeded areas, use of the "modified DeSimone strip method" should be considered. With this method, seeded strips are installed at the width of the drill seeding equipment (e.g., 6 feet wide) and are alternated with an unseeded strip wide enough for access to conduct remedial weed management but also narrow enough to facilitate natural recruitment from adjacent seeded strips as the native vegetation grows and reaches reproductive maturity.

This method would be most appropriate for sites without a significant source of upwind or adjacent, nonnative propagules that would make the additional on-going weed maintenance required in the unseeded strips cost prohibitive. Weed maintenance would need to continue until the plants in the seeded strips reach reproductive maturity and

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

successfully recruit into the unseeded strip. Otherwise, it is usually more efficient to seed the entire habitat restoration area under weed management, and if seed sources are limited, collect seed from the mature restored habitat (no more than 15 percent of the seed of any one plant) to install in a second phase of the project later.

6.1.2 Drill Seeding Equipment

Range drill seeders come in a variety of widths ranging from 6 to 15 feet. Planting row spacing can vary between 8 to 12 inches. Drill seeding equipment consists of seed boxes, seed metering devices, drill tubes that drop the seed and a type of soil opening device such as disk openers followed by an implement such as drag chains or press wheels that covers the seed in the furrow with soil. The press wheels also serve to firm and press the soil over the seed (USDA 2009). Range drill seeders can be mounted to many types of equipment like a crawler type dozer or rubber-tired tractor with all-wheel drive.

Drill Seeder Calibration

Seeding equipment requires calibration prior to applying the seed mix to ensure that the seed mix is applied uniformly across the site per the specified seeding rate. All equipment should be checked to ensure everything is in proper working order and any maintenance performed as necessary. Also check the seeding equipment for any impediments to the openers that could inhibit seed flow, clogged tubes, and make sure the tire pressure is adequate. The recommended air pressure of the tires should be set and maintained at the same pressure during calibration and seeding operations. Improper tire inflation will cause inaccuracies in the calibration of the equipment and subsequent inaccuracies in the seeding rates (USDA 2010).

Depending on the type of drill seed equipment, multiple methods are available for calibrating the drill seeder. Refer to the equipment manual for specific guidelines on calibration and how to perform adjustments to the seeder. The following describes general guidelines for drill seeder calibration.

If the specified seed mix is presented in pure live seed (PLS) rates, the rates must be converted to bulk lbs per acre for calibration. Use the following formula for calculating bulk seeding rate per acre.

$$\frac{PLS\ lbs\ per\ acre}{Percent\ PLS} = Bulk\ seeding\ rate\ per\ acre$$

To begin the calibration process, the drill gates should be checked for proper positioning for the type and size of seeds being planted. Calibration of the equipment should start at the widest open position based on the seed sizes in the mix and then closing the drill gates to the proper position. Two commonly used methods for calibration are the seed weight-distance method and the wheel circumference method (USDA 2010).

Some drill seeders have a third seed box for fluffy seed material. If fluffy seeds are incorporated in the seed mix, it is very important to calibrate the drill seeder accordingly. The fluffy seed mix with the carrier should be placed in the fluffy seed box

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

and the drill seeder should be run to calibrate the specified seeding rate. A carrier such as wheat bran or rice hulls, is used to ensure that different sized seeds stay evenly mixed and to improve seed flow. Approximately 1 acre of seed with the carrier should be sufficient for calibration. If the target seeding rate cannot be achieved, then adjust the amount of carrier accordingly until calibration is set (St. John et al. 2008).

Note: When calibrating the equipment, be sure to calibrate the drill seeder accordingly if applying the seed in two separate passes. The seeding rate for calibration should then be divided in half.

Seed Weight-Distance Calibration Method

Step 1. Compute the area of a 100-foot test run that is based on the drill seeder width.

$$\frac{Drill\ width\ (feet) \times\ 100\ foot\ test\ run}{43{,}560\ square\ feet/acre} = Acreage\ of\ test\ run$$

Step 2. Calculate the amount of seed mix needed for test run.

$$Bulk\ pounds\ of\ seed\ per\ acre\ \times\ acreage\ of\ test\ run = Pounds\ of\ seed\ mix\ needed\ for\ test\ run$$

Then calculate:

$$\frac{Pounds\ of\ seed\ mix\ for\ test\ run}{Number\ of\ seeding\ tubes\ on\ drill} = Pounds\ of\ seed\ mix\ per\ seed\ tube$$

Step 3. Mark the 100-foot test run in the field. The drill seeder should be run for at least 6 feet before starting the test run to make sure the seed is dropping uniformly to prime the drill tubes. The drill tubes should be removed from the disk openers and a collecting implement placed under the tube spout to collect the dropped seed. Drive at a constant speed during the test run. Weigh the dropped seed from a minimum of 2 tubes on either side of the drill and compare it to the calculated seed amount. If necessary, adjust the drill openings. This step should be repeated until the weight of the dropped seed is within 10 percent of the calculated amount. Once the calibration is set, repeat the procedure again at least twice to insure proper calibration (USDA 2010).

Wheel Circumference Calibration Method

The wheel circumference calibration method involves measuring the circumference of the drill drive wheel in feet and then determining the number of revolutions the wheel is required to turn for a predetermined length. To use this calibration method, the drive wheel must be able to be turned by hand without the need for pulling the drill.

Step 1. Calculate the area covered for the determined seeding run length.

$$\frac{Drill\ width\ (feet) \times\ 100\ foot\ test\ run}{43{,}560\ square\ feet/acre} = Acreage\ of\ test\ run$$

Step 2. Calculate the number of drive wheel revolutions. Measure the circumference (perimeter) of the drive wheel to determine the number of revolutions.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

$$\frac{Distance\ of\ test\ run\ (feet)}{Wheel\ circumference\ (feet)} = Number\ of\ drive\ wheel\ rotations\ for\ test\ run$$

It is important to note that the measurements in Step 1 and Step 2 should be to the nearest tenth of a foot for accuracy.

Step 3. Calculate the amount of seed mix that would be delivered from each tube for the determined test run acreage.

$$Bulk\ pounds\ of\ seed\ per\ acre\ \times\ acreage\ of\ test\ run = Pounds\ of\ seed\ mix\ needed\ for\ test\ run$$

Then calculate:

$$\frac{Pounds\ of\ seed\ mix\ for\ test\ run}{Number\ of\ seeding\ tubes\ on\ drill} = Pounds\ of\ seed\ mix\ per\ seed\ tube$$

Step 4. The drill tubes should be removed from the disk openers. The drive wheel should be turned until seed is dropping uniformly to prime the drop tubes. A collection implement should be placed under the tube spout to collect the dropped seed. Weigh the dropped seed from a minimum of 2 tubes on either side of the drill and compare it to the calculated seed amount. If necessary, adjust the drill openings. This step should be repeated until the weight of the dropped seed is within 10 percent of the calculated amount. Once the calibration is set, repeat the procedure again at least twice to insure proper calibration (USDA 2010).

Drill Seeder Calibration Field Test

Once the equipment is calibrated and prior to seed installation, perform a field test within a plot approximately 100 feet long in distance to demonstrate that the drill seeder is seeding uniformly at the specified seeding depth and that the furrows are properly covered with soil. Check the uniformity of seeding throughout the day, as many variables can affect calibration of the equipment. Changes in weather conditions such as temperature or humidity can have an effect. Different seed lots of the same mix can also behave differently in the equipment.

Travel speed when seeding is important, particularly in rough terrain or in areas with plant thatch present. Higher rates of speed can cause an increase in disk bounce height when hitting objects in the field, causing areas to be missed, improper furrow depth because the seeder may not dig a deep enough furrow for seed placement or soil displacement further away from the furrow leading to inadequate soil coverage of the seed mix in the planting furrows (Kees 2006). In general, travel speeds are typically set to between 3 and 4 miles per hour.

6.2 HYDROSEEDING

Hydroseeding can be used in areas that are not accessible by an imprinter or drill seeder and may be the only seeding method option on steep slopes. Hydroseeding is a planting process that uses a hydraulically applied slurry of ingredients including cellulose wood

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

fiber, the specified seed mix, organic binder and tackifier (e.g., "M-Binder"), and any amendments to be added (e.g., slow-release fertilizer, AM fungi). Hydroseeding equipment has access constraints and there must be a source of water for the batch preparation of slurry. The water source may be near the equipment, or water can be transported to the equipment by water truck for example. The slurry can be applied by a spray nozzle mounted to the equipment or by a nozzle attached to a hose to direct application. Long lengths of hose and/or hard pipe can be designed to allow application at up to 700 feet or more, depending on conditions such as pump pressure and the viscosity of the slurry. Prior to hydroseed application, the site should be cleared of plant thatch to provide good seed-to-soil contact.

Hydroseeding can be applied in a one- or two-step process. The one-step application consists of applying the slurry of ingredients in one step. The two-step application consists of applying the specified seed mix, one-quarter of the cellulose wood fiber, and amendments in the first step. The second step consists of adding and applying the remaining cellulose wood fiber and organic M-binder.

For very steep slopes, the best available method for seed application is the hydroseed method, because specially formulated erosion control products can be added, such as Flexterra® High Performance-Flexible Growth Medium™ (HP-FGM™) or EarthGuard® Fiber Matrix™. Refer to the manufacturer's specifications for application rates when applying seed with products such as HP-FGM™ or Fiber Matrix™.

6.2.1 HYDROSEEDING IMPLEMENTATION

The following are sample one-step and two-step hydroseeding application specifications, which should be modified as necessary for the project site application.

Prior to hydroseed application, the site should be cleared of plant thatch to provide good seed-to-soil contact.

Hydroseed mixing should be done in a clean tank. The hydroseeder must be equipped with a continuous agitation recirculation system to produce a uniform slurry. Once the seed and AM fungi inoculum (if needed) are added to the mixing tank, application must be within one hour of preparation. If AM fungi is used, then commercially available *Rhizophagus intraradices* is recommended for the AM fungi amendment, as it is ubiquitous and will not impede the development of other native mycorrhizae species.

A slow-release organic fertilizer may be used, if appropriate. However, the benefit to encouraging germination and growth of the seeded species must be weighed against the risk of encouraging vigorous growth of any weed species remaining in the seed bank. Many of the upland native vegetation community species have physiological traits and/or symbiotic associations with mycorrhizal fungi that colonize the plant's roots, which allow them to grow in lower nutrient content soils, so fertilization may not be necessary or desired.

One-Step Hydroseeding

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

The one-step application consists of the hydraulic application of a slurry mixture that contains water, cellulose wood fiber, seed, AM fungi (if needed), and organic soil stabilizer as follows:

- 2,000 lbs per acre of virgin cellulose wood fiber or recycled newsprint paper fiber (Enviro Fiber S-100 Hydroseeding Mulch or comparable product)
- 60 lbs per acre of AM fungi amendment (approximately 3,300,000 live propagules per acre of AM fungi based on the guarantee of the supplier) *
- Specified seed mix
- 160 lbs per acre of organic M-binder (Ecology Control or comparable product).

**If needed (most undisturbed native soils do not require the addition of AM fungi).*

Two-Step Hydroseeding

Step 1 – Hydraulic application of a slurry mixture that combines water with the following components:

- 500 lbs per acre of virgin cellulose wood fiber or recycled newsprint paper fiber (Enviro Fiber S-100 Hydroseeding Mulch or comparable product)
- 60 lbs per acre of AM fungi amendment (approximately 3,500,000 live propagules per acre of AM fungi based on the guarantee of the supplier) *
- Specified seed mix

**If needed (most undisturbed native soils do not require the addition of AM fungi).*

Step 2 – Hydraulic application of a slurry mixture that combines water with the following components:

- 1,500 lbs per acre of virgin cellulose wood fiber or recycled newsprint paper fiber (Enviro Fiber S-100 Hydroseeding Mulch or comparable product); and,
- 160 lbs per acre of organic M-binder (Ecology Control or comparable product).

If the air temperature at the site exceeds 90°F, the second hydroseeding step must be applied within three hours of the application of the first step. Regardless of the air temperature, the second hydroseeding step must be applied the same workday as the first hydroseeding step.

6.3 MECHANICAL BROADCAST SEEDING

In restoration areas that are accessible by mechanical equipment, a broadcast seed spreader can be used. Many types of broadcast seeders are available in a range of sizes and can be mounted to an all-terrain vehicle (ATV), tractor, or similar equipment. Broadcast seeders work by centrifugal force and the weight of the seed material (USDA

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2009). Mechanical broadcast seeding works best in large restoration areas that are accessible by equipment but where conditions limit the use of a drill seeder.

Disadvantages of broadcast seeding include higher rates of seed loss from wind or predation, higher potential for uneven distribution of seeds, with dense seeds or overcrowding in one location and sparse seeds or lack of seeds in another location, a decrease in seeding depth precision compared to drill seeding, and calibration inaccuracies inherent in the equipment. Calibration of broadcast spreaders is not as accurate for drill seeders because of the different seed delivery methods of the equipment (USDA 2009). Inaccurate calibration will influence the desired seeding rate causing over- or under-seeding.

6.3.1 Mechanical Broadcast Seeding Implementation

Prior to broadcast seeding, thatch material should be removed from the site because a well-prepared seedbed is critical for seed- to-soil contact (USDA 2009). Good seed-to-soil contact is key for successful germination of the seed mix.

Wheat bran should be added at ¼ the weight of the specified seed mix bulk weight to facilitate seeding. The bran helps to keep the seeds evenly dispersed in the seeder and produces uniform seeding of different sized seeds (St. John et al. 2012).

Materials to be applied during mechanical broadcast seeding include:

- Specified seed mix for each area
- Bran at ¼ the weight of the specified bulk seed

Prior to broadcast seeding, the surface of the soil should be lightly scarified with a hand rake or a 6-foot wide cultipacker attached to an all-terrain vehicle, crawler type dozer, or tractor. Scarification of the ground before applying the seed mix is important to facilitate seed-to-soil contact.

The materials (seed mix and wheat bran) should be divided into two equal parts. Half of the seed should be broadcast across the entire area in a linear orientation appropriate for the site to ensure even coverage. The remaining half of the seed should be broadcast across the site in a linear orientation perpendicular to the first application.

Following seed broadcast, the seed material should be incorporated into the soil at less than ½ inch deep with a cultipacker pulled by a tractor, ATV, or similar equipment. This will increase seed-to-soil contact to improve germination success and reduce loss of seed to wind, erosion, and seed predation.

Mechanical Broadcast Seeder Calibration

Broadcast seeders require calibration prior to seed installation. Refer to the equipment manual for specific guidelines on calibration and how to perform seeder adjustments. The following are general guidelines for broadcast seeder calibration (USDA 2009).

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Note: When calibrating the equipment, be sure to calibrate the broadcast seeder accordingly if applying the seed in two separate passes. The seeding rate for calibration should then be divided in half.

Step 1. Determine the bulk seeding rate per acre and convert to anticipated seed per square foot.

Step 2. Several tarps should be placed at different locations within the test area.

Step 3. Run the broadcast seeder within the test area over the tarps and determine the average bulk weight per square foot on the tarps.

Step 4. Increase or decrease the seed flow by adjusting the adjustable gate to achieve the desired seeding rate.

6.4 HAND-BROADCAST SEEDING

Broadcast seeding is an all-purpose seeding method that can be used in relatively small areas limited by access or areas with a high density of natives or sensitive species. Hand-broadcast seeding is the best option in areas where sensitive resource protection is required.

The disadvantage of this method is that hand-broadcast seeding will result in the greatest potential for loss of seed due to wind, runoff, and seed predation, higher potential for uneven seed distribution, greater potential for poor seed-to-soil contact and inefficient coverage in large areas (e.g., greater than one or two acres in size).

6.4.1 HAND-BROADCAST SEEDING IMPLEMENTATION

Prior to hand broadcast seeding, thick plant thatch should be removed to accomplish incorporation of seed into the soil because a well-prepared seedbed is critical for seed-to-soil contact (USDA 2009). Good seed-to-soil contact is key for successful germination of the seed mix.

Hand-seeding will be implemented using a small hand-held seed spreader to evenly broadcast the seed mix.

Wheat bran will be added at ¼ the weight of the specified seed mix bulk pounds to facilitate seeding. The bran helps to keep the seeds evenly dispersed in the seeder and produce uniform seeding of different sized seeds (St. John et al. 2012). It is important to note, since there is a high potential for the loss of seed from hand broadcast seeding, that the specified seed mix may need to be doubled.

Materials to be applied during hand-broadcast seeding include:

- Specified seed mix for each area
- Bran at ¼ the weight of the specified bulk seed

Prior to hand-seeding, the surface of the soil should be lightly scarified with a hand rake or a 6-foot wide cultipacker attached to an all-terrain vehicle, crawler type dozer, or

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

tractor. Scarification of the ground before applying the seed mix is important to facilitate seed-to-soil contact.

The materials (seed mix and wheat bran) should be divided into two equal parts. Half of the seed should be hand broadcast by walking across the entire area in a linear orientation appropriate for the site making sure of even coverage. The remaining half of the seed should be hand-broadcast by walking across the site in a linear orientation perpendicular to the first application.

Following seeding, the soil will be scarified either with hand-held rakes or a 6-foot wide cultipacker attached to an ATV, crawler type dozer, or tractor. Scarification of the soil following seeding will aid in seed-to-soil contact and provide a thin covering of soil over the applied seed mix. Seeds should be incorporated into the topsoil no more than ¼ inch and less than ½ inch deep.

The method used for scarification of the soil following seeding will depend on access to the site and the size of the restoration area. If the site is accessible with mechanical equipment, then scarification with mechanical equipment is more efficient than hand raking.

Hand Broadcast Seeder Equipment

A hand broadcast seeder is typically comprised of a seed hopper, agitator, flow gauge, "on-off" lever, hand crank for seed dispersal, and shoulder harness.

Hand Broadcast Seeder Calibration

Prior to seeding, the equipment requires calibration to insure uniform distribution of the seed mix. Refer to the equipment manual for specific guidelines on calibration and how to perform seeder adjustments. The following describes general guidelines for seeder calibration and is based on the EarthWay® hand crank broadcast spreader.

Note: when calibrating the equipment, be sure to calibrate the hand-seeders accordingly if applying the seed in two separate passes. The seeding rate for calibration should then be divided in half.

Step 1. Mark the beginning and end of an area 50 feet in length.

Step 2. Calculate the amount of specified seed mix including the wheat bran to be applied to a 1,000 square foot area.

Step 3. Weigh and record the weight of enough seed mix to fill the seeder at least half full.

Step 4. Select an appropriate Setting Rate position on the seeder for the seed material. In general, start with the setting in the middle if unsure of the appropriate setting rate.

Step 5. Start far enough behind the beginning of the 50-foot test area to achieve the desired walking speed. Use a normal pace and crank the handle so that the crank makes one revolution for each step then stop seeding at the end of the 50 feet.

Step 6. Measure the entire spread width of the broadcast seed.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Step 7. Record the weight of the remaining seed material in the seeder and calculate the amount of seed applied.

Step 8. Calculate the amount of seed mix required for test area.

$$Weight\ of\ seed\ mix\ per\ 1{,}000\ square\ feet \times \frac{Spread\ width\ x\ 50\ feet}{1{,}000\ square\ feet} = Seed\ mix\ required\ for\ test\ area$$

Step 9. Compare the results in Step 7 with the calculation in Step 8. If too little or too much seed was applied in the test area, adjust the rate setting accordingly and repeat the test again until the desired application rate is achieved.

All hand-seeders should be calibrated prior to seeding since variations can occur between equipment and the operator. The calibrated rate setting from one seeder can be used as a guide or starting point for calibration of other seeders.

6.5 IMPRINT SEEDING

Imprint seeding is best used in areas with few to no native species already present. Steep topography, areas of shallow soil, and the presence of medium size rocks will limit the use of imprinting. Imprinters consist of a metal roller with teeth that create v-shaped imprints in the soil (Dixon and Carr 2000). The seed is applied at the same time the imprints are made thereby pressing the seed into the soil for better seed-to-soil contact. The imprints should be at a specified depth and stable so that erosion of the imprints or collapse does not occur. Imprint seeding generally requires the soil to be cleared of thatch and ripping or disking prior to imprinting to allow the imprinter to make the specified imprints in the soil. The specified imprints can be made in areas with "soft" soil without the need for disking or ripping. However, if the soil is too soft, such as areas with coarse soils with a high sand content, the imprints can be too unstable. In these instances, imprinting should not be the seeding method utilized. An unstable imprint is subject to erosion of the imprint or collapse burying the seed too deep.

The purpose of the imprint is to provide a "safe" microclimate protecting the seeds from wind, providing shade to prevent desiccation, and serves to collect water to provide moisture for germination. Imprinting is best done in the fall since rain can help to stabilize the imprints and prevent erosion and/or collapse of the imprint. While imprinting works best if soils are moist, imprinting should not be done in wet soils as the soil can stick to the imprinting teeth and resulting in improper imprints. Imprints can generally last for a couple of years and continue to provide moisture for germinated seedlings and provide wind protection from evaporation. It is important to note, that in instances where the soil requires ripping or disking, this will encourage the germination of weed seed that would not otherwise have germinated. Hence, disking is more appropriate in a condition where there is a limited weed seed bank and few native plants. Disking can also result in collateral death to ground dwelling wildlife (e.g.,

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

snakes, gophers). Drill seeding is generally the more appropriate method in settings where imprint seeding may also be an option.

6.6 SEED BALL BROADCAST SEEDING

An alternative method for hand-broadcast seeding is the use of seed balls. Seed balls are mixtures of clay, compost, seed material and water formed into small balls. The benefit of using the seed ball method is the reduction in loss of seed from wind and herbivory and the clay combined with the compost provides a growing medium and nutrients for germinating seeds. The general recipe for making seed balls is as follows:

- 5 parts dry terra cotta clay
- 3 parts dry organic compost
- 1 part seed mix
- Sufficient water to bind the materials and allow for rolling into marble-sized balls.

The seeds in the seed mix are often very small therefore, the seed mix part of the recipe can be increased in volume with an inert material, such as sand, in order to distribute the seed mix at the desired rate. The amount of seed per seed ball should be adjusted to reach the desired pure live seed (PLS) rate for the restoration area. Too much seed should not be applied to the seed ball so that competition for resources prevents successful establishment of any germinated seeds. Generally, spacing of the seed balls 1-2 feet on-center between will ensure good coverage. Seed balls can be pressed gently into the soil so that approximately half of the seed ball is in the ground.

The seed balls should be allowed to thoroughly dry before storage or placement to prevent premature germination of the seed material.

6.7 SEED MIX ESTABLISHMENT

The health, development, and cover of native vegetative should be estimated visually by site walk overs, performed regularly during the post seed addition maintenance period.

For purposes of evaluating whether remedial seeding may be required to achieve the project success criteria, the project restoration ecologist/biologist shall use the following general guidance for establishment of native cover. Observations will typically be made in spring, but the actual timing of native cover estimates will depend on the phenology of plant growth each year with respect to factors such as weather. The target values for absolute cover of the native vegetation will be as follows:

- **Seed Mix Establishment Monitoring Year 1.** At least 10 to 15% absolute native cover.
- **Seed Mix Establishment Monitoring Year 2.** At least 15 to 25% absolute native cover.
- **Seed Mix Establishment Monitoring Year 3.** At least 25 to 35% absolute native cover.
- **Seed Mix Establishment Monitoring Year 4.** At least 50 to 75% absolute native cover.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Actual cover values will depend in part on growing conditions (e.g., soil nutrients, humidity, temperature, and rainfall) during the establishment and weed maintenance periods and the habitat restoration type. The established vegetation cover and distribution will likely not be uniform, in response to microvariation and fuel management activities in the project zones. Hence, some level of patchy distribution of vegetation cover is expected and natural. Consequently, the target native cover values shall apply to areas of homogenous vegetation cover and will exclude areas that develop conditions that prevent significant vegetative growth, such as extreme soil conditions that are not practical to amend to promote growth. Bare areas or seasonally bare areas although not vegetated, still provide microsite diversity to the habitat.

7 CONTAINER PLANTS AND CUTTINGS

Cuttings and container plants provide three important functions in habitat restoration: (1) to allow plants that are past the vulnerable seedling stage to be introduced and to establish onsite, (2) to provide the means of introducing species that do not establish well from seed, and (3) to provide some diversity of plant age to promote natural regeneration earlier in the restoration process.

7.1 PLANTING LAYOUT

Prior to plant installation, the planting locations for container plants and cuttings should be marked onsite using different colored pin flags and under the supervision of the restoration specialist/project biologist. Groups of container plants should be spaced in a natural-looking mosaic to mimic existing habitat and not planted in rows. The spacing should follow the specified spacing on-center for each species from other container planting and existing native plants. The layout should be determined based on micro topographic features, soil conditions, and site conditions, e.g., aspect or slope.

7.2 CUTTINGS

Direct planting of cuttings can be used for some native species and either don't require being grown in container plants or establish better from cuttings compared to container plants. During container plant production, especially for tree species, the long tap roots can quickly become root bound, which can cause long-term health issues for the planting.

Cuttings are typically done for riparian species such as mulefat (*Baccharis salicifolia*) and willow species (*Salix* spp.). Cuttings should be collected from nearby, intact riparian habitat if feasible and ideally harvested no more than 12 hours prior to installation on the restoration site. Cuttings should be collected in the fall during the dormant season and planted during the rainy season.

For sites that will be irrigated, it is recommended cuttings for both willows and mulefat are made from branches between 3/8- and 5/8-inch in diameter and a minimum of 4

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

feet in length. Proximity to groundwater depth should be kept in mind when determining cutting length to be able to install the cuttings as close to groundwater depth as possible, particularly for willow species. Cuttings should be kept moist until installation, and it is recommended to dip the cuttings in a rooting hormone and vitamin powder immediately prior to planting. No more than 1/3 of the cutting should be above ground once planted. For cuttings that will be installed with no supplemental irrigation, they should be tall enough (eight feet or greater or depending on groundwater depth) to reach the groundwater when planted. Planting should be time to occur during the rainy season and prior to a forecast rain event so the cuttings can be watered in.

7.3 ACORNS

7.3.1 ACORN COLLECTION

Acorn production varies from year to year depending on many factors, particularly local weather patterns. The abundance of acorns can vary as well as the viability of the acorns. Acorn collection is typically in early fall to early winter. Start assessing acorn production in late summer to determine collection areas and monitor for collection timing. The best time to collect acorns is when they are turning from green to brown and are starting to fall from the tree, usually early fall (September/October). The caps should be easy to remove. Ideally, acorns are collected from the tree since they are generally the healthiest acorns. Collection of acorns from the trees can be accomplished by knocking the tree with a pole or some implement and laying a tarp on the ground under the tree to collect the acorns. Acorns can be collected from the ground; however, these acorns tend to dry out and become damaged. If acorns are collected from the ground, don't collect acorns that are small, cracked, have parasite entrance/exit holes, or feel light.

The general belief is that acorns should be collected from local populations to maintain the integrity of the local oak populations since evolution of certain genetic traits allow the oaks to survive in a particular region (UCANR, Accessed 2023). Ideally, acorns should be collected as close to the planting area as possible trying to match soil, slope, elevation, and exposure to the planting site.

7.3.2 ACORN STORAGE

Acorn caps should be removed, and the acorns soaked in water for a day before storage. Acorns that float should be discarded since these likely have insect damage or have dried out. Place the acorns on absorbent material such as newspaper, paper towels, or the like, to air dry the surface, typically about half an hour. Once dry, place the acorns in plastic bags leaving the bag partially open to reduce mold development and store in the refrigerator. The temperature should be as cold as possible but above freezing. Cold storage in the refrigerator slows down metabolic activity and depletion of stored reserves. Acorns should be inspected occasionally for mold development while in storage and if mold is detected rinse the acorns to remove the mold and then put them back in cold storage. In general, acorns can only be stored for a couple of months and

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

should be planted the growing season following collection (UCANR Accessed 2023). If the acorns begin to germinate in cold storage, they should be planted as soon as possible as the radicle, or root system, can start to rot in a few weeks.

7.3.3 Acorn Planting

Acorns can be planted beginning in November, after the first rains have soaked the soil, through March. Planting acorns as early as possible will allow for maximum root development before dry weather. Acorns planted late in the season, February, or March, will need supplemental irrigation. Planting holes should be dug several inches wide to loosen the soil to allow for root expansion and should be dug as deep as possible. The holes should be backfilled with excavated soil and tamped down firm to approximately one inch below grade. Tamping prevents the soil from settling and the acorn sinking deeper into the hole. Place the acorns on their side in the planting hole and cover with the remaining soil so that the acorn is approximately ½ to 1-inch below the soil surface. If the acorns have germinated, position the acorn so that the root is pointing downward, being careful not to break the tip.

To increase the chances of producing the desired density of oak trees in an area, multiple acorns, as many as four, can be planted per planting hole. Multiple acorns planted in a planting hole should be spaced approximately six inches apart. It is recommended to place at least two acorns per planting hole to increase the success rate for each planting basin. Plant spacing between planting basins depends on the desired density of the oak trees. Spacing should be a minimum of five feet on center for acorn plantings and arranged in a natural mosaic and not in rows.

To improve acorn establishment success, the acorns can be pre-germinated prior to planting. To pre-germinate the acorns, the acorns should be placed in shallow trays with a mixture of moist vermiculite, sand, or peat. The acorns should be laid on their side on the medium and gently pressed in. The medium should be kept moist but not saturated. The trays should be kept at room temperature and observed for the emergence of the radicle (plant embryo that develops into primary root) from the pointed end of the acorn. Once the radicle has emerged, the acorns should be planted as soon as possible.

To increase seedling survival, weeds should be controlled in an approximately two- to three-foot radius around the oak planting and the weeds maintained for at least the first couple seasons of development. This will reduce competition for scarce resources, particularly available soil moisture. After clearing the areas of weeds, mulch can also be used to suppress weed development and conserve soil moisture.

7.3.4 Acorn Supplemental Irrigation

Acorn success rate increases with the use of supplemental irrigation for at least the first couple of seasons. If irrigation is not possible, as stated above, the acorns should be installed at the start of the rainy season to maximize development time before dry weather starts. In drought years with significantly lower than average precipitation, acorn survivorship decreases without supplemental irrigation.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

If irrigation is possible, the acorns should be irrigated immediately after planting. Dependent on rainfall, the general guideline for irrigation is for weekly irrigation until germination, then weekly for the first month, every other week during the second month and once a month through to the next winter, or as needed and dependent on rainfall. Monitoring of oak irrigation needs is crucial since too much or too little water can be injurious/detrimental to establishing oak plants. A soil probe or shovel should be used to examine soil moisture and rooting depth directly. The amount of applied irrigation should be adjusted as the trees develop to ensure deep penetration of the root system.

Depending on the oak development and the annual rainfall, irrigation may need to continue for a second season following once a month irrigation events or as needed. It is best to avoid or limit the amount of irrigation applied in the summer and should only occur in the first planting season and only in the second season if necessary due to severe drought conditions.

Care should be taken to avoid having the tree trunk and particularly the crown wet or moist for extended periods of time, especially in the summer. This leaves oaks susceptible to various diseases and pathogens. If possible, apply the irrigation away from the base of the tree while still ensuring moisture is delivered to the root system. If mulch is applied around the oak tree, ensure that moist mulch does not contact the crown or trunk of the tree for extended periods, particularly in the summer.

7.4 NURSERY-GROWN PLANTS

Container plant production will be done by the Conservancy at their on-site nursery or if this is not feasible because of the quantities needed for the project, a local nursery that has experience in growing native plants and at least three years of experience growing native plants for the target vegetation communities of the project should be used. The plants should have a well-developed root system and conditioned (prepared to withstand the elements of the natural environment), prior to planting. Mycorrhizal inoculum, if specified, should be incorporated with the greenhouse soil mix according to the label at the time of transplantation to containers.

The container plants should be inspected by the project restoration ecologist/biologist during the growing period. Upon delivery for planting, the restoration specialist should also verify that the plants are the correct species and quantities, are free of weeds, pests, and disease, and show signs of healthy growth. Plants should be grown in the specified container long enough to develop a root system that reaches the bottom of the container and forms a healthy root ball without becoming root bound. Any container plants that are not within these standards should be rejected and replaced. Substitution of plant material at the time of planting depends solely upon the discretion of the project restoration specialist.

It is generally recommended for tree species that deep tree pots are used for large woody shrubs and tree species to allow for healthy development of the deep tap roots

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

and prevent injury. Injury to tap roots of oaks, for example, has been shown to affect the health of the tree in perpetuity.

7.5 PLANT INSTALLATION

Upon delivery of the contract grown plants from a native plant nursery, or if container plants produced by the Conservancy are stored at the project site prior to installation, the container plants should be properly stored in a designated storage location and kept safe from herbivory, vandalism, theft, as well as maintained (watering) while they are in storage.

All container plants and cuttings should be planted to the following specifications:

- Plants shall be planted with the roots untangled. Roots shall be protected from weather exposure during planting.
- Planting holes will be made with the minimum disturbance to accommodate the root ball or cuttings. For container plants, the planting hole shall be no more than 1.5 times the diameter and 2 times the depth of the container species to be planted made to accommodate the root ball. Oak container planting holes shall be augured with a minimum of disturbance and be no more than 2 times the diameter and depth to accommodate the root ball.
- Planting holes should be backfilled 25 percent with excavated native soil, filled with water, and allowed to drain completely prior to planting. Container plants must never be installed in planting holes with standing water; all water shall be allowed to settle and infiltrate through the soil prior to plant installation.
- A fertilizer packet (Bio Pak™ from Reforestation Technologies International) should be added to each planting hole prior to planting—if needed.
- Plantings shall be set in well-drained planting holes with the crown of the root ball no more than 0.5 inches above grade. Under no circumstances shall the plant crown be buried. Cuttings will be planted so that a minimum of two-thirds of the cutting is buried in the ground. The soil around the planting shall be tamped down sufficiently to eliminate any air pockets in the soil.
- A basin around the planting shall be constructed by creating a berm above the existing grade approximately 24 inches in diameter around the planting.
- Each planting shall be sufficiently watered at least once after installation so that water reaches the lower roots. If possible, the plantings should be watered twice on the day of installation.

7.5.1 SOIL AMENDMENTS

A specially formulated, slow-release fertilizer provided in planting packets can be installed with container plants to aid establishment of the nursery-grown stock. The packets should be buried below the container plant so that their nutrients are available

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

only to the plants and not weedy seedlings that may develop at the soil surface. Specific formulations are available for different plant types, such as shrubs and trees.

For shrub and herbaceous species, each packet (10 grams weight) should contain a blend of 16% total nitrogen, 6% available phosphoric acid, and 8% soluble potash plus minor nutrients. The nitrogen, phosphorous, and potassium should be coated with a polyurethane coating to provide 15.69% coated slow-release nitrogen, 5.09% coated slow-release available phosphate, and 6.80% slowly available soluble potash. For example, Bio Pak™ meeting these specifications are available from Reforestation Technologies International.

For tree species, each packet (30 grams weight) shall contain nitrogen, available phosphoric acid, and soluble potash plus minor nutrients. The nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium shall be coated with a polyurethane coating to provide 22 percent coated slow-release nitrogen, 10 percent coated slow-release available phosphate, and 7 percent slowly available soluble potash. For example, Booster Pak™ meeting these specifications are available from Reforestation Technologies International.

7.5.2 Plant Protection

Local wildlife such as rabbits, pocket gophers and other rodents are expected to browse on the plantings and seed material. If the project restoration ecologist/biologist determines that the plantings are being jeopardized by wildlife, corrective measures such as organic, non-toxic deterrents and fencing/plant cages may be used. No rodenticides should ever be used for a restoration project. Invertebrate pests are rarely a serious problem in this type of habitat restoration project if site conditions are appropriate to the desired habitats.

To protect newly planted acorns or 1-gallon oak trees in areas where gophers and ground squirrels are present, below ground root protection are recommended to be installed to protect against root herbivory/damage. Root guards should be 18-gauge wire with ¾ inch mesh. The planting basin should be approximately 18” in diameter depending on the number of acorns planted per planting hole. The root guard shall be buried approximately 24 inches below ground and extend above the ground two to four inches. The root guard shall have an open bottom so as not to inhibit plant roots. Power augers can be used to dig the holes to the appropriate depth and width. The root guard material shall not be galvanized so that it breaks down in the environment over time after it is no longer needed for root protection.

If browsing is detected on young saplings, above ground protection can be installed. Wire caging, similar to the root guards can be installed using 18-inch gauge wire with ¾ inch mesh, such as chicken wire. The recommended diameter of the cage is approximately four feet with a height of four feet to protect the sapling from browsing while not inhibiting growth. The wire can be “stitched” together with binding ties and anchored to the ground using two pieces of rebar on opposite sides of the cage. Inspection of the planting cages should occur regularly to ensure tree growth is not inhibited by the cage and damage/girdling is not occurring.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Planting cones or tree shelters are an alternative to the cages; however, they are not recommended. Cones and shelters tend to inhibit lateral expansion of the root crown, do not protect the upper portions of the sapling that extend beyond the top of the shelter from browsing, and can increase the ambient temperature near the tree. Tall tree guards that significantly reduce available light can produce spindly top-heavy young trees that may be too heavy for the trunk to support the tree crown which allows for the tree to be easily damaged from high winds. If planting cones or tree shelters are used, inspect the health of the plant regularly to ensure the tree guards are not inhibiting growth and development of the tree.

Once the above ground plant protection is no longer needed, or if it begins to inhibit the development of the tree, the guards should be carefully removed.

7.6 PLANT SURVIVORSHIP

In at least the first two years of establishment after planting, survivorship of container planted trees and shrubs should be visually assessed during the spring and determined by counting the total number of dead container plants. Survival of container plants within the first two growing seasons should typically be at least 80 percent. Plants should be replaced if survivorship falls below 80 percent in the first season, including loss due to vandalism. Replacements should be planted as previously specified and maintained for one growing season, with hand-irrigation if necessary. Replacement tree species such as oaks may need more than one year of maintenance before they are established.

After the second year of establishment, container plant survival should be visually estimated. As sites develop, it is very difficult to implement direct counts of all the container plants especially in woodland and riparian habitats. Natural recruitment of trees and shrubs in these habitats should occur and preclude the necessity for plant replacement. Replacement planting after the first season should only be specified if the visual estimate indicates substantial mortality over 60 percent in the second establishment year and the function of these species has not been replaced by seeded material and natural recruitment.

8 TEMPORARY IRRIGATION SYSTEM

When nursery-grown plants or cuttings are used, a temporary irrigation system is often necessary to supplement natural rainfall. There are several types of irrigation systems, as well as alternative watering systems, including the following: overhead, drip, micro-sprinkler, bubbler, hand watering from water truck or reservoir, and biodegradable watering shelters (e.g., Cocoon by Land Life Company).

The advantage of overhead irrigation is that it mimics natural rainfall, provides an even distribution of water across the site and is durable and low maintenance. However, overhead irrigation uses the most amount of water and there is loss through evaporation.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Drip and micro-sprinkler irrigation systems both make more efficient use of water by directing water application, but they can be readily damaged by weathering or animals. Bubbler irrigation systems also are water efficient, direct the application of water with strategically placed bubbler heads, and have the advantage of being more durable.

When a limited number of watering events are required or a limited number of plants need to be irrigated, hand watering can be an effective approach. Plants can be watered by hand using a hose that is attached to a water truck or a reservoir/basin that is filled externally by a water truck, from a well or from a municipal water source, for example. Another option is to install biodegradable watering shelters in which basins are placed in the planting holes, fitted around the plant stem(s), and filled with water by hand. The intent of using the watering shelters is to provide enough water for the first year of establishment.

Water used for irrigation must be of good quality with total dissolved solids (salts) at no greater concentration than 500 parts per million (ppm). Individual chemical constituents should be evaluated against the site soil tests, if available, to avoid salt build-up in the soils.

The following are typical specifications for an overhead irrigation system with impact sprinklers and a bubbler irrigation system.

8.1 OVERHEAD IRRIGATION SYSTEM

A temporary above-ground irrigation system should include the following features, as appropriate:

- The mainline will have lateral lines and gate-valves to separately manage the different areas or habitats, as necessary, depending on soils and landform.
- Sprinkler heads will be tested to accommodate the infiltration rate of the soil and landscape position. The size of the sprinkler heads and application rate will be determined after infiltration is evaluated in each area.
- The system will be laid out so that the wetted area from each sprinkler head has no more than a two- to three-foot overlap with adjacent sprinklers. The final layout design will depend on the system water pressure and the size of the sprinkler heads (based on the infiltration rate of the soil).
- Separate valves will be installed to manage overhead impact sprinklers. This is important because it may be required to turn off valves where nesting sensitive bird species are present.
- All impact sprinkler stems will be fitted with on/off ball valves to allow for hose connections and hand watering of container plants at installation and during establishment, as necessary. These valves will also allow specific areas to be shut off, as necessary.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

The size of the sprinkler heads and application rate should be determined after infiltration is evaluated for the restoration area. Sandy and sandy loam soils typically have high infiltration rates.

For riparian habitat restoration, the system should be flexible and easily disassembled when it runs across waterways for easy removal during periods of high flow. If the irrigation system is in the active floodplain, then it should be portable for removal prior to the onset of heavy rains or other conditions that might result in the loss of the irrigation system.

An overhead irrigation system can also be used to germinate and establish seeded material, as appropriate.

8.2 BUBBLER IRRIGATION SYSTEM

For more direct irrigation of planted trees and large shrubs, such as island scrub oak. A temporary bubbler irrigation system should include the following features, as appropriate:

- A mainline with lateral lines will be installed with gate valves to separately manage areas within the restoration site, as necessary depending on site soils and landforms.
- PVC lateral lines will be laid out from the mainline to individual container plants.
- Full circle bubbler nozzles will be installed at each planting location.
- Individual bubbler nozzles will be pressure regulating.
- The irrigation system shall be fitted with on/off ball valves to allow for hose connections and hand watering of container plants at installation and during establishment, as necessary. These valves will also allow areas to be shut off, as necessary.

8.3 IRRIGATION SYSTEM OPERATION

Supplemental irrigation should be timed to mimic natural rainfall patterns to extend the rainy season in the fall and spring. Upon completion of plant installation, irrigation should occur weekly for about the first month in the absence of adequate rainfall to prevent desiccation of the container plants or cut material.

For the establishment of tree species, the container plants should be irrigated once per week in the weeks without sufficient rainfall for the first two months and then monthly for the remainder of the first year of establishment with approximately 10 to 15 gallons of water provided for each container plant. Irrigation in the second year will be applied to mainly supplement or mimic natural rainfall patterns in the spring and fall in such a way that plants develop deep root systems to maximize survival and vigor after irrigation is removed. Irrigation in the third year will only be used as sparingly as possible if drought conditions are severe.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

For riparian and woodland habitats, in general, the temporary irrigation system is used for a minimum of two years to establish container plants. Native trees and shrubs may require irrigation in the summer of the first year, as well as several subsequent seasons of irrigation for successful establishment.

The irrigation system should not be operated with any type of controller or automatic timer. The irrigation system should be run manually and only when at least one maintenance person is on site to check the system for leaks and prevent blowouts.

The timing of irrigation events will depend on the amount of evapotranspiration between events and soil moisture. Regarding irrigation, there are only guidelines to follow and no cookbook formula (i.e., step-by-step prescriptive procedures) for successful water management of native vegetation.

The following is a sample irrigation management scheme:

- Irrigate soil to full field capacity to the desired depth (approximately 18 inches during germination and seedling/cutting/plant establishment; and 18-24 inches during subsequent establishment).
- Initially keep seeded areas moist until seeded material has germinated (if applicable).
- Allow soil to dry down to approximately 50-60 percent of field capacity (in the top 6-10 inches after germination and during seedling and plant establishment; and 8-12 inches during plant establishment) before the next irrigation cycle.

Wetting of the full root zone and drying of the soil between irrigation events is essential to the maintenance of the plants and the promotion of a deep root zone that will support the vegetation in the years after establishment. A soil probe or shovel should be used to examine soil moisture and rooting depth directly.

9 ON-GOING MANAGEMENT

One of the goals of a restoration plan is to create native habitats that will be self-sustaining and long term. Initially, maintenance of a project will be necessary to establish the newly seeded and or planted restoration area. To achieve habitat restoration goals, on-going management of the restoration site may be necessary after site preparation (i.e., weed management) and seed addition. There are several reasons that the habitat restoration project may require on-going management, including the following:

- There are portions of the project that have higher weed loads than others and require post-seeding weed maintenance to facilitate the establishment of the native vegetation
- To contain or eradicate the population of a high priority invasive plant species
- Supplemental irrigation for installed container plants or cuttings

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

- Remedial seeding in areas where germination of the native seed mix failed after at least one season of adequate rainfall
- Replacement of container plantings or cuttings in localized areas with less than 80 percent survival in years one and possibly year two of plant establishment, based on visual assessments of substantial mortality
- Installation of erosion control best management practices (e.g., straw wattles and a native remedial seed mix) following significant erosion requiring repair
- Conservation activities for sensitive species
- Pest and disease control, if necessary (no rodenticides should be used)
- Removal of trash, debris, and litter (Restoration Contractor is only responsible for trash produced as part of this project; Restoration Contractor is not responsible for illegal dumping, trash left by neighbors or the public on the trail system)

The amount of remedial weeding required each year will depend on weather conditions, development of the native habitats and the density and type of weed species in the restoration area. Post-seed installation maintenance period can be up to five years beginning after installation of plant material. In general, the most intense maintenance is in the first two years of establishment and only seasonal spot-weeding activities in the third through fifth years, as needed. Weed control should be as needed to control weed species while minimizing disturbance to the restoration area and should be scheduled as determined by the project restoration ecologist/biologist.

Remedial weeding effort can be greatly reduced with an increase in the duration and/or intensity of nonnative weed management prior to seeding. It is very important to wait to add native plant material until after it is determined that adequate weed management has been accomplished.

9.1 POST-SEEDING WEED MANAGEMENT

After seed and plant installation the primary method of weed management should be hand weeding; however, under the direction of the project restoration ecologist/biologist, select use of other methods, including targeted spot spray application of herbicide using a low-pressure nozzle for high priority invasive species or perennial weeds, or line trimming of dense stands of weeds, may be allowed. The restoration ecologist/biologist must weigh the relative cost-benefit of the effectiveness of weed control with either herbicide or line trimming compared to unavoidable collateral damage to the native plants in the treatment area. Only post-emergent herbicides should be used and applied according to methods and recommendations described in the restoration plan and be consistent with the Conservancy's herbicide use policies.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Timing is critical to successful weed management, so the restoration ecologist/biologist should conduct phenological monitoring to determine the appropriate timing and method of weed control events.

Post-seeding weed management should be concentrated where nonnative plants inhibit native plant germination and/or growth, as well as to continue the control of high priority invasive species that can readily re-establish in the restoration area. The amount of post-seeding weeding required each year will depend on weather conditions, development of the native habitats, and the density and type of weed species in the restoration area. The objective of post-seeding weed management is to reduce nonnative plants to a threshold level that allows desirable native species to establish and thrive.

Careful weeding shall be done by trained crews to avoid damage to the establishment of the native vegetation. Weeds should be removed on a regular basis, as necessary and if possible, before they set seed and/or reach approximately 12 inches in height. All seed material that has set prior to a weed control event should be carefully collected and removed from the site so as not to be introduced into the weed seed bank. All weeded material should be raked, removed from the site, and properly disposed of.

Adaptive management is key to success and includes regular monitoring to guide the scheduling and selection of control methods. Care should be taken to limit the amount of soil disturbance and trampling of native seedlings from weeding activities. The management of weeds must be balanced with the negative side effects on native plant development (i.e., not all weeds in a site need to be treated). It is important to train the crews to weed by sweeping through a site and target weed control for the weeds that need to be weeded at the stage described above. Other weeds that have not reached the desired control stage should be left to weed later. This will limit the amount of disturbance in each area during a weed control event.

9.1.1 Control of High Priority Invasive Species

Control of the target high priority invasive species should follow the species-specific best management practices (BMPs) of the Conservancy's CHIRP program to treat high priority invasive species that may not be controlled with routine weed management methods. If herbicides are used, great caution should be used with foliar spray application to avoid any drift or overspray to establishing native plants. To limit herbicide drift or overspray, the stump-cut method should be used when possible and appropriate for woody perennial invasives.

9.1.2 Remedial Seeding

Remedial seeding may be necessary in areas with significant erosion or if native cover is low. Significant erosion areas should be repaired and re-seeded in the first fall seasons after damage. Re-seeding should occur in areas if coverage is less than 20 percent of native species over any contiguous area of 200 square feet. Collecting and storing extra

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

seed for remedial seeding purposes is advised to ensure that seed is available and ready to use at the time needed for remedial seeding.

Remedial seeding is often best accomplished using hand broadcast seeding methods when the area to be repaired is relatively small (e.g., less than one acre). Seed should be applied using the hand broadcast seeding method using a hand-operated device. The ground shall be lightly scarified with a hand rake prior to seeding. Scarification of the ground is important to facilitate seed-to-soil contact. Wheat bran should be added to the seed mix to achieve even dispersal of the seed material. Seed shall be mixed with the carrier stated above and divided into two equal parts. Half of the seed shall be hand-broadcast by walking across the entire area in a linear orientation appropriate for the site making sure of even coverage. The remaining half of the seed shall be broadcast by walking across the site perpendicular to the first application. Materials to be applied during hand broadcast seeding are the following:

- Specified remedial seed mix
- Wheat bran at ¼ the weight of the specified bulk seed
- 60 lbs/acre of AM fungi (commercial variety *Rhizophagus intraradices*)

Following seeding, the soil will be scarified with hand-held rakes. Scarification of the soil following seeding will aid in seed-to-soil contact and provide a thin covering of soil over the applied seed mix. Seeds should be incorporated into the topsoil no less than ¼ inch and no more than ½ inch deep.

9.1.3 Container Plant Replacement

Container plantings and cuttings should be replaced if survivorship falls below 80 percent after the first year of plant establishment. Replacements should be planted as previously specified and maintained for a minimum of one growing season, as necessary. As sites develop, it is impractical to implement direct counts of all the container plants. Replacement planting after the first season shall only be specified if the visual estimate indicates substantial mortality and the function of these species has not been replaced by seeded material and natural recruitment.

Oak Plant Replacement

Oak container plant replacement can be accomplished by replanting of container plants or through the planting of acorns. Acorn replacement can be accomplished more readily than container plants since between the time of acorn collection, plant production, and planting will be approximately one year. Alternatively, acorns can be collected and planted immediately in the same season. Acorns can either be planted in container planting basins or new planting basins can be created for installation.

Container plantings and acorn plantings should be planted as previously specified Section 7.5 and Section 7.3.3 in the restoration plan and maintained (e.g., irrigated) for up to two years or as needed for plant establishment.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

9.1.4 Erosion Control

Erosion control measures, including straw wattles, silt fencing, or erosion mats, may be required for protection of the project as wells as any necessary repairs from washouts and rutting that may occur from rain events or irrigation related issues. Erosion control measures and erosion repairs should be as needed and approved by the project restoration ecologist/biologist and the Conservancy prior to implementation.

9.1.5 Pest and Disease Control

Local wildlife such as rabbits, pocket gophers and other rodents are expected to browse on the plantings and seed material. If the Restoration Specialist determines that the plantings are being jeopardized by wildlife, corrective measures such as organic, non-toxic deterrents and fencing/plant cages may be used. No rodenticides should ever be used on the project. Invertebrate pests are rarely a serious problem in this type of habitat restoration project if site conditions are appropriate to the desired habitats.

If it is observed that the root systems of coast live oak plantings are being predated upon by pocket gophers, then open bottom protective root guards shall be installed in the planting basins prior to acorn plantings or container plant replacement. Root guards shall consist of using 18-guage gopher wire with ½ inch mesh to protect against gopher herbivory. The root guard material shall not be galvanized. The root guard shall have an open bottom so as not to inhibit plant roots. The root guard shall be buried at a minimum of 24 inches below ground and extend above ground two to four inches.

9.1.6 Removal of Trash and Debris

During project implementation, the restoration area should be kept free of trash and debris. If large trash items are dumped illegally in the project area, the Conservancy should be responsible for the cost of removing the items.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

10 REFERENCES

Bossard, C.C., J.M. Randall, and M.C. Hoshovsky. 2000. Invasive Plants of California's Wildlands. California, University of California Press.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2019. CAL FIRE Prescribed Fire Guidebook. Prepared by the CAL FIRE Prescribed Fire Working Group. September 2019.

California Native Plant Society (CNPS) 2019. Fire Recovery Guide. 92 pages.

California Native Plant Society (CNPS) 2015. Seed Collection Guidelines. Sanhedrin Chapter Inland Mendicino and Lake Counties California Native Plant Society. May 23, 2015.

DiTomaso, J.M., G.B. Kyser *et al.* 2013. Weed Control in Natural Areas in the Western United States. Weed Research and Information Center, University of California. 544 pp.

Dixon, R.M., and A.B. Carr 2000. Land Imprinting Specifications for Ecological Restoration and Sustainable Agriculture. Proc. Conference 31, International Erosion Control Assocation. February 21-25, Palm Springs, CA p 157-169.

Espeland, E. K., and K. J. Rice. 2007. Facilitation across stress gradients: The importance of local adaptation. Ecology 88:2404-2409.

Houseal, Greg A. 2007. Tallgrass Prairie Center's Native Seed Production Manual. A Cooperative Publication of the Tallgrass Prairie Center at the University of Iowa, the USDA-NRCS Elsberry Plant Materials Center, USDA-NRCS Iowa State Office, and Iowa Crop Improvement Association. August 2007. 123 pages.

Hubbert, K.R.H, P.M. Wohlgemuth, and J.L. Byers. 2012. Effects of hydromulch on post-fire erosion and plant recovery in chaparral shrublands of Southern California. *International Journal of Wildland Fire*. 21:155-167. dx.doi.org/10.1071/WF10050.

Kees, Gary. 2006. Rangeland Drills: Can Seed Placement be Improved? Tech Tip 0622-2345-MTDC. Missoula, MT: United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Missoula Technology and Development Center. 6 pages.

Riordan, Erin C.; Montalvo, Arlee M.; Beyers, Jan L. 2018. Using species distribution models with climate change scenarios to aid ecological restoration decisionmaking for southern California shrublands. Res. Rep. PSW-RP-270. Albany, CA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station. 130 p.

Ruiru, G., X. Yang, G. Liu, Z. Huang and J.L. Walck. 2015. Effects of rainfall pattern on the growth and fecundity of a dominant dune annual in a semi-arid ecosystem. Plant Soil 389:335-347.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Tu, M. Hurd, C. & J.M. Randall. 2001. Weed Control Methods Handbook, The Nature Conservancy. http://tncweeds.ucdavis.edu, version: April 2001.

St. John, Loren *et al.* 2008. Calibrating the Truax Rough Rider Seed Drill for Restoration Plantings. Plant Materials Technical Note No. 20 (revised). Boise, ID: United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 15 pages. April 2008.

St. John, Loren, *et al.* 2012. Mixing Seed with Rice Hulls. Plant Material Technical Note No. 7 (revised). Boise, ID; Bozeman, MT: United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 16 pages. October 2012.

U.S. Forest Service (USFS) 1993. Native Seed Collection Guide for Ecosystem Restoration. Wallowa-Whitman National Forest August 1993. 32 pages.

U.S. Forest Service (USFS) 2006. Burned Area Emergency Response Treatments Catalog. 254 pages.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). August 2009. Alexandria, LA. Conservation Planting Methods for Native and Introduced Species. Plant Materials Technical Note No 14. 6 pages.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). June 2010. Calibrating a Seed Drill for Conservation Planting. Plant Materials Technical Note (No: TX-PM-10-04). 5 pages.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2012. Straw Bale Check Dam. USDA NRCS 2012 Fact Sheet.

University of California Agriculture and Natural Resources. Prescribed Fire on Working Landscapes Workshop Handout. Date accessed 1/25/2023. https://bof.fire.ca.gov/media/yi2dwh2x/6-prescribed-fire-handouts_ada.pdf

University of California Agriculture and Natural Resources. Oak Tree Care. Written by Doug McCreary, Natural Resources Specialist, University of California Integrate Hardwood Range Management Program. Date accessed 1/25/2023. https://ucanr.edu/blogs/slomggarden/blogfiles/13336.pdf

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Appendix G

Regulatory Setting

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

1 FEDERAL RESOURCE REGULATIONS

Federal Endangered Species Act (16 US Code 153 et seq.)

The FESA of 1973 provides for (1) the conservation of plant and animal species that are listed by the federal government as endangered or threatened with extinction throughout all or a significant portion of their range and (2) the conservation of the ecosystems on which they depend. A federally listed species is protected from unauthorized "take" pursuant to Section 9 of FESA. "Take" means to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or to attempt to engage in such conduct. Persons are prohibited from taking a federally listed species unless and until (1) the appropriate Section 10(a) Permit has been issued by the USFWS or (2) an Incidental Take Statement is obtained as a result of formal consultation between a federal agency and the USFWS pursuant to Section 7 of FESA and the implementing regulations that pertain to it (50 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 402).

Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 US Code 703–711)

The federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 implemented the 1916 Convention between the U.S. and Great Britain (for Canada) for the protection of migratory birds. Later amendments implemented treaties between the U.S. and Mexico, the U.S. and Japan, and the U.S. and the Soviet Union (now Russia). At the heart of the MBTA is this language:

Establishment of a Federal prohibition, unless permitted by regulations, to "pursue, hunt, take, capture, kill, attempt to take, capture or kill, possess, offer for sale, sell, offer to purchase, purchase, deliver for shipment, ship, cause to be shipped, deliver for transportation, transport, cause to be transported, carry, or cause to be carried by any means whatever, receive for shipment, transportation or carriage, or export, at any time, or in any manner, any migratory bird, included in the terms of this Convention . . . for the protection of migratory birds . . . or any part, nest, or egg of any such bird." (16 U.S.C. 703)

Under current interpretations, disrupting the nesting of nearly any native bird species may be considered a violation of the MBTA.

2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA RESOURCE REGULATIONS

California Endangered Species Act (California Fish and Game Code Section 2050 et seq.)

Pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) and Section 2081 of the Fish and Game Code, an incidental take permit from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) is required for projects that could result in the take of a state-listed threatened or endangered species. Under CESA, "take" is defined as an activity that would directly or indirectly kill an individual of a species. An incidental take permit

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

authorized by CDFW under Section 2081(b) of the California Fish and Game Code would be required where a project could result in the taking of a state-listed threatened or endangered species. The application for an incidental take permit under Section 2081(b) requires the preparation of a conservation plan, generally referred to as a Habitat Conservation Plan.

The State of California considers an endangered species as one whose prospects of survival and reproduction are in immediate jeopardy; a threatened species as one present in such small numbers throughout its range that it is likely to become an endangered species in the near future in the absence of special protection or management; and a rare species as one present in such small numbers throughout its range that it may become endangered if its present environment worsens. The rare designation applies only to California native plants. Under CESA, CDFW is authorized to issue permits authorizing incidental take of threatened and endangered species.

California Fish and Game Code (Sections 1600–1616)

Pursuant to California Fish and Game Code Section 1600, CDFW regulates all diversions, obstructions, or changes to the natural flow or bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake that supports fish or wildlife or riparian vegetation. Activities conducted by private parties that involve such alterations (i.e., diversions, obstructions, or changes) to natural streambeds or lakes that support fish or wildlife require authorization from CDFW by means of entering into a streambed alteration agreement pursuant to Section 1602.

California Fish and Game Code (Sections 3511, 4700, 5050, 5515)

These sections provide for the protection of bird, mammal, reptile, amphibian, and fish species that are “fully protected.” Fully protected animals may not be harmed, taken, or possessed.

California Fish and Game Code (Sections 3503, 3503.5, 3513)

These sections make it unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird, except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation made pursuant thereto. Section 3503.5 explicitly provides protection for all birds of prey, including their eggs and nests. Section 3513 makes it unlawful to take or possess any migratory non-game bird as designated in the federal MBTA.

California Fish and Game Code (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Sections 670.2, 670.5)

These sections list animals designated as threatened or endangered in California. CDFW designates species considered to be indicators of regional habitat changes, or potential candidates for future state listing, as California Species of Special Concern.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Appendix H

Nesting Bird Management Plan

Prepared for

CATALINA ISLAND CONSERVANCY™

708 Crescent Ave.
Avalon, CA 90704

Prepared by

Robert A. Hamilton

Hamilton Biological, Inc.
Los Angeles, CA 90066316 Monrovia Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90803
robb@hamiltonbiological.com

FEBRUARY 2024

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

1 MANAGING FOR NESTING BIRDS

Effective management of nesting birds involves preventing nest failures while minimizing project delays, as outlined below:

1. Conduct pre-project nesting bird survey no more than one week prior to start of planned project actions.
2. For each active nest detected, establish, and delineate a species-specific buffer in which project activities shall be restricted to avoid take of active nests, eggs, nestlings, or nesting birds.
3. Conduct periodic biological monitoring of active nests within or adjacent to restoration sites, to ensure that buffers are being adhered to and to confirm that buffers are adequate to avoid disruption of any active nest.

1.1 DEFINITION OF "ACTIVE NEST"

The term "active nest" is not defined in either the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act or the California Fish and Game Code. For purposes of this NBMP, a nest is considered "active" when construction of a new nest or use of an existing nest commences. In most cases, a previously active nest becomes inactive when it no longer contains viable eggs and/or living young and is not being used by a bird as part of the reproductive cycle (eggs, young, fledging young still dependent upon nest). In some cases, a nest can be abandoned by the bird constructing it and become inactive prior to egg laying. In such cases, determination that the nest is inactive is to be made on a case-by-case basis based on consistent observations and the determination of the Biological Monitor. Using this approach, buffers are established around the nest upon nest discovery and/or prior to commencement of construction activities and will remain established until the nest is determined to be inactive by the Biological Monitor or restoration activities are completed in the nest vicinity.

1.2 SURVEY METHODS

During each field visit the surveyor will watch for birds, and for evidence of bird nesting, within the survey area. Evidence of nesting includes observations of copulation, carrying nest material, nest building, agitated behavior, distraction displays, carrying food, removal of fecal sacks, and other characteristic behaviors that indicate the presence of an active nest.

Trees within 300 feet of work areas shall be inspected for the potential presence of nesting raptors.

Once a nest is found, the surveyor will attempt to determine the stage of nesting (nest building, incubation/brooding, small young, large young, or fledglings near the nest). If

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

no adult or juvenile bird activity is observed after one hour (four hours for raptor nests), the nest can be considered inactive.

Every effort will be made to avoid exposing the nest to potential predation because of survey and/or monitoring activities. All nest visits will be conducted by a single surveyor and will last only as long as necessary to check the nesting stage or until circumstances necessitate departure (e.g., potential nest predator detected or sustained indications of stress by any protected bird).

Surveyors will remain of the possibility of additional, undetected nests nearby. They will avoid creating a scent or visual path that directs animals to the nest (e.g., leaving no trampled spot by the nest and continuing past the nest upon leaving it rather exiting on the entrance path).

1.3 ESTABLISHING NEST BUFFERS

Upon discovering an active nest, the Biological Monitor will establish a buffer within which construction activities will be temporarily restricted. Table A identifies standard buffer distances based on the natural history and known tolerances of bird species known to nest on the island. Beyond the identified buffer distance, project activities are considered very unlikely to cause nest failure. The starting point for these standard buffers is the table of buffer distances approved by the US Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game for previous projects in southern California (ICF International and Bloom Biological 2011, Hamilton Biological 2021). The standard buffer distances proposed herein also reflect Robert Hamilton's experience conducting nesting bird surveys and monitoring nesting birds in a variety of settings. Prior to finalization of this plan the buffer distances were reviewed and adjusted by personnel from the Catalina Island Conservancy, the biologists most familiar with the sensitivity to disturbance of different bird species on Catalina Island.

The bird species included in Table A reflect Mr. Hamilton's understanding of the nesting birds of Catalina Island, based mainly on the *Checklist of the Avifauna of Santa Catalina Island* (Dvorak 2015). Any additional bird species that might unexpectedly nest within the project's area of potential disturbance would have to be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

Buffers shall not be required for non-native and domesticated species, including domesticated geese and ducks, Wild Turkey, Feral/Rock Pigeon, Eurasian Collared-Dove, Spotted Dove, parrots, parakeets, Swinhoe's White-eye, European Starling, and House Sparrow. Whereas no requirement exists to provide a disturbance-free buffer around the nests of the above-identified exotic and domesticated species, note that the destruction and/or removal of the active nest of *any* bird species is prohibited under Section 3503 of the California Fish and Game Code.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Nest buffers are normally established in the field using colored flagging tape but may be established using other materials or methods so long as the buffer's limits are clearly demarcated for those who must stay clear of the buffer.

When establishing the buffer, the Biological Monitor will evaluate the appropriateness of establishing either a reduced or an expanded buffer (relative to the distance given in Table A) based on relevant factors. A reduced buffer may be appropriate if, for example, the nest is effectively shielded from human activity by existing infrastructure; if the birds appear to be unaffected by ongoing, non-project human activities; if the type of restoration activity is relatively benign; or if the nest already has young that are unlikely to be abandoned due to previous parental investment in the nest. An expanded buffer may be appropriate if, for example, the nest is positioned in an exceptionally vulnerable location; if the birds' behavior indicates unusual sensitivity to human activity; if the construction activity is unusually intense; or if the nest is at an early stage, when parents may be more likely to abandon.

If the Biological Monitor establishes a buffer larger or smaller than the standard buffer identified in Table A, the monitor will document the reasoning behind this decision. Relevant information to mention in the discussion of a variance may include:

- Distance to project activity.
- Type and anticipated duration of project activity.
- Microhabitat at the location of the nest that may provide visual or acoustic barriers.
- Observations of bird behaviors at the nest.
- Reproductive cycle stage.

Upon establishing the buffer, the Biological Monitor will provide a map of the buffer to the restoration foreman and inform them of the restrictions to work activities within the buffer.

1.4 PERIODIC NEST MONITORING

The adequacy of the buffer around a given nest, for the activity being conducted nearby, shall be evaluated, and documented by the Biological Monitor during periodic monitoring of the nest during construction activity. If a nesting pair is seen to become agitated or an incubating bird leaves the nest in apparent response to project activity, the Biological Monitor shall increase the buffer distance and then evaluate the adequacy of the increased buffer. The Biological Monitor shall be authorized to halt work in the vicinity of the nest until verifying that an adequate buffer has been established.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Table A. Standard Nest Buffers.

Avian Group	Species	Standard Buffer (ft)
Waterfowl	Mallard	100
Waterfowl	Ruddy Duck	100
New World Quail	California Quail	75
Doves	Mourning Dove	25
Swifts	White-throated Swift	50
Hummingbirds	Anna's Hummingbird	25
Hummingbirds	Allen's Hummingbird	25
Rails	American Coot	100
Shorebirds	Black Oystercatcher	125
Shorebirds	Killdeer	125
Alcids	Scripps's Murrelet	300
Gulls and Terns	Western Gull	150
Gulls and Terns	Caspian Tern	300
Storm-Petrels	Leach's Storm-Petrel	150
Storm-Petrels	Ashy Storm-Petrel	150
Cormorants	Brandt's Cormorant	300
Cormorants	Double-crested Cormorant	150
Herons and Egrets	Great Blue Heron	150
Herons and Egrets	Black-crowned Night-Heron	150
Birds of Prey	Osprey	150
Birds of Prey	Bald Eagle	300
Birds of Prey	Red-tailed Hawk	150
Barn-Owls	Barn Owl	150
Typical Owls	Northern Saw-whet Owl	150
Woodpeckers	Acorn Woodpecker	25
Woodpeckers	Northern Flicker	25

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Avian Group	Species	Standard Buffer (ft)
Falcons	American Kestrel	100
Falcons	Peregrine Falcon	300
Flycatchers	Western Flycatcher	25
Flycatchers	Black Phoebe	25
Flycatchers	Ash-throated Flycatcher	25
Vireos	Hutton's Vireo	25
Crows and Jays	Common Raven	50
Larks	Horned Lark	100
Swallows	Barn Swallow	25
Wrens	Rock Wren	100
Wrens	Bewick's Wren	25
Mockingbirds, Thrashers	Northern Mockingbird	50
Finches	House Finch	10
Finches	Lesser Goldfinch	25
New World Sparrows	Chipping Sparrow	50
New World Sparrows	Dark-eyed Junco	25
New World Sparrows	Spotted Towhee	25
New World Blackbirds	Western Meadowlark	100
New World Blackbirds	Hooded Oriole	25
New World Warblers	Orange-crowned Warbler	50
New World Warblers	Common Yellowthroat	50

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

2 REFERENCES


Dvorak, T. M. 2015. Checklist of the avifauna of Santa Catalina Island. Draft checklist dated November 12, 2015, prepared for the Catalina Island Conservancy. https://catalinaconservancy.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/Checklist_Santa-Catalina-IslandDraft_12Nov2015_TMD.pdf

Hamilton Biological, Inc. 2021. Nesting Bird Management Plan, Huntington Beach Channel and Talbert Channel Sheet Pile Repair Project, Orange County, California. Report dated August 9, 2021, prepared for Reyes Construction, Inc., Pomona, CA.

ICF International and Bloom Biological, Inc. 2011. Southern California Edison Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project, Segments 4–11, Nesting Bird Management Plan. Revised report dated August 2011 prepared for Southern California Edison, Brea, CA.

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit 6 – Map Depicting 10-acre acre of Active Restoration




Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit 7 – Map Depicting 105-acre area of Active Restoration



Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit 8 – Map Depicting 100-acre area of Active Restoration



Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Exhibit 9 – Covered Species Take Reporting Table

Covered Species or Covered Species Group	Expected Take	Authorized Take Mechanism	Actual Take (Capture)	Actual Take (Kill)	Comments
Island fox	All individuals encountered may be pursued and captured No more than 5 individuals annually may be killed via humane euthanasia when necessary	Pursue and capture using baited and unbaited traps, nets, and hand capture. Measure, weigh, insert passive integrated transponder (PIT) tags, affix GPS and radio collars, vaccinate, collect biological samples (blood, non-invasive swab), transport, maintain in captivity for medical reasons such as wound care, release to the wild, and chemically euthanize for humane reasons when necessary			
Covered Reptiles and Amphibians	All individuals encountered may be pursued and captured No more than 5 individuals of each Covered Species captured annually may be killed via accidental mortality during capture	Pursue and capture using hand capture, lasso, cover boards, pitfall and funnel traps, and nets. Measure, weigh, take non-invasive swabs, toe clippings, and tail tissue samples. Apply temporary external color markings.			

Docusign Envelope ID: D323B1B5-41D7-422E-A9E0-5DA9ED9BD52B

Covered Small Mammals	All individuals encountered may be pursued and captured No more than 5 individuals of each Covered Species captured annually may be killed via accidental mortality during capture	Pursue and capture using baited box or cage (e.g. Sherman, Tomahawk) traps, pitfall traps, cover boards, and hand capture. Affix metal ear tags, PIT tags, and temporary external color marks. Measure, weigh, and take samples (fur, whisker, feces, and non-invasive swabs).			
Covered Invertebrates	No more than 5 individuals of each Covered Species annually	Pursue and capture using nets, night lights, and spotlights. Measure, weigh, and collect samples.			
Mule deer	All individuals encountered may be killed	Hunt, pursue, capture, kill, and attempt to do so using bait, firearms (e.g. centerfire rifles and shotguns), air guns (e.g. air rifle and air pistol), net guns or drop nets (Outside Avalon), night lights, spotlights, and detection dogs. Anesthetize and chemically immobilize. Humanely euthanize. Take blood samples. Apply ear tags and GPS collars.			
Covered Plants	Less than 5% of total from any individual plant	Capture via seed and vegetative collection. Possess for purposes of air layering, micropropagation, growing using hydroponics and aeroponics, seed storage, and outplantings			

EXHIBIT L

DEPARTMENT OF FISH &

State of California – Natural Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE Division of Wildlife and Fisheries
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1208 Sacramento, CA
95814 www.wildlife.ca.gov
THE STATE

EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Governor CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director

SEAL
OF
EUREKA

CALIFORNIA

February 16, 2016

Dr. Anthony DeNicola
White Buffalo Inc.

Sent via Email

Subject: Scientific Collecting Permit for Research on Catalina Island

Dear Dr. DeNicola,

The Department has reviewed your Scientific Collecting Permit application and is denying the application to conduct research on non-native deer on Catalina Island.

The reason for the denial is based on the initial planning discussions that this Department had with the Catalina Island Conservancy wherein the Department advised that the scientific project needed to emphasize the importance of restoring a natural system to the extent possible through removal of non-natives from a fenced area. Consequently, the Department expected a manipulative study framed as monitoring the response and recovery of the native plant and animal community after the treatment (removal of non-native deer) has been implemented in the project area. From the drafts we have seen, however, the proposed effort continues to focus primarily on the study of deer and the efficacy of removing deer rather than the ecosystem based restoration and monitoring.

studying the response compared to the other parts of the island (control). The Department is not supportive of studying deer on the island as a test of the efficacy/methods of removal.

Additionally, and based on the initial discussion that included Chief Deputy Director Kevin Hunting and Regional Manager Ed Pert, we believed there would be, and needs to be, a commitment from the Catalina Island Conservancy to conduct advance outreach to the public given the expectation of controversy regarding deer removal. We have not seen an indication that this outreach is being planned or implemented.

While we regret having to deny this permit application, we remain committed to working with the Catalina Island Conservancy's prime objective of restoring the island ecosystem and would consider a SCP application that focuses on the above-mentioned objectives.

Conserving California's Wildlife *Since* 1870

Please contact Mr. Justin Garcia if you have any additional questions related to this permit application. His contact information is (916) 323-0644; justin.garcia@wildlife.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Eka

Eric Loft, Ph.D., Chief Wildlife Branch

Ec: California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Kevin Hunting, Chief Deputy Director
Dr. Ed Pert, Regional Manager, South Coast Region
Stafford Lehr, Acting Deputy Director, Wildlife and Fisheries Division
James Fong, Chief, License and Revenue Branch
Craig Stowers, Game Wildlife Program Manager
Karen Miner, Nongame Wildlife Program Manager Justin Garcia, Environmental Scientist

Catalina Island Conservancy
John Mack, Chief Conservation and Education Officer

PRA0000083

Wildlife Branch

June 24, 2015; JDG sent to game program for review.

NT USE ONLY

THIS PERMIT IS VALID:

THROUGH

PERMANENT NUMBER

OF PI's

SC-

152

October 8, 2015 submitted draft memo reg Airborne

PERMIT, AMENDMENTS AND REPORT OF SPECIMENS CAPTURED Hunting Act to KM, CS, and EL.

MUST BE IN IMMEDIATE POSSESSION WHILE COLLEC

NTIFIC COLLECTING IS NOT ALLOWED UNDER THE AUTHORITY O February 22, 2016 denial letter sent to the applicant. **NEW**

RENEWAL - SC-

STUDENT - $26.27 STUDENT - $52.79

ng, Report of Specimens Collected or Salvaged **MUST** BE **ATTACHED** or application will be returned. **CHECK ONE: Nonrefundable Application Fee (submit no AL OR ENTITY - $105.58 CHECK ONE: Permit Fee (submit when notified) INDIVIDUAL, ENTITY or PI - $315.00 DO NOT SUBMIT THE PERMIT FEE required to submit the permit** fee **if the permit is approved**. Fees include a nonrefundable three percent (3**%)** application fee, not to exceed $7.50 per iter 0.4, Title **14**, California Code of Regulations (CCR)). **BEFORE COMPLETING APPLICATION:** Read instructions, permit descriptions, standard conditions, an horizations requested or issued. **Complete all appropriate sections of the application (sponsor's section may be required). Type or print clearly.**

1 - INDIVIDUAL PERMITTEE INFORMATION - Complete only if applying as an individual.

E

I

falo, Inc.

'S MAILING ADDRESS

on Road

R

LOR

M.I. J

LAST NAME DeNicola

Check here if you want future correspondence mailed to your affiliation

GO ID NUMBER (FROM ALDS ISSUED LICENSE)

President

PRA0000083

TITLE

DAY TELEPHONE

FAX NUMBER

(860) 790-0224

STATE

CT

ZIP CODE

06469

E-MAIL ADDRESS

tony@whitebuffaloinc.org

EYE COLOR Brown

HEIGHT

WEIGHT

190

ISEX

04/12/1966

BIRTH

CITY

MALE FEMALE

STATE

ZIP CODE

I'S MAILING ADDRESS

ıbove

2 - ENTITY PERMITTEE - Complete only if applying as a qualified entity

'ude California certified small businesses, aquariums or zoos accredited by the Association of Zoos and Aquariums, museums, California Special Districts, pub
*'on-profit non-govemmental organizations, accredited colleges or universities and instructors at accredited colleges or universities, Proof of **such** status **must***
*'th the application. An additional permit **fee** is required for each PI when the permit **is** ready to be issued.* ENTITY'S NAME

AILING ADDRESS

¡CITY

DATE TELEPHONE

STATE

FAX NUMBER

ZIP CODE

PRINCIPAL SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATOR (PI) INFORMATION - Provide the following information and attach **a** statement of qualifications or resume for the full- time pe esponsible for providing adequate supervision and training of the employees and volunteers listed below. **WHAT IS THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PI's PROPOSED**

more than one PI proposed under the entity permit, complete and attach page 8 (make copies if needed). The entity shall submit a non-refundable application f

' NAME

IM.I.

LAST NAME

PRA0000083

TITLE

E-MAIL ADDRESS

List **ALL** employees or volunteers that will be working under the Principal Scientific Investigator named above. Attach a separate list if n
ment form and fee must be submitted, approved, and returned to you by the Department before you can add or remove employees and volunte

FIRST NAME

LAST NAME

DRIVER'S LICENSE OR DMV ID NUMBER

STATE

.RTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE USE ONLY

D BY/DATE APPLICATION FEE TRANSACTION **#** |PERMIT FEE TRANSACTION #

APPLICATIONS LRB ROUTED TO/DATE

2

3.

SS

:NIA State of California - Department of Fish and Wildlife

)15 SCIENTIFIC COLLECTING PERMIT APPLICATION DFW 1379 (REV. 09/02/14) Previously
G 1379 Page 2

CDFW Received JL

L

BY

PERMANENT ID-NUMBER

ME

M.I.

J

LAST NAME OR ENTITY NAME (IF QUALIFIED ENTITY)

DeNicola

SC

--- PERMIT INFORMATION

ERMIT: CHECK ALL APPLICABLE BOXES

Biological Consulting (generally, catch and release only)
Federal or Other Agency Biologist

Research

Education

Biological Collection Service

PRA0000083

Museum Collection

Other-

LS

Other activity -

ES

6 C SL M FRESHWATER FISHES

SR CSL M

FRESHWATER INVERTEBRATES

SRC **SL** MANADROMOUS FISHES

IANS

SRC **SL** M

MARINE FISHES

☐ VERNAL POOL/TERRESTRIAL INVERTEBRATES SRC **SL M** ***See**

ndition "K"

☐

MARINE AQUATIC PLANTS MARINE/TIDAL INVERTEBRATES

NE: Other SCP permittees are involved in activity or project. YES

FIRST NAME

S S

R C

M

M

M

R C

SRC

SRC **SL** M

S C **SL**

SRC **SL** M

NO *(If yes, list the permittees below. Attach separate list if needed.)*

LAST NAME

SCIN NUMBER

SC

SC

SC

- SPONSOR INFORMATION

teachers and individuals collecting on behalf of an organization must all have one member of the organization sponsor them. Sponsors must this section of the application. Students must have one faculty member with affiliation to the student's college or university sponsor the stude

¡DAY TELEPHONE

M.I.

LAST NAME

ORGANIZATION

E-MAIL ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

'S CERTIFICATION/SIGNATURE: I verify the take described in this application is required by this organization

DATE

DRESS

ON CERTIFICATION

BY CHECKING ALL BOXES, I HEREBY DECLARE THAT THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION IS PROVIDED IN THIS AMENDMENT AND IN THE JUSTIFICATION SECTION

e

ds/Activity

Species + Numbers to be collected Literature Cited

Locations + Timeframes for Collecting

Species Disposition Attached Federal/State Permit(s) (Applicable/Not Applicable - Circle appropriate on

nd that if I fail to provide all information, circle items or check the boxes, my permit may be denied. I certify that I have read, understand, and bide by, all conditions of this permit and attachments, the applicable provisions of the FGC, and the regulations promulgated thereto. I certify tha y under any Fish and Wildlife license or permit revocation or *suspension, and that there are no other legal or administrative proceedings pending that v me from obtaining this permit. I agree that if I make any false statement as to any* fact *required as a prerequisite to the issuance of this perm oid and will be surrendered where purchased, and I understand that I may be subject to prosecution pursuant to FGC Section 1054 ninistrative actions pursuant to Section 746, Title 14. of the CCR.*

SIGNATURE

Author

CosMeda

DATE

18 June 2015

CDFW Received **JUN**

2

BY

M.L. J

LAST NAME OR ENTITY NAME (If qualified entity)

DeNicola

SC

PERMIT JUSTIFICATION - Required for **ALL** activities.

IS A FEDERAL OR ADDITIONAL STATE PERMIT OR MOU REQUIRED? ☐ YES ***(If* yes, *attach***

PROVIDE START AND END DATE AND/OR EXPLAIN SEASONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR YOUR WORK.

NO

END

START

10/01/2015 12/31/2018

Field work will be conducted primarily in Jan/Feb and Oct-December **REMINDER - You must provide justification here for eac**
ɛa and activity circled in Section 3. Use the space below to summarize your proposed research. Be sure to include each of the following headers in **bold/underlined**
ɔose (include scientific or educational need for the requested activity); methods/**techniques** (include equipment/gear) and the reason for using them; **species and nu**
ɛcted, if known (include scientific and common names); **collection locations** (include counties and specific locales and reasons for choosing them); and **disposition**, which de
ɲ's fate (i.e. sacrifice, catch and release, salvage, captivity). If you propose to collect in a Marine Protected Area (MPA), give the proper name of the MPA and explain (1) Why coll
ithin an MPA and provide justification for why it cannot be conducted outside of an MPA; (2) Why the proposed methods are appropriate for this activity; and (3
ɲe frequency of the proposed activity per collecting area. If you are working in areas where special status species (listed, **fully** protected, or species of special
ɾe expected to be incidentally captured, explain **why** collection is required in these areas, and describe how your methods/techniques and equipment/gear will
ake of non-target sensitive species. If requesting marking/tagging, captivity, or sacrifice, specific details as described above must be included for each species
uested. **Attach additional pages if** needed. **Attach complete copies of appropriate federal permits** and **additional State permits (e.g., Memorandum o**
ıding) to avoid delay of processing.

tate of California - Department of Fish and Wildlife

015 SCIENTIFIC COLLECTING PERMIT APPLICATION DFW 1379 (REV. 09/02/14)

Previously FG 1379 Page 4

E

İM.I.

J

LAST NAME OR ENTITY NAME (If qualified entity)

DeNicola

ARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE USE ONLY

OF ATTACHEMENTS NOTED IN THIS PERMIT SHALL REMAIN WITH THIS PERMIT AT ALL TIMES. CONDITIONS, AUTHORIZATIONS,
AND APPROVALS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

CDFW Received

JUN **22** 2015

BY

LRB

PERMANENT ID NUMBER-

SC

ISSUED BY/DATE

MENT REVIEWER(S) SIGNATURE

RECOVERY OF AN ISLAND ECOSYSTEM THROUGH EXPERIMENTAL REMOVAL OF NON- NATIVE MULE DEER

Santa Catalina Island, California

Submitted by

Dr. Anthony J. DeNicola

White Buffalo, Inc.

26 June 2015

Purpose

One of the dominant causes of high extinction rates and threats to unique species is the introduction and proliferation of non-native species. Non-native vertebrates (often introduced by humans) can directly or indirectly lead to species extinction, and land managers globally must address these threats with ambitious eradication efforts (Myers et al. 2000; IUCN 2002). Exotic ungulate species are introduced through two primary mechanisms; released/escaped domestic stock and intentional release (e.g., for recreational hunting). Non-native deer, remnants from efforts to create recreational hunting opportunities, have been an issue in many areas, including Santa Catalina Island (SCA), California. Of particular concern, aside from economic impacts, are the ecological

eradication programs (i.e., Point Reyes National Seashore involving fallow and axis deer, and Santa Rosa Island that included mule deer and elk) that successfully managed risks and now provide guidelines for more efficient approaches that can be applied to eradication projects elsewhere.

The key strategy is to eliminate target animal education in every aspect of the project. Prior to project implementation and throughout its duration, the focus should be on how the last deer will be detected and dispatched. The main factor to achieve eradication is 100 percent effectiveness at putting all deer 'at risk' and dispatching them on the first encounter throughout the project. The goal should be keeping the last deer as naive as the first. If a deer receives a sub-lethal application of an eradication technique and survive, it was unlikely it would be caught again using that same technique. By eliminating opportunities for deer to become educated, their naivety would not be compromised, and this would result in relatively easy detection in the future.

In 1998, the Conservancy first became a licensee of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to steward its portion of Catalina as a Private Lands Wildlife Habitat Enhancement and Management Area (PLM). Since that time, there has been extensive recreational deer hunting, with an average of 250 deer harvested annually over the past 10 years. This results in a population that is very wise to the human threat on the ground, but leaves them relatively naive to aerial shooting techniques. The greatest risk to the project would be creating a pool of educated deer that were skilled in the avoidance of helicopters. This is even more critical on this project as all other field options have been eliminated because of past management activities. Ultimately, an efficient method to detect the last remaining animals that is cost- effective and politically acceptable must be identified.

Much has been learned over the past 2 decades regarding ungulate eradication projects (Morrison 2007; Morrison et al. 2007). However, there has been little work/research on optimal methods for deer eradication. Given the past hunting efforts on the island, and previous experiences with ungulate eradication initiatives, our primary objective is to determine the optimal methods to ensure the goal of complete removal is met, conducted humanely, and at the lowest cost. Part of this assessment is to evaluate the relative utility of the Sentinel (aka: Judas) technique with deer. The method has proven invaluable for other ungulates that have strong social tendencies/behaviour (Campbell and Donlan 2005). Deer, however, tend to engaged only

with individuals of their matrilineal group, with males typically only being social with other males during the pre-rut period and with females during the breeding season. The second objective is to assess how home range size may change as deer densities are significantly reduced. We will be able to measure how rapidly area usage changes as associated family units, as well as proximate conspecifics, are removed. This will allow us to determine the optimal Sentinel distribution for full area coverage. The third objective is to compare the catch-per-unit- effort data to other helicopter-based ungulate eradication programs (e.g., Santa Rosa Island) in determining the population status after intensive aerial shooting. The final objective is to evaluate vegetation recovery after the removal of the last non-native ungulate species. This would be one of the world's largest ungulate exclosure initiatives documented.

During the 2014 PLM hunting season, only 24 of 225 deer were harvested on the island's west end. All traditional PLM hunt areas will continue to be available for public PLM hunting. If the program is successful there will be minimal recreational opportunity lost given the harvest levels on the west end of the Island.

Study Site

Santa Catalina Island (194 km2), located approximately 31 km south of Long Beach, California, has mountainous terrain, with a central ridge running its length. A narrow isthmus (<0.8 km wide)


scrub, island chaparral, island woodland, and coastal grassland (Schoenherr et al. 1999). Roughly 88% (170.5 km2) of Catalina is owned and managed by the Catalina Island Conservancy, a nonprofit land trust dedicated to the protection and management of the island's ecosystem. The remaining 12% is owned and managed by the Santa Catalina Island Company (11%) and the City of Avalon (1%), each with differing organizational missions. Catalina is home to a resident human population of over 3,700 within the City of Avalon and 350 within Two Harbors.

Catalina Island supports 477 native vascular plant taxa, including 39 Channel Islands and 9 Catalina Island endemics. Catalina endemic fauna include 5 mammals and 3 avian species. Two non-native ungulate populations, Mule deer *(Odocoileus hemionus)* and bison *(Bison bison)*, also inhabit the island and negatively impact its unique natural resources. Historically, recreational hunting has been used to manage mule deer with limited success due to logistical constraints of the island environment. An on-going fertility control research project is being used to hold the local bison population at 150 animals and reduce their associated impacts.




Figure 1. Study site overview.

PRA0000083


PARADISE STONY
POINT LANDING
BEACH
472 FT
Cactus Bay
Star Bay
SILVER PEAK
Spring Landing
Ribbon Beach
GULL ROCK
IRON BOUND
BAY
Ribbon Rock
HELP POINT
WHALE ROCK
Cape Cortes
DOCTORS COVE
EMERALD
BAY INDIAN ROCK
HOWLAND'S
LANDING
BIG GEIGER COVE
LITTLE GEIGER COVE
METOROUEMACA
LION T
LOBSTER BAY
SHIP ROCK
EAGLE NEST
Primary Exclosure Fence
BIRD ROCK
Chy Cove
TH OF JULY COVE
STEMUS REFF
USC
TWO HARBORS

PRA0000083


WRIS
BEACH
TAUNA HARBOR
LOMTER POINT
atalina Head
ROCK
Feral Animal Removal (FAR) Fencing
Isthmus Zone
Airlock
Gate
Buffer Zone
PEDISTAL
ROCK
LE CAVERN POINT
CAVES
SPOUTING CAVES
Airlock
Gate
Empire Quarry*
EMPIRE LANDING
Rippers Paradise
WEST
Cove
Cove
BUFFALO
CORNALE
Big Spring, Cve
UTTLE HARBOR
WHALES TAIL HARBOR
EL RANCHO
ESCONDIDO
RAGGERS POINT
HEAD ROCK Cottonwood Beach
SENTINEL ROCK
BEACH
Lava Wall



To better quantify the merits of some past eradication methods we propose to remove a deteriorating 5-foot tall welded wire hog fence built in the 1950s and install a new primary 8-foot tall ungulate-proof exclosure fence in its place, east of the Two Harbors isthmus (see Figure 1). A secondary plastic "Deer Buster" fence may be installed west of the isthmus during the fall of 2016 as a safety net in the event of excessive vandalism to the primary fence that may permit deer to breach the fence. This will permit a scaled and controlled assessment of these methods in a well-defined area. We also will be able to measure the vegetative response to the elimination of forage pressure by non-native ungulates. This will closely represent the original mammalian species composition prior to human settlement. We also will define a "buffer area" on the east side of the primary fence (Figure 1) to minimize immigration pressure into the exclosure area. This is the area <2 km distance from the fence where similar methods to the core study area (west of the fence) will be deployed (i.e., aerial shooting and Sentinel monitoring). We would expect minimal deer repopulation pressure because deer are behaviourally very philopatric and have small home ranges. So deer that are proximate to the buffer zone will not likely readily disperse into the "habitat vacancy".

Methods/techniques

Capture – All the deer will be captured using net guns from a helicopter and subsequently sterilized in October 2015. All females will be administered 4.4 mg Telazol (tiletamine HCl + zolazepam HCl) and 2.2 mg xylazine HCl with focal injection sites in the large muscle masses of the hindquarter. Once deer are secured masks will be placed over the eyes and opthalmic ointment will be applied to prevent ocular desiccation. Deer then will be transported via helicopter to a central location to perform surgical procedures. Transport will take <5 minutes. All immobilizations will be reversed with an intravenous injection of tolazoline HCL (2.0 mg/kg) upon delivery to the release location.

One mature doe in each matrilineal group will be radio-collared (n =~15) to facilitate future culling efforts (e.g., to locate unmarked deer). In addition, six males will be captured to serve as Sentinel animals. All sterilized animals will be fitted with livestock ear tags labeled "Do Not Consume" and a contact phone number to be determined. We will use large DuFlex ear-tags and ATS Wildlink GPS collars model W300 GTX (350g).

Surgical sterilization - Females of all age-classes will be sterilized via tubal ligation, and males sterilized via vasectomy. These procedures are conducted in <20 minutes and we will employ only veterinarians that are licensed in California (see Principal Investigators). After capture, all female deer will be premedicated with flunixin meglumine at a dosage of 1-3 mg/kg IM, and a long acting antibiotic (ceftiofur - Excede) at 3-6 mg/kg also IM. To provide adequate anesthesia ketamine HCl will be given intravenously at dosages up to 5 mg/kg, as needed.

Routine three layer closure of the abdomen will be performed to complete the procedure. In over 600 sterilization surgeries in deer (black-tailed and white-tailed deer) we have never had a known dehiscence (DeNicola 2013A, 2013B). The suture materials and patterns support continued use, as does the use of stainless steel staples for skin closure. We have recaptured many of the previously sterilized deer and found the staples absent after only a few months.

After capture, all male deer will be premedicated with flunixin meglumine at a dosage of 1-3 mg/kg IM, and a long acting antibiotic (ceftiofur - Excede) at 3-6 mg/kg also IM. To maintain anesthesia supplemental doses of ketamine HCl may be given intravenously at dosages up to 5 mg/kg, as needed. A small midline incision along the posterior of the scrotum will be used to expose the vas deferens. We will perform a simple vasectomy using electrocautery for removal of a ~2.5 cm section of the vas deferens. The incision will be closed with stainless steel staples. We will retain all deer in the surgical area until they show clear signs of recovery before returning them to the field. This limits the recovery time in the field and helps keep their body temperatures stable. Sterilized deer will be released proximate to their capture location within the study area and administered the reversal agent tolazoline HCl (2.0 mg/kg) intravenously.

Sentinel deer

We will capture and collar the deer in October to collect baseline home range data from October 2015 - January 2016. We can compare the relative accuracy of this partial year home range data to see if it is representative of annual home range data collected in 2006 using GPS collars (Manuwal 2007). Each deer will be surgically sterilized using standard veterinary procedures (i.e., tubal ligations to ensure multiple ovulations per breeding season and vasectomies for males) to ensure that if radio-collars fail there is no risk of missing a reproductively viable animal (see above surgical summary). This will remove all elements of doubt of the success, or failure, of the program. These individuals will be to use as Sentinel animals during the subsequent shooting and monitoring phases. They will be intentionally avoided by shooters until no detectable unmarked deer are located.

We will deploy one deer per drainage on the west end, 10-12 total (4 adult males, 8 juvenile females; so likely not pregnant). We also will capture and redeploy four deer (as Sentinel) in the eastern buffer area beyond the ungulate exclosure fence (2 dominant males, one adult female, and one juvenile female).

The following are considerations for using Sentinel deer that will be further assessed:

1) Collect pre-removal home range (HR) data to better understand Sentinel deployment density.
2) Focus more on the rut as the primary Sentinel usage timeline. Do not just select animals that would search for social relations. Both approaches are necessary.
3) Select enough dominant males (≥4 years old) to cover the entire area with minimal overlap based on pre-implementation HRS to make sure the Sentinel will be the ones to tend unmarked females in estrus during the first rut.
4) Collar sizing considerations for longer deployments, particularly on males, but even on juvenile females.
5) Use GPS collars for more reliable, regular detection and observations given ephemeral

affiliations.

7) GPS data collection: one data point per day around sunrise (or ~one hour after). At least two data points per day in case a fix is not recorded you do not lose the ability to track for a whole day. VHF programmed sunrise to sunset.

8) More adult male Sentinels in the first year that can focus on finding all unmarked females and not have any unmarked females untended by Sentinel males. Only need a few females to socialize with unmarked females pre-rut.

9) In Year 2 remove all but one adult male Sentinel to allow any unmarked adult males to compete and find/tend Sentinel females.

10) If necessary in Year 3, redeploy refurbished adult male collars on males captured (via remote immobilization) in the eastern portion of the study area. These males (n = 2) can serve as a final step to locate any possible non-Sentinel females.

11) Collar enough females (~25% more than the minimum based on pre-implementation HRs) so that you can weed out females with smaller HRS and keep those that cover more area.

12) Shifting Sentinel across the area did not work to facilitate connections with conspecifics under the premise that they would travel more trying to return to their natal range and encounter unmarked deer.

The use of Sentinel deer will increase shooting efficacy because deer are social and tend to find each other, particularly during the breeding season. Sentinel deer will be located by radio tracking them from the ground (facilitated using GPS coordinates), and helicopter initially in January 2016, and dispatching any untagged deer in the vicinity. This technique is especially helpful once deer densities are low.

Initial culling - aerial shooting

In January 2016 we will conduct intensive aerial culling. With modest ground cover for deer to hide in, Catalina Island is ideal for aerial shooting. Aerial shooting has the advantage of covering the study area quickly and the ability to herd animals. This makes it a far more effective tool than ground shooting for detecting and removing groups of deer while minimizing their chances of escape. Deer on SCA should be relatively naive to aerial shooting. During every outing the pilot and shooter must be extremely conscientious to leave no survivors from any encounter. Prior to engaging a deer (pursuing, shooting, or otherwise disturbing), the aerial shooter will assess whether there are additional deer near the one/s sighted.

Aerial shooting will take place in the early morning and late evening when deer are most active. The helicopter will systematically cover the terrain by working through each major catchment and gully, searching for deer. At the beginning of each day, the aerial shooting team would continue from where they left off the previous day. This method ensures that all areas were covered equally. Ground shooting support will be used during the systematic flights in areas where vegetation may be too thick to clearly see mark animals and their potential associates.

Hot spotting is a technique used where 'hot spots', or areas that had high deer densities based on dispatch data, are revisited more frequently. More intensive efforts will be used in all areas that appeared to be favorable deer habitat. This will be part of the initial culling initiative in January 2016.

Mark-resight

A mark-recapture program will be integrated during systematic flights to serve as a population estimator in January 2016. This method will be used to monitor the effectiveness of the helicopter phase by assessing the percentage of the tagged animals (Sentinel) that are observed.

Carcass Recovery

Recovering or processing any deer dispatched during the culling would add considerable cost to the program. If this is deemed necessary for the research to get approval, the cost of recovering carcasses, skinning/gutting, refrigerating, and then transporting the meat off island to be processed at a USDA approved facility needs to be budgeted for. Utilization of meat will have a significant impact on the overall cost and potential outcome of the project.

Sentinel monitoring - Phase 1

Two weeks before the peak breeding season Sentinel animals will be monitored for unmarked associates (November/December 2016). Each deer will be checked every other day through two estrus cycles.

Sentinel monitoring - Phase 2

Same as Phase 1 except most of the Sentinels will likely be culled by this time because of social affiliations with other Sentinels.

Sentinel monitoring - Phase 3

Final monitoring for unmarked deer (November/December 2018) using the same procedures as Phase 2. Following the completion of monitoring in Year 3, all remaining Sentinel deer on the west side of the exclosure fence will be dispatched.

Species and numbers to be collected

We will capture 15-20 mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) and release them post-surgery. All remaining deer will be culled (~500).

Collection location

Collection will only take place in the enclosed area (8592 acres) west of the primary exclosure fence, and in the aforementioned 1282 acres of the east end buffer zone, on Catalina Island. See above study site description.


All captured animals will be released on site. Any animals that are culled during the research efforts will be left in the field to recycle.

Vegetation Recovery Monitoring

Long-term island-wide vegetation monitoring will be established and conducted annually by Catalina Island Conservancy botanists to document vegetation changes in response to ungulate removal. Monitoring protocols, using 30-m point transect frames were developed by

the Mediterranean Coast Network which includes Channel Islands National Park, Cabrillo National Monument and Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area. Monitoring objectives include determining the status (current condition) and trends in species composition, richness, and abundance within the terrestrial vegetation of Catalina Island. To achieve this objective, the following plant parameters will be quantitatively monitored: (1) foliar cover for all plant species; (2) density of shrubs and trees (also basal area of trees)-seedling, sapling, mature, dead; (3) species richness-all species occurring in a monitoring plot; (4) species frequency- calculated from richness and; (5) soil cover type-biological crust, litter, rock, soil. Groups of interest include all native species, all non-native species, native shrubs, native forbs, non-native forbs, native perennial forbs, native annual forbs, native grasses, and non-native grasses (Tiszler et al. 2015).

Figure 2. Vegetation sampling locations.



While all of these parameters provide information only on composition and structure, changes in these parameters over time and space will provide information for understanding process. Parameters will be monitored with permanent plots placed in a random, spatially- balanced design (Generalized Random-Tessellation Stratified Design -GRTS) that results in communities and environmental covariates being sampled in proportion to their areal occurrence.

To be with consistent with sampling efforts on the northern Channel Islands, 1 transect per 350 ha will be monitored, for a total of approximately 50 plots (Figure 2).

Continued Photo Monitoring: The Conservancy will resume obtaining cover and composition data from quadrats placed along 17 transects, distributed among six different vegetation types (ironwood groves, woodland, chaparral, coastal sage scrub, maritime cactus scrub, and grassland) on the west end. Data was collected annually 1990-1993 and 2000 following the removal of feral pigs and goats from the west end and a subset of points were resampled in 2006.

Point 14

February 1990

Background of Principal Investigators

December 1993

Dr. Anthony J. DeNicola is President of White Buffalo, Inc., a non-profit research organization dedicated to conserving ecosystems through wildlife population control. He received a M.S. degree from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies and a Ph.D. from Purdue University. Dr. DeNicola has conducted, or been directly involved with, nearly all the large ungulate eradications in the United States over the past 18 years. Dr. DeNicola's research interests include ecological approaches to control wildlife damage, eradication/control of introduced vertebrate species, and wildlife reproductive control.

wildlife capture and disease investigation, to include experience with capture, restraint, tissue sampling, pathology, diagnostics and treatment of carnivores, ungulates, and feral species. He worked on Catalina Island for several years in the late-1990s (Island fox, non-native ungulate projects, etc.) and is very familiar with the island. Dr. Timm and White Buffalo Inc. recently established a protocol for rapid ovariectomy and tubal ligectomy using direct surgical approaches. This work involves the combined experience of the White Buffalo team of researchers and the surgical and field experience of Dr. Timm, and has established a technique to provide surgical (definitive) sterilization in a field environment. Working together they have captured and surgically sterilized over 600 deer. Currently, Dr. Timm lives in southwestern Wisconsin and provides mobile surgical services to companion animal clinics in southern Wisconsin. He has interests in veterinary surgery and intensive care, and free-ranging wildlife disease research.

LITERATURE CITED

Campbell, K. J., and Donlan, C. J. 2005. A review of feral goat eradications on islands. Conservation Biology. 19:1362-1374.

IUCN (The World Conservation Union). 2002. Turning the tide: the eradication of invasive species. Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK: IUCN SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group.

Manuwal, T. A. 2007. Implications of introduced mule deer on Santa Catalina Island, California: their impacts, population ecology, and management. MS Thesis, University of North Dakota. 118 pp.

Morrison, S. A. Reducing risk and enhancing efficiency in non-native vertebrate removal efforts on islands: a 25 year multi-taxa retrospective from Santa Cruz Island, CA. Prepared for Proceedings of the Managing Invasive Vertebrate Species International Symposium, USDA, Fort Collins, CO, August 2007.

Morrison, S. A., N. Macdonald, K. Walker, L. Lozier, and M. R. Shaw. 2007. Facing the dilemma at eradication's end: uncertainty of absence and the Lazarus effect. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 5: 271-276.

Myers, J. H., D. Simberloff, A. M. Kuris, and J. R. Carey. 2000. Eradication revisited: dealing with non-native species. Trends in Ecology and Evolution 15: 316-20.

Schoenherr, A.A., C.R. Feldmeth, and M.J. Emerson, 1999. Natural history of the islands of California. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA. pp 491.

Tiszler, J., D. Rodriguez, K. Lombardo, T. Sagar, L. Lee, T. Handley, K. McEachern, L. Starcevich, and T. Philippi. 2015. Terrestrial Vegetation Monitoring in the Mediterranean Coast Network: Cabrillo National Monument, Channel Islands National Park, and Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area. Draft Natural Resource Report NPS/XXXX/NRR— 20XX/XXX. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.

11

THE
TE OF

FISH & **WILDLIFE**

15

CALIFORNIA

AD

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
SCIENTIFIC COLLECTING PERMIT APPLICATION FEE
See permit **for validity dates**.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
6/24/2015 2:40 PM
CDFW License and Revenue Branch Outlet No: 310001-001
Clerk: RLEE
Purchase Receipt
Trans #10800190

D-0014389218-6

ANTHONY J DENICOLA
GO ID: 1026870587

Item Name	Amount
Scientific Collecting App Fee	105.58

Customer Total: $105.58

DFG Item **Fees SubTotal**: $105.58
Transaction **Total**: $105.58

GO ID: **1026870587**

PRA0000083

26 DAVISON

ON RDLIFORNIA

MOODUS, CT **06469** ANTMENT JA

FISH &

Doc No: D-0014389218-6 WILD Outlet No: 310001-001 Trans: 000000010800190

6/24/2015 2:40:22 PM

245578505

Item

$105.58

CHECK

2084

Scientific Collecting App Fee

REAT

SEAL

OF

EUREKA

Tender Amount: $105.58 CHANGE: ($0.00) Total

Amount: $105.58

Fee* $105.58

Total: **$105.58**

*Includes any applicable application fees, agent handling fees


HE STA

and license buyer surcharge.

End of Document D-0014389218-6-

EXHIBIT M

ADVANCE REPORT CATALINA ISLAND MULE DEER PROJECT: POPULATION BIOLOGY AND MANAGEMENT OF INTRODUCED MULE DEER ON SANTA CATALINA ISLAND, CALIFORNIA[1]





THAD A. MANUWAL AND RICK A. SWEITZER
DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA
GRAND FORKS, ND 58202

Contact information TM: thad.manuwal@und.nodak.edu, phone 701-777-2164
Contact information RS: richard_sweitzer@und.nodak.edu, phone 701-777-4676

[1] *Data and analyses included in this document are not final and should be considered preliminary in advance of receipt of the final report on the study*

INTRODUCTION

Non-native species are a major conservation threat to biodiversity, particularly on oceanic islands (Savidge 1987, Cree et al. 1995). The ecological implications of large introduced ungulates are becoming increasingly understood which has prompted their removal from several oceanic islands in recent years (Lombardo and Faulkner 2000, Schuyler et al. 2002, Campbell and Donlan 2005, Cruz et al. 2005, Carrion et al. 2007, Morrison et al. 2007). Mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) were introduced to Santa Catalina Island, California (hereafter, Catalina Island) in the early 1930's from adjacent mainland California and have co-existed with several other large ungulates including bison (*Bos bison*), pigs (*Sus scrofa*), and goats (*Capra hircus*) until recently. The Santa Catalina Island Conservancy, a non-profit conservation organization that owns and manages 88% of the island, began an intensive restoration program in the 1990's during which many of the introduced ungulates were removed with the exception of bison and mule deer. Bison are now being managed at reduced herd levels (Sweitzer et al. 2003) and with the removal of feral goats and pigs (Schuyler et al. 2002) from the island mule deer numbers have increased, despite harvesting efforts (Fig. 1).

Mule deer on Catalina Island are currently managed under the California Department of Fish and Game Private Lands Management Program (PLM), which includes an extended hunting season beginning in September and ending in December of each year. Mule deer are hunted using two distinct harvesting approaches. Residents of Catalina Island are allowed to hunt during the first and last months of the season, and each hunter is required to harvest one antlerless mule deer prior to harvesting an antlered mule deer. In contrast, deer hunters from mainland California and elsewhere must use a guide service (operated by Wildlife West Inc.) when on the island, and guided hunts

target mostly adult antlered mule deer (trophy harvest). Also, guided hunters are not required to harvest an antlerless deer prior to taking antlered animals. Harvest focused on adult antlered mule deer will have little to no influence on the size of the deer herd on Catalina Island.




Figure 1. Mule deer population estimates beginning with their introduction to Santa Catalina Island, California in 1930. The last estimate in 2006 is from this study. Note indications of a rapid increase in the mule deer herd recent years.

Mule deer are considered a potential threat to many native species on Catalina Island (Melody and Garcelon 1999, Stratton 2002, Manuwal and Sweitzer *in press*) and there is concern for the irruptive potential of the deer herd now that feral pigs and goats are removed and bison are being managed at a reduced herd size. An important concern for the Conservancy is that an irruptive population of mule deer will cause irreparable damage to the island's sensitive ecosystem. Further, in April 2007 a wildfire burned approximately 4,760 acres (10%) of the island. Once the winter-spring wet season begins in October or November 2007 and herbaceous and woody plants begin to re-emerge,

intensive browsing by mule deer in the burned area will suppress recovery of native trees and shrubs (Mills 1986).

Although introduced mule deer on Catalina Island are considered an ecological threat, the species is a big game mammal in California and within the management purview of the California Department of Fish and Game. Also, mule deer on Catalina Island have economic value for tourism and hunting. Complete removal and intensive control of mule deer on Catalina Island will be difficult from a policy perspective because the Conservancy will need to obtain approval from the California Department of Fish and Game prior to implementing any major change in management. Any new management approach for mule deer on Catalina Island that includes culling or focused control will require detailed data on abundance and population dynamics for mule deer herd on the island. The objectives of this part of our research on mule deer were twofold, (1) to estimate current mule deer densities on the island, and (2) to develop science-based management options for reducing mule deer numbers in the areas burned by the wildfire in April 2007 (FAR zones 3 and 4). As part of this second objective, we used modeling to estimate the approximate numbers of mule deer in different age and sex classes that will need to be removed by culling to reduce the herd in FAR zones 3 and 4 by 50%, 75% and 90% of the population size in these areas in August 2006.

STUDY AREA

Catalina Island is a 194-km^2 island located 40 km south of coastal Los Angeles, in Los Angeles County, California. Elevation on the island ranges from sea level to 640 m, with a topography dominated by a northwest-southeast mountain range containing a series of

lateral canyons (Schuyler et al. 2002). The climate is Mediterranean with relatively mild temperatures throughout the year and a long term mean annual precipitation of 290 ± (S.D.) 155 mm, mostly occurring between November and April (Schoenherr et al. 1999). There are four common habitat types on the island: (1) coastal sage scrub, characterized by coastal sage (*Artemisia californica*) and prickly pear cactus (*Opuntia littoralis*); (2) grassland, dominated by exotic annual grasses and forbs, such as wild oats (*Avena fatua*) and storksbill (*Erodium* spp.), interspersed with native bunch grasses (*Nasella* spp.); (3) island chaparral, represented by evergreen and drought-resistant shrubs and low trees such as island scrub oak and lemonade berry (*Rhus integrifolia*); and (4) riparian habitats limited to a few permanent or ephemeral streams in relatively deep canyons and marshy




Figure 2. Map of Catalina Island illustrating locations of three cross-island fences (solid black lines) established in the 1990s, which partitioned the island into four feral animal removal zones. The red shaded area represents the April 2007 fire.

wetland areas are represented by cottonwood (*Populus trichocarpa*), willow (*Salix* spp.) various sedges and rushes, and mule fat (*Baccharis pilularis*) (Knapp 2002).

In the 1990s three cross-island fences (~ 1.2m in height) were established on the island to facilitate eradication of feral pigs and goats (Schuyler et al. 2002), effectively dividing the island into four zones to contain feral pigs and feral goats while allowing mule deer to move among zones (Fig. 2). The large wildlife in April 2007 occurred in FAR zones 3 and 4 (Fig. 2), which is where the Conservancy desires to reduce the herd in order to permit island native trees and shrubs the opportunity to recover. The FAR fences have remained intact after the removal of feral pigs and goats. It should be possible to adapt and modify the existing fences in ways that will prevent mule deer from moving among zones following herd reduction in zones 3+4. Our modeling effort makes the important assumption that such a modification of the FAR fence will occur for preventing movement of mule deer from zone 2 into zones 3+4.

METHODS

Population Estimation

We used distance sampling methods on predetermined spotlight survey routes to estimate mule deer densities on Catalina Island. Survey routes were extended from Stapp and Guttilla (2006) by carefully considering the distribution of readily driveable primary and secondary (dirt and gravel) roads across the island. In 2006, we established four different variable length spotlight survey routes that would facilitate complete coverage of the island excluding Avalon/Avalon Canyon (Fig. 3). The four spotlight routes were 29.5 km, 29.0 km, 19.0 km, and 15.3 km in length, respectively. Two different spotlight

surveys were completed for each route, one survey in July and a second survey in August to test the reliability of a single estimate. The timing of the surveys preceded the hunting season (early September through December) when female deer (yearlings and adults) would be distinguishable from male deer (males with antlers) and before the movements and activities of deer were influenced by activities of hunters. Because of the length of time required to complete each spotlight route, we divided each transect into equal




Figure 3. Map of the four primary spotlight routes used to estimate the population density of mule deer on Catalina Island, California.

portions and surveyed the first portion in one night and the remaining portion the following night. Surveying transects in this manner reduced the chances of missing any deer at the end of long transects that may have retreated to cover after their peak activity period around dusk. A four-wheel drive vehicle fitted with two 2,000,000 candlepower spotlights was used for spotlight surveys. Spotlight surveys were initiated at dusk,

approximately 1 hour after sunset when a driver plus two spotlight operators/observers drove slowly (16 to 24 km/h) along each transect route for 3 to 4 hours depending on number of deer observed. During spotlight surveys each observer scanned different sides of the road and ahead of the vehicle to detect deer moving away from the approaching vehicle along the road centerline. When deer were observed the vehicle was stopped for data collection (typically recorded by the driver or a fourth person in the vehicle). Data that were collected for each deer/deer group included (1) time, (2) vehicle odometer reading, (3) number and sex of deer, (4) perpendicular distance of the deer/deer group from the road obtained with a range-finder, (5) a compass reading/azimuth for the deer/deer group (degrees from north), (6) vegetation type, (7) GPS coordinates for the vehicle position, and (8) any other pertinent notes (radio-collared deer, etc.). Binoculars were used to aid determining sex for yearling and adult deer (no attempt was made to identify the sex of juveniles/fawns). All observers were consulted when the age or sex classification of any individual mule deer was uncertain.

Once surveys were completed, Program Distance 4.1 (Thomas et al., 2003) was used to calculate estimates of mule deer densities. Program Distance uses a detection function to estimate densities when only a fraction of objects along transects are detected and fits a series of statistical models to the observed distances. Goodness-of-fit tests and Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC) are then used to select a detection function. Following suggestions of Buckland et al. (1993) we combined data from July to August to model the detection function. Before modeling the detection function we visually inspected histograms of the distance data for evidence of movement away from transects, a critical assumption of distance sampling methodology. Some movement away from

transects was observed, and we truncated data <10m (left truncated) and the largest 5% (right truncated) of distance values to improve the shape of the data for model fitting (Buckland et al. 1993). After running multiple models with different key functions and series expansions, we selected a detection function model with a uniform key function and cosine series expansion, which had the lowest AIC value of all models.

Following the wildfire in April 2007 there has been strong interest in focused management of mule deer occupying FAR zones 3 and 4. These two FAR zones encompass the area that was affected by the wildfire (Figure 2). Spotlight surveys were designed to estimate densities of deer island-wide, however, approximate equal numbers and lengths of transects were conducted in zones 1+2 and zones 3+4. No transects were completed within zone 4 due to the limited number of roads and limited visibility (narrow ridge tops) from roads in this area of the island. Thus, to properly model the population in the burned portion (zones 3 and 4) of the island, we stratified the transect data to include data from transects or portions of transects within zone 3. After determination of the detection function model and data truncation, we estimated the density of mule deer in the burned portion of the island and the remaining portion for July and August 2006, respectively. Because no spotlight transects were completed in zone 4, we assumed that the density of mule deer in zone 4 was similar to the density of mule deer in zone 3. The remaining data were used to estimate the density of mule deer throughout the remaining portions of the island.

Population Modeling

We developed a stage-based model, characterized by 2 sex and 3 age stages (juveniles, 0-1 years; yearlings, 1-2 years; and adults, >2 years; Fig. 4) to estimate the




Figure 4. Life cycle diagram illustrating the structure of the population model developed for mule deer on Catalina Island, California. Table 1 includes information on the definitions of life history parameters and state variables, as well as sources for data used to parameterize the model.

minimum number of mule deer that will need to be culled/removed to reduce and then maintain the mule deer herd in zones 3+4 at specific management levels. To begin we defined a one year time scale July (time t) to July (time $t+1$), that corresponds to timing of censuses (July and August). We assumed that culling and most natural mortality of female yearling and adult stages typically occurs before the birth pulse in late April-late May. The model was based on a similar model developed by Hobbs (2003) to evaluate effects of culling and fertility control on fallow and axis deer at Point Reyes National Seashore, California. Following Hobbs' model we first defined a recruitment function, representing the number of offspring born per female in the population,

$$f(Y_t, A_t, N_t) = s_A(Y_t m_Y + A_t m_A)\left(1 - \frac{N_t}{k_m}\right)^{\tau}$$

where, Y_t is the number of yearling females at time t, A_t is the number of adult females at time t, N_t is the total population size at time t. See Table 1 for a description of the remaining variables. Here, we assume density affects yearling and adult reproduction in the same manner. The parameter τ defines the relationship between density and recruitment. As τ approaches 1 the relationship becomes linear, whereas when τ nears 0,

recruitment remains relatively unaffected by density until very near carrying capacity. The value of τ is rarely known, but populations of mammals in the deer family Cervidae generally remain insensitive to density until near ecological carrying capacity (Skogland 1990, McCullough 1999, Owen-Smith 2006). Thus, we assumed density-dependence was not linear, but curvilinear, and modeled τ as a uniform random variable between 0.2 and 1. The advantage of this modeling approach is that it allows for integrating information on how population density influences recruitment and survival following marked reductions in population size via removal/culling.

The number of juveniles, yearlings, and adults can be estimated by:

$$J_{t+1} = f(Y_t, A_t, N_t) - H_t$$

$$Y_{t+1} = J_t s_J \left(1 - \frac{N_t}{k_s}\right)^{\tau} - H_{Yt}$$

$$A_{t+1} = (A_t + Y_t) s_A - H_{At}$$

respectively, where J_t is the number of juveniles at time t, and H_t is the number of deer harvested/culled from each age class at time t.

Our study was not explicitly designed to estimate population vital rates based on age-specific survival of large numbers of radio-collared deer. Instead we surveyed the broad literature on mule deer in mainland California and throughout their range and incorporated this uncertainty into the model, which will provide confidence intervals on model predictions (Table 1). We purposely chose to use conservative estimates of vital rates to avoid underestimating the irruptive potential of mule deer. Other information required for initializing the model (doe:fawn ratios, buck:doe ratios) were estimated from census data obtained by fieldwork in 2006. All Monte Carlo simulations were run in Microsoft Excel.

Mule Deer Management Goals and Scenarios

We developed models to represent four different management goals for mule deer in zones 3+4: (1) no major change from current PLM management (baseline/no change), (2) 50% reduction from the summer 2006 herd size, (3) 75% reduction from the summer 2006 herd size, and (4) 90% reduction from the summer 2006 herd size. Note that the 50%, 75%, and 95% reductions were based on the estimated size of the mule deer population in August 2006. In the baseline/no change model harvest rates were set at 12% for adult antlerless deer, 20% for adult antlered deer, and 0% for juvenile/fawn deer for 15 years beginning in 2007. These harvest rates for the baseline/no change model were estimated from the actual harvest data for the period from 2002 to 2006 (Conservancy records), and our assumption that hunters will almost always target older-aged animals when possible. For the 50%, 75% and 90% herd reduction models, harvest rates were adjusted to significantly increase harvest/culling of female (antlerless) and juvenile deer (Table 2). By leaving some males in the population we can take advantage of density-dependent effects on population dynamics, effectively slowing recruitment. In the 50%, 75% and 90% herd reduction models, we assumed there would be an intensive effort to reduce the herd in 2007 and 2008, whereupon culling rates would be somewhat less for the following 13 years (Table 2). After the initial 2 years of high harvest/culling, harvest rates were scaled back to levels that would be sufficient to maintain the 50%, 75%, or 90% reduction goals for at least 13 years. All modeling assumed that mule deer would not be able to leave or enter the zone 3+4 portion of the island (closed population assumption).

Table 1. Values and definitions for parameters used in the Catalina Mule Deer Model.

Parameter	Value	Source	Definition
m_A	1.0 - 1.75	Wallmo 1981 Schauss & Coletto1986 Andelt 2004 Bishop 2005	Maximum per capita rate of recruitment by adult females occurring when population size is close to 0. This recruitment rate specifies the number of offspring that survive to the first census produced per adult female alive at the birth pulse.
m_Y	0.69 – 1.03	Wallmo 1981 Lawrence 2004	Maximum per capita rate of recruitment by yearling females occurring when population size is close to 0. This recruitment rate specifies the number of offspring that survive to the first census produced per yearling female alive at the birth pulse.
k_m	2255		The population size at which no offspring survive from birth to census.
r	0.4 – 0.6	Kie and Czech 2000	Sex ratio of offspring.
s_J	0.5 – 0.95	Unsworth 1999 Lawrence 2004 Bishop 2005	Maximum survival of juveniles. The maximum value occurs when total population size is near 0.
s_A	0.85 – 0.95	Lawrence 2004 Bishop 2005	Adult survival rate.
k_s	6444		The population size where juvenile survival rate reaches a minimum value, assumed to be 0.10.
τ	0.2 – 1.0	Skogland 1990 McCullough 1999 Owen-Smith 2006	Shape parameter controlling the abruptness of density-dependence. As τ approaches 0, effects of density are not seen until large population sizes.
Decision Variables			
h	Varies with management goals		Culling rate, the number of animals that are culled during time t to t+1 divided by the number of animals that survival natural mortality during time t to t+1.

Table 2. Summary of culling rates associated with different levels of mule deer management on Santa Catalina Island, California. We assumed extensive culling during 2007 and 2008, and lower culling levels thereafter to maintain the desired herd reduction associated with each management objective.

	Culling Rates					
	Initial 2 years (2007, 2008)			Maintenance (2009 and after)		
Management Objective	Fawn	Adult Antlerless	Adult Antlered	Fawn	Adult Antlerless	Adult Antlered
Current – no change	0.00	0.12	0.20	0.00	0.12	0.20
50% herd reduction	0.50	0.50	0..25	0.15	0.15	0.08
75% herd reduction	0.72	0.72	0.36	0.15	0.15	0.08
90% herd reduction	0.95	0.95	0.48	0.15	0.15	0.08

RESULTS

Population Estimation

We observed 484 and 538 deer during spotlight surveys conducted in July 2006 and August 2006, respectively. Group size for the 305 (July 2006) and 320 (August 2006) groups of mule deer that were observed during these surveys ranged from 1 to 7, with a median and mode of 1.0. The buck:doe ratio of the population was 1:1.577 and the doe:fawn ratio was 1:0.517. Island wide density estimates were 12.07 (95% CI 8.67, 16.80) and 12.62 (95% CI 8.01, 19.8) mule deer/km^2 for July and August, respectively. Extrapolating to the total land area of Catalina Island (194 km^2), our population estimate based on the July 2006 spotlight survey was 2341 (95% CI 1682, 3259) mule deer, whereas the population estimate from the August spotlight survey was 2448 (95% CI 1553, 3857) mule deer. The mean value and our best estimate of the island-wide population size for mule deer in summer 2006 was 2395 mule deer.

Density estimates for zone 3 were 11.96 deer/km^2 (95% CI 7.83, 18.28) for the July 2006 survey, and 15.03 deer/km^2 (95% CI 6.90, 37.72) for the August 2006 survey. The median density was 13.5 deer/km^2 (Table 3). GIS layers from the Conservancy were

used to estimate the combined area of zones 3 and 4 (105.5 km^2). Extrapolating the median density for mule deer from zone 3 to the zone 3+4 area produced an estimated population of 1424 deer within the boundaries of zones 3+4 in summer 2006.

Density estimates for the remaining portions of the island (zones 1 and 2) were 10.28 (95% CI, 5.94, 17.79) and 13.86 (95% CI, 7.15, 26.89) deer/km^2 for July and August, respectively. Median density for zones 1 and 2 was 12.07 deer/km^2. Total area for these two zones equals 88.78 km^2. Thus, extrapolating we estimated 1072 deer in zones 1 and 2 (Table 4).

Mule Deer Management in Zones 3+4 – No Change/Current Harvest Levels

Model runs suggested the current population is slightly at or above carrying capacity and the population will slowly decrease by approximately 20% over the next 15 years under current management with hunters targeting mostly antlered deer (Fig. 5a).

Table 3. Mule deer population estimates and associated confidence levels for July and August 2006 in zone 3 of Santa Catalina Island, California.

	Density (deer/km^2)	95% CI	Area (km^2)	N	LCL N†	UCL N‡
July	11.96	(7.83, 18.28)	67.48	807	528	1234
August	15.03	(6.90, 37.72)	67.48	1014	466	2545
Median	13.50			911		

† Lower population size confidence level
‡ Upper population size confidence level

Table 4. Mule deer population estimates and associated confidence levels for July and August 2006 in zones 1 and 2 of Santa Catalina Island, California.

	Density (deer/km^2)	95% CI	Area (km^2)	N	LCL N†	UCL N‡
July	10.28	(5.94, 17.79)	88.78	913	527	1579
August	13.86	(7.15, 26.89)	88.78	1230	635	2387
Median	12.07			1072		

† Lower population size confidence level
‡ Upper population size confidence level

The geometric mean of lambda (λ_G) after 1000 model iterations suggests that the population will decrease by a rate of approximately 2-3% per year (Table 5). The population size in 15 years is projected to be approximately 1111 ± SD 513 deer.

Mule Deer Management in Zones 3+4 – 50% Herd Reduction from August 2006 Level

The management objective of achieving a 50% reduction of the current mule deer population in Zones 3+4 would require targeting 50% each of the fawn and adult antlerless segments of the population in 2007 and 2008, with approximately 25% culling rate of adult antlered deer. Maintenance of the 50% herd reduction would require a minimum 15% harvest/cull rate for the fawn and adult antlerless segments and approximately 8% of adult antlered segments in subsequent years. Based on our projections, the estimated mule deer population in Zones 3+4 in 2021 would be around 609 ± SD 425 animals. Cull rates under the 50% reduction goal would require an overall estimated removal of 1048 deer from zones 3+4 over the next 15 years (Table 6).

Mule Deer Management in Zones 3+4 – 75% Herd Reduction from August 2006 Level

The management objective of achieving a 75% reduction of the current mule deer population in Zones 3+4 would require targeting 72% of the fawn and adult antlerless segments of the population in 2007 and 2008, with a 36% culling rate for adult antlered deer. Maintenance of the 75% herd reduction would require a minimum 15% harvest/cull rate for the fawn and adult antlerless segments and 8% of adult antlered segments in subsequent years. Based on our projections, the estimated mule deer population in Zones 3+4 in 2021 would be around 409 ± SD 347 animals. Cull rates under the 75% reduction goal would require an overall estimated removal of 1152 deer from zones 3+4 over the next 15 years (Table 7).




Figure 5. Mean (solid black line) ± 1SD (solid grey line) mule deer population projections for the next 15 years under (a) current management practices, (b) 50% herd reduction management practices, (c) 75% herd reduction management practices, and (d) 90% herd reduction management practices after 1000 model iterations. N_t = mule deer population size at time t.

Mule Deer Management in Zones 3+4 – 90% Herd Reduction from August 2006 Level

The management objective of achieving a 90% reduction of the current mule deer population in Zones 3+4 would require targeting 95% each of the fawn and adult antlerless segment of the population, with a culling rate of 48% for adult antlered deer in 2007 and 2008. Maintenance of the 90% herd reduction would require a minimum 15% harvest/cull rate for the fawn and adult antlerless segments and 8% of adult antlered segments in subsequent years. Based on our projections, the estimated mule deer population in Zones 3+4 in 2021 would be 121 ± SD 118 animals. Cull rates under the

90% reduction goal would require an overall estimated removal of 1241 animals over 15 years (Table 8).

Table 5. Mean (± 1 S.D.) simulated number of fawn, adult antlerless (Adult A-), and adult antlered (Adult A+) mule deer culled during the next 15 years under current management practices. Values were calculated from 1000 model iterations. λ_G is the geometric mean of lambda.

	Current Management								
Year	Fawn Cull	Fawn (SD)	Adult A- Cull	Adult A- (SD)	Adult A+ Cull	Adult A+ (SD)	Total Cull	Herd Reduction	λ_G
2007	0	0	50	1	43	2	93	0.00	0.98
2008	0	0	48	3	37	3	85	0.01	0.97
2009	0	0	45	4	34	5	79	0.04	0.97
2010	0	0	44	7	34	9	77	0.06	0.97
2011	0	0	43	10	33	11	76	0.08	0.97
2012	0	0	42	12	33	12	74	0.10	0.98
2013	0	0	41	14	32	12	73	0.11	0.97
2014	0	0	40	15	32	13	72	0.13	0.98
2015	0	0	40	17	31	13	71	0.14	0.98
2016	0	0	39	17	30	13	69	0.16	0.98
2017	0	0	38	18	30	14	68	0.17	0.98
2018	0	0	38	19	30	14	67	0.18	0.98
2019	0	0	38	20	29	14	67	0.19	0.98
2020	0	0	37	20	29	14	66	0.20	0.98
2021	0	0	37	21	28	14	65	0.21	--
All Years	0		617		484		1102		

Table 6. Mean (± 1 S.D.) simulated number of fawn, adult antlerless (Adult A-), and adult antlered (Adult A+) mule deer culled during the next 15 years under 50% herd reduction management practices. Values were calculated from 1000 model iterations. λ_G is the geometric mean of lambda.

	50% Herd Reduction								
Year	Fawn Cull	Fawn (SD)	Adult A- Cull	Adult A- (SD)	Adult A+ Cull	Adult A+ (SD)	Total Cull	Herd Reduction	λ_G
2007	92	28	207	6	54	3	353	0.00	0.70
2008	76	15	138	8	43	4	257	0.30	0.70
2009	4	1	24	2	10	1	38	0.51	0.97
2010	4	1	22	4	9	2	35	0.52	0.96
2011	4	1	22	5	8	2	34	0.53	0.97
2012	4	1	22	7	8	3	34	0.54	0.97
2013	4	2	22	8	8	3	33	0.55	0.97
2014	4	2	22	9	8	3	33	0.55	0.98
2015	4	2	22	11	8	3	33	0.55	0.98
2016	4	2	22	12	7	4	33	0.56	0.98
2017	4	2	22	14	7	4	33	0.56	0.98
2018	4	2	22	15	7	4	33	0.56	0.98
2019	4	2	22	16	7	4	33	0.56	0.98
2020	4	3	22	17	7	5	33	0.56	0.98
2021	4	3	22	18	7	5	33	0.57	--
All Years	220		630		198		1048		

Table 7. Mean (± 1 S.D.) simulated number of fawn, adult antlerless (Adult A-), and adult antlered (Adult A+) mule deer culled during the next 15 years under 75% herd reduction management practices. Values were calculated from 1000 model iterations. λ_G is the geometric mean of lambda.

	75% Herd Reduction								
Year	Fawn Cull	Fawn (SD)	Adult A- Cull	Adult A- (SD)	Adult A+ Cull	Adult A+ (SD)	Total Cull	Herd Reduction	λ_G
2007	194	58	298	10	78	4	570	0.00	0.53
2008	127	24	148	8	55	5	330	0.47	0.52
2009	2	0	12	1	7	1	21	0.72	0.95
2010	2	1	11	2	6	1	19	0.73	0.96
2011	2	1	11	3	5	1	19	0.74	0.97
2012	2	1	11	3	5	1	18	0.74	0.98
2013	2	1	11	4	5	2	18	0.75	0.98
2014	2	1	11	5	5	2	18	0.74	0.99
2015	2	1	12	6	5	2	19	0.74	0.99
2016	2	1	12	7	4	2	19	0.74	0.99
2017	2	2	12	8	4	3	19	0.73	0.99
2018	3	2	13	10	4	3	20	0.73	0.99
2019	3	2	13	11	4	3	20	0.72	0.99
2020	3	2	14	12	5	3	21	0.71	0.99
2021	3	2	14	13	5	4	21	0.71	--
All Years	352		602		198		1152		

Table 8. Mean (± 1 S.D.) simulated number of fawn, adult antlerless (Adult A-), and adult antlered (Adult A+) mule deer culled during the next 15 years under 90% herd reduction management practices. Values were calculated from 1000 model iterations. λ_G is the geometric mean of lambda.

	90% Herd Reduction								
Year	Fawn Cull	Fawn (SD)	Adult A- Cull	Adult A- (SD)	Adult A+ Cull	Adult A+ (SD)	Total Cull	Herd Reduction	λ_G
2007	335	102	392	11	102	5	830	0.00	0.00
2008	149	28	122	6	63	5	335	0.65	0.00
2009	1	0	3	0	5	1	8	0.88	0.85
2010	0	0	2	0	4	1	7	0.90	0.88
2011	1	0	3	1	3	1	6	0.91	0.91
2012	1	0	3	1	2	1	6	0.92	0.93
2013	1	0	3	1	2	1	5	0.92	0.95
2014	1	0	3	1	2	1	5	0.93	0.96
2015	1	0	3	1	2	1	5	0.93	0.97
2016	1	0	3	2	1	1	5	0.93	0.98
2017	1	1	3	2	1	1	5	0.93	0.99
2018	1	1	3	3	1	1	5	0.92	0.99
2019	1	1	4	3	1	1	6	0.92	1.00
2020	1	1	4	4	1	1	6	0.92	1.00
2021	1	1	4	4	1	1	6	0.91	--
All Years	493		554		193		1241		

DISCUSSION

The results of our population estimate indicate that mule deer numbers on Catalina Island have increased significantly in the last few years. Ninety-five percent confidence intervals indicate our July and August estimates of 2341 (95% CI 1682, 3259) and 2448 (95% CI 1553, 3857), respectively, are significantly greater than Stapp and Gutilla's (2006) estimate of 1048 (95% CI: 852, 1,288) in 2004. Further, our estimates are greater than typical statewide densities of 4 to 9 deer/km^2 (Longhurst et al. 1952, Kie and Boroski 1995).

Recent increased mule deer densities on Catalina Island are the likely result of reduced competition for forage with feral pigs, feral goats (both eradicated from Zones 1,

2, and 3) and bison (herd size reduced by over half after 2002. Also, there was a very high mast production by island scrub oak (*Quercus pacifica*) in fall 2004, followed by near-record rainfall in the winter/spring of 2004/2005. Spring precipitation and forage biomass have been identified as important predictors of mule deer population dynamics in other areas of North America (Peek et al. 2002). Consistent long-term data on mule deer numbers, precipitation, forage biomass, and numbers of competing ungulates would be useful for determining the mechanism by which the mule deer population on Catalina Island is operating. Nevertheless, mule deer numbers are high and the current densities are impacting native vegetation on the island (see Catalina Mule Deer Study Advanced Report: Implications of introduced large ungulates on island scrub oak habitats on Santa Catalina Island, California).

While spotlight estimates indicate the population has been growing in recent years, population modeling simulations indicate the population is at or slightly above carrying capacity (approximately 2400; equivalent to ~12 deer/km^2) and will decrease somewhat over the next 15 years through density-dependent mechanisms and without a major change in management. Schmidt et al. (2000) argued that the mule deer population on Catalina Island was at carrying capacity when it was determined at around 10.6 deer/km^2 by Garcelon in 1988. Although Schmidt et al. (2000) did not have any empirical evidence for this suggestion, we believe they may have been essentially correct.

Population modeling indicated that herd reduction goals and maintenance of 50%, 75%, and 90% reduction of the current population level are plausible, given extensive culling followed by subsequent years of constant but lower culling rates over the next 15 years (Fig. 5). Although all management scenarios suggested a similar total number of

deer culled (1069-1260 deer over the next 15 years), the number of deer culled during the intensive culling period (i.e. first two years) varied substantially. A 50% reduction of the current population would require culling approximately 552 deer in the first two years, a 75% reduction would require culling approximately 898 deer, while a 90% would require culling approximately 1128 deer, almost twice the number of deer as the 50% reduction plan (Tables 6,7, and 8). This is an important point to consider when making management decisions and planning culling operations (see discussion below).

Perhaps the most useful information gained from the modeling is the number of specific age and sex classes of the population that need to be culled during specific years to achieve management goals of 50%, 75%, and 90% herd reductions (Tables 5-8). These predictions will be useful in planning and implementing management strategies. For example, it will be valuable to know that almost twice as many animals will need to be culled in the initial two years of management for a 90% reduction compared to a 50% reduction, while will require significantly more effort and resources. It is also important to note that more females than males will need to be culled/harvested to achieve any herd reduction goal with efficiency. Further, although the actual number of animals required to be culled for maintaining any of the three herd reduction goals might appear small, encounter rates with mule deer will be lower at smaller population sizes, which will increase the effort required for removal.

LITERATURE CITED

Andelt, W.F., Pojar, T.M., and Johnson, L.W. 2004. Long-term trends in mule deer pregnancy and fetal rates in Colorado. Journal of Wildlife Management. 68:542-549.

Bishop, C.J., Unsworth, J.W., and Garton, E.O. 2005. Mule deer survival among adjacent populations in southwest Idaho. Journal of Wildlife Management. 69:311-321.

Buckland, S.T., D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, and J.L. Laake. 1993. Distance sampling: estimating abundance of biological populations. Chapman and Hall, London, United Kingdom.

Campbell, K. and C.J. Donlan. 2005. Feral goat eradications on islands. Conservation Biology 19(5):1362-1374.

Carrion, V., C.J. Donlan, K. Campbell, C. Lavoie, and F. Cruz. 2007. Feral donkey (*Equus asinus*) eradications in the Galapagos. Biodiversity and Conservation 16(2):437-445.

Cree, A.; C.H. Daugherty and J.M. Hay. 1995. Reproduction of a rare New Zealand reptile, the tuatara, Sphenodon punctatus, on rat-free and rat-inhabited islands. Conservation Biology 9:373-383.

Cruz, F., C.J. Donlan, K. Campbell, and V. Carrion. 2005. Conservation action in the Galapagos: Feral pig (*Sus scrofa*) eradication from Santiago Island. Biological Conservation 121(3):473-478.

Garcelon, D.K. 1998. A census and evaluation of deer in select areas of Santa Catalina Island. Unpublished report prepared for the Santa Catalina Island Conservancy, Avalon, California.

Hobbs, N.T. 2003. Final Report Point Reyes Fallow Deer Modelling. Appendix D in Point Reyes National Seashore non-native deer management plan: protecting the seashore's native ecosystems. Final Environmental Impact Statement. July 2006. 431 pp.

Kie, J. G., and B. B. Boroski. 1995. Using spotlight counts to estimate mule deer population size and trends. Calif. Fish and Game 81:55-70.

Kie, J.G. and Czech, B. 2000. Mule and black-tailed deer. Pages 629-657 in S. Demarais and Krausman, P.R., editor. Ecology and management of large mammals in north America. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, USA.

Knapp, D. 2002. Santa Catalina Island vegetation mapping project report. Unpublished report prepared for Santa Catalina Island Conservancy, Avalon, California.

Lawrence, R.K., Demarais, S., Relyea, R.A., Haskell, S.P., Ballard, W.B., and Clark, T.L. 2004. Desert mule deer survival in southwest Texas. Journal of Wildlife Management. 68:561-569.

Longhurst, W. M., S. Leopold, and R. F. Dasmann. 1952. A survey of California deer herds: their range and management problems. Game Bulletin 6, California Department Fish and Game. 136 pp.

Manuwal, T.A. and R.A. Sweitzer. 2007. Effects of mule deer and bison on regeneration of island scrub oak on Santa Catalina Island, California. In: Proc. of the 6th symposium on oak woodlands: Today's Challenges, Tomorrow's Opportunities, October 9-12, 2006, Rohnert Park, California. *In press.*

McCullough, D.R. 1999. Density dependence and life-history strategies of ungulates. Journal of Mammology 80(4):1130-1146.

Melody, K., and D. K. Garcelon. 1999. Potential impacts of introduced mule deer on the ecology of Santa Catalina Island, California. Unpublished research report, Institute for Wildlife Studies, Arcata, California.

Mills, J.N. 1986. Herbivores and early postfire succession in southern California chaparral. Ecology 67(6):1637-1649.

Owen-Smith, N. 2006. Demographic determination of the shape of density dependence for three African ungulate populations. Ecological Monographs 76(1):93-109.

Peek. J.M., B. Dennis, and T. Hershey. 2002. Predicting population trends of mule deer. Journal of Wildlife Management 66:729-736.

Savage, J.A. 1987. Extinction of an island forest avifauna by an introduced snake. Ecology 68:660-668.

Schauss, M.E., and H.J. Coletto. 1986. Population characteristics and management of black-tailed deer in the Mt. Hamilton Range of central California. Research Report. 81 pp.

Schoenherr, A. A.; C. R. Feldmeth; and M. J. Emerson. 1999. Natural history of the Islands of California. University of California Press, Berkeley, California.

Schuyler, P.T.; D.K. Garcelon; and S. Escover. 2002. Eradication of feral pigs (Sus scrofa) on Santa Catalina Island, California, USA. Pp. 274-286 In: Turning the Tide: the Eradication of Invasive Species (C.R. Veitch and M.N. Clout, editors),

IUCN SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.

Skogland, T. 1990. Density-dependence in a fluctuating wild reindeer herd; maternal vs. offspring effects. Oecologia 84:442-450.

Stapp, P. and D.A. Guttilla. 2006. Population density and habitat use of mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) on Santa Catalina Island, California. The Southwestern Naturalist 51(4): 572-578.

Stratton, L. 2002. Oak restoration trials: Santa Catalina Island. Proceedings of the 5th symposium on oak woodlands: oaks in California's changing landscape. General Technical Report PSW-GTR-184. Albany California: Pacific Southwest Research Station, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Sweitzer, R.A.; J.M. Constible; and D.H. Van Vuren. 2003. Population ecology and ecological effects of bison on Santa Catalina Island, California. Final report to Santa Catalina Island Conservancy. 113 pp. Available online: http://www.catalinaconservancy.org/ecology/research/bison%20Study.pdf

Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, S. Strindberg, F.F.C. Marques, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S.L. Hedley, J.H. Pollard, and J.R.B. Bishop. 2003. Distance 4.1. Release 2. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, United Kingdom.

Unsworth, J.W., Pac, D.F., White, G.C., and Bartmann, R.M. 1999. Mule deer survival in Colorado, Idaho, and Montana. Journal of Wildlife Management. 63:315-326.

Wallmo, O.C. 1981. Mule and black-tailed deer of North America. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, NE, USA.

EXHIBIT N

Scott Haskell Campbell
Partner
(213) 617-7489
scott.campbell@bbklaw.com

File No. 65059.00300

February 6, 2026

VIA U.S. MAIL AND E-MAIL

Christian Romberger
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
3030 Old Ranch Pkwy, Suite 400
Seal Beach, CA 90740
christian.romberger@wildlife.ca.gov
R5RMP@wildlife.ca.gov

Re: City of Avalon's Protest to the Catalina Island Conservancy's Permit and Corresponding CEQA Determination to Massacre All Mule Deer on Catalina Island

Dear Mr. Romberger:

The City of Avalon ("City") submits this written protest to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife ("Department") in opposition to the Restoration Management Permit No. RMP 2025-0017-R5 signed and made effective on January 30, 2026 ("Permit") to Catalina Island Conservancy ("Conservancy") for the Catalina Island Conservation Project ("Project"). Through the Project, the Conservancy seeks to eradicate thousands of mule deer and, in so seeking, threatens the City's residents, economy, public safety, and livelihoods, and also presents substantial risk to the unique Channel Islands ecosystem. This written protest is submitted because: (1) no notice under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") was provided to the City prior to the Department's January 26, 2026 Concurrence Opinion which determined that a statutory CEQA exemption applies; (2) the Permit's approval of deer eradication conflicts with applicable City ordinances; and (3) complete eradication of the deer is unnecessary and unreasonable, as reasonable alternatives should first be attempted and considered.

Catalina Island—the southernmost of the Channel Islands—is a unique and renowned destination in Southern California. Located southwest of Los Angeles, it is an island just 22 miles long and 8 miles across, containing two towns that are surrounded by rugged hills and the majestic Pacific Ocean. The Conservancy's Permit threatens the culture and livelihood of this special place.

This Department is tasked with managing California's natural resources, including deer. (Cal. Fish & Game Code, § 450 ["It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Legislature to encourage the conservation, restoration, maintenance, and utilization of California's wild deer

populations …"], see also Cal. Fish & Game Code § 1801[1].) This Department is entrusted by the people of the State of California to preserve and protect the State's natural resources. But the mass elimination of deer, as proposed by the Conservancy, would violate the Department's mandate to preserve and protect these animals for the benefit and enjoyment of the people. Accordingly, the City submits this written protest to the Department and, for the reasons stated herein, the Permit should be reconsidered or amended.

The Permit Should be Reconsidered or Amended Because the City was Not Provided any Notice About the Permit's Supposed CEQA Exemption

The Department, acting as lead agency, utilized the Statutory Exemption for Restoration Projects ("SERP") found in Public Resources Code Section 21080.56 to determine the Project was exempt from CEQA. The Department issued Concurrence No. 21080.56-2026-090-R5 ("Concurrence") on January 26, 2026, prior to posting a Notice of Exemption (SCH No. 2026020024) on January 28, 2026.[2] However, contrary to the Department's stated policy, and despite covered Project activities occurring within the City, the City of Avalon was not timely notified of the Department's consideration or approval of the Project.

The Department's website states that "[w]hile Public Resources Code section 21080.56 does not include a public comment requirement, CDFW encourages and supports lead agency efforts to meet and confer with interested parties, neighbors, public officials, and California Native American tribes prior to submittal of a SERP concurrence request to CDFW."[3] The Department's Concurrence describes coordination of interested parties, describing outreach done by the Conservancy. Nowhere does the Permit mention any community outreach or coordination, or noticing to interested parties done by CDFW, which is the lead agency for this Project. The Avalon City Attorney communicated with the Department's General Counsel on December 1, 2025, at which time the City expressed its intent to comment on the Conservancy's application once it was filed. During this call, the City was not told that an application had been received. Despite this communication and the City of Avalon's previous objections to the Conservancy's plan in 2023, the Department never notified the City of its intent to file a Concurrence or approve Restoration Management Permit No. RMP 2025-0017-R5 ("RMP") once the Conservancy submitted its application on December 4, 2025. The City Attorney did speak to the General Counsel of Fish and Wildlife on January 28, 2026 about the Concurrence and notified her that he would be talking to

[1] This section states in pertinent part: "It is hereby declared to be the policy of the state to encourage the preservation, conservation, and maintenance of wildlife resources under the jurisdiction and influence of the state. This policy shall include the following objectives: … (c) To perpetuate all species of wildlife for their intrinsic and ecological values … (d) To provide for aesthetic, educational, and nonappropriative uses of the various wildlife species … (e) To maintain diversified recreational uses of wildlife, including the sport of hunting, as proper uses of certain species of wildlife, subject to regulations consistent with the maintenance of healthy, viable wildlife resources, the public safety, and a quality outdoor experience … [M]anagement shall be consistent with the maintenance of healthy and thriving wildlife resources and the public ownership status of the wildlife resources …"

[2] Restoration Management Permit No. RMP 2025-0017-R5 was not approved until January 30, 2026, thus the January 28, 2026 NOE was filed in violation of CEQA as it was filed prior to Project approval. The Department issued a corrective NOE on February 2, 2026, attempting to cure that violation.

[3] https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Cutting-Green-Tape/SERP/QA#570063372-will-the-public-have-opportunities-to-comment-on-a-project-that-is-utilizing-the-serp-process, accessed February 5, 2026.

the City Council in closed session on Feb. 3, 2026 about whether the City would direct the City Attorney to file an updated protest. Despite such notice, the Permit was issued before the City Council meeting.

As the City was not properly notified of the approval of RMP and CEQA determination, the City requests the Department reconsider its determination or amend the RMP. The City also reserves its right to challenge the Department's approval and use of the SERP exemption from CEQA, as the RMP does not satisfy the requirements for a SERP exemption.

The Project does not result in public benefits such as access and recreation. Eradication of mule deer from the City of Avalon and Catalina Island will result in a permanent loss in recreational hunting, which will be a detriment to the City's local economy as well as for interested hunters that visit Catalina Island during deer season. While the Concurrence cites increased birding as a benefit of the Project, this is called into question by the use of helicopters to net mule deer, the use of drones to locate mule deer for removal, as well as the use of detection dogs and air rifles.

The Project will restrict public access throughout the 10 year life of the Project. Mule deer will be shot with tranquilizer darts prior to being euthanized within the City of Avalon. While there are safety protocols in place, the Permit provides that "the Permittee will work collaboratively with Avalon city officials to adjust operations based on community concerns to the extent practicable." (Permit, pp. 10-11.) This is a vague and unenforceable measure. City residents have no guarantee on how operations will be conducted, which leads to a chilling effect on how they may wish to access public spaces should deer be present.

The Project will not result in long-term net benefits to climate resiliency, particularly regarding wildland fires. As noted by Los Angeles County Fire Chief Anthony Marrone, in correspondence dated January 7, 2026, complete removal of mule deer would increase chaparral fuel loads, increasing wildfire risk to developed areas – particularly the City of Avalon.

Accordingly, the City requests the Department reconsider the RMP, as well as rescind its Concurrence that the Project qualifies for the SERP under CEQA.

The Permit Should be Reconsidered or Amended Because it Conflicts with the City's Ordinances

Concurrently with some of the Conservancy's earlier attempts to obtain approval for eradicating the deer, City Council passed amendments to the Ordinance of the City of Avalon, Title 6, Chapter 6-1, Section 6-1.128 Animal Care of the Avalon Municipal Code ("Ordinance"). In particular, the City has determined that hunting, injuring, pursuing, killing, or trapping animals within the City represents a threat to public health and safety within the City, and that such activities would be inconsistent with the residential, recreational, and visitor-friendly nature of the City. In pertinent part, the Ordinance states:

> (e) No person shall hunt, pursue, kill, or trap any domesticated or wild animal in the City. Additionally, **even if a permit to hunt, pursue, kill, or trap animals is issued by a State**

> **or Federal Agency, such permit shall be subject to this Section 6-1.128 in order to protect public health, safety and welfare**. This prohibition on killing animals shall not apply to the removal or extermination of rats, mice, squirrels, stinging insects, or other vermin from private or public property. This section shall not apply to City of Avalon Code Enforcement personnel in the discharge of his/her duties.
>
> (f) No person shall feed, trap, or lure any wild animal located within the City **with the intent to hunt or kill such wild animal or with the intent to transport that wild animal out of the City to hunt or kill said animal**.
>
> (g) As used in this section, "hunt" means the killing or wounding of any animal by means of any poison, trap, fireworks, firearm, weapon, air gun, archery device, slingshot, spear, javelin, knife, paintball gun, or explosive of any type with the specific intent to frighten, injure, mutilate, or kill any animal, domesticated or wild.

(Emphasis added.)

The Permit directly states that it intends to violate subsections (e) and (f) of the Ordinance. For example, the Permit states that the Conservancy intends to "us[e] bait to attract mule deer and us[e] air rifles to shoot mule deer with tranquilizer darts to capture mule deer, followed by either surgical sterilization or euthanasia of mule deer." The Permit's limitation that the Conservancy cannot use a Shooting Device within the City "unless Permittee has obtained any applicable and legally required permit from the City of Avalon" does not prevent against the Permit's violation of subsection (f) of the Ordinance, which prohibits the contemplated "bait" approach within City limits. Thus, the Permit directly violates subsection (f) of the Ordinance because the Permit's limitation is not adequate and does not address the baiting element.

The Permit vaguely references it "will include … protocols for working within Avalon." (Permit at p. 9 of 35.)[4] But no such protocols are included in the Permit; and what is included in the Permit directly contradicts the City's Ordinance. The Ordinance is not preempted because it concerns the health and safety of City residents and the Permit does not demonstrate that the solutions therein are necessary.

The Department Has The Authority to Amend/Reconsider the Permit Because the Permit's Plan to Completely Eradicate Deer is Unnecessary and Unreasonable

The Permit here is a Restoration Management Permit, which began pilot programs just one year ago in January of 2025 pursuant to the Restoration Management Permit Act, Cal. Fish & Game Code, § *1670 et seq.*

This Department has the authority to issue permits, "subject to restrictions and regulations that the department determines are desirable, to take or possess, in any part of the state, for scientific, educational, or propagation purposes, mammals, birds … fish, amphibians, reptiles, or

[4] The Permit also states it "will include … protocols for night shooting" even though night-time hunting is prohibited under California law in other coastal areas similar to Catalina Island. (See, e.g., 14 C.C.R. § 263.)

any other form of plant or animal life." (Cal. Fish & Game Code, § 1002, subd. (a).) Here, there are numerous reasons why the Permit should be amended or reconsidered based on this authority, the common thread amongst all of those reasons is that complete eradication of the deer is unnecessary and unreasonable.

First, California law has unequivocally tasked this Department with maintaining sufficient populations and habitat for mule deer to provide for, inter alia: (1) their beneficial use and enjoyment by all citizens of the State; (2) their perpetuation for their intrinsic and ecological values, as well as for their direct benefits to all persons; and (3) their aesthetic, educational, and nonappropriative uses. (Cal. Fish & Game Code, § 1801, subds. (b), (c), and (d).) The granting of this Permit is a direct violation of the Department's obligations and duties towards the citizens of this State to protect and preserve deer for the enjoyment and benefit of all.

Second, the Conservancy fails to adequately address why individual hunting permits are not a viable alternative that can maintain and contribute to a healthy management of the island's deer population. Indeed, Department regulations clearly include Catalina Island as part of its typical hunting regulations which would permit hunting, but not eradicate all deer. (14 C.C.R. § 360(14). In fact, increasing the number of deer tags could be the answer. The Conservancy could also, in addition to increasing the tag allowance, expand the season or eliminate the requirement that hunters forfeit mainland tags. And yet, the Conservancy has declined to even try this more reasonable approach. In short, the Conservancy has not even tried to increase individual hunting permits, even though it has numerous tools at its disposal to do so in order to manage the island's deer population.

Third, the Conservancy's proposed methods for eliminating the deer are extremely aggressive , especially given the Conservancy's stated intent to hunt within the City's limits and directly adjacent to a thriving human population. Humane taking of animals requires a process that inflicts "the least possible degree of pain and suffering." (14 C.C.R., § 650, subd. (b)(9).) But the Permit itself understands that deer will be shot and "wounded," resulting in suffering and great pain to the animal.[5] (Permit at p. 9 of 35.) For example, the use of "aerial net capture" within City limits to capture deer will only lead to the deer struggling for their lives as hunters then try to carefully shoot the deer in a very specific location in the back of the skull. (See Permit at pp. 7-8 of 35.) Further, the use of "detection dogs" could lead to animal-on-animal altercations and. (Permit at p. 8 of 35.) Whether it is attempting to shoot a pinpoint target while the deer are in a frenetic and panicked melee, or whether it is attempting to shoot a deer who is engaging with a detection dog, the result is clear—any such shooting will surely cause substantial agony to the deer, and is not a peaceful "euthanasia." (*See id.*) Such shooting likewise is almost certain to result in the wounding of numerous deer before they can be finally killed.

Fourth, and on this point, shooting at such a large scale further presents an unreasonably high risk of death or injury to human beings, domesticated animals, and other wild animals on the island, such as the island's protected Catalina Fox and numerous protected bird, snake, shrew, and

[5] Not to mention that this Project also presents a great threat to the surrounding human population, as wounded deer can lash out and threaten the health and safety of those surrounding it during its convulsive death throes.

bat species. Nearly 4,000 people reside in the City and many have vociferously voiced their fears and apprehensions related to the Permit. The Department should not allow the Conservancy to fire any "Shooting Device"[6] consistently over the course of numerous years. That, too, appears to be in violation of California law. (Cal. Penal Code, § 246.3 [prohibiting "the willful discharge of a firearm in a grossly negligent manner which could result in injury or death to a person"].)

Fifth, the Conservancy fails to address other potential environmental risks associated with their proposed Permit. For example, the risk of igniting wildfire from rounds of "firearm" shooting (see footnote 6, below) are substantial. Such shooting could ignite nonnative grass species (which are highly flammable) and could result in wildfires similar to the tragic incident in Lahaina, Maui in 2023. There is further a risk that lead poisoning or other pollution of the waters and soils could result from the thousands of rounds that would be used to eradicate the thousands of deer currently inhabiting the island. Finally, it is unclear how the thousands of deer carcasses will be collected from across the island and adequately disposed of, presenting further health and safety concerns to residents and visitors to the island.

Both the Department and the Conservancy Haves Failed to Meaningfully Engage With the Public

The Permit requires that the Conservancy coordinate directly with City officials. (Permit at pp. 10-11 of 35.) Yet the Conservancy has failed to provide the City or the City's legal counsel with a copy of the Permit or Application prior to approval; failed to update the City or the City's legal counsel about the status of the Permit and Application prior to approval; and failed to coordinate or collaborate with the City in the drafting of the Application or Permit, **including the provisions that purport to specifically provide safety protocols for within City limits**. The Conservancy's strong-arm approach to force upon the City what is an unwanted and extremely unpopular Project should not be given the stamp of approval by this Department.

The Department itself is required to address conflicts in a clear and forthright manner, because "[i]t is the policy of the state to anticipate and resolve potential conflicts between the management, conservation, and protection of fish and wildlife resources and their habitat and private and public activities that may affect them. Accordingly, the Department may use such informal consultative procedures prior to taking any formal action as will assist in the achievement of this policy." (Cal. Fish & Game Code, § 1017, subds. (a) and (b).) The Department never engaged in such conflict resolution approaches with the Conservancy and the City. Rather, the Department elected to issue the Permit without consultation or input from the City prior to issuing the Permit. (*See id.* at subd. (e) ("As used in this section, "formal action" means … the issuance, suspension, or revocation of any permit, license, or other entitlement.")

[6] The Permit refers, at different times, to the use of "rifles," "guns," "firearms," "center-fire rifles," "rimfire rifles," and "air rifles." But the Permit otherwise lacks clarity as to whether the term "Shooting Device" could include, for example, semi-automatic weapons, AR-15s, or other forms of weaponry. This is cause for concern to the City and its residents.

Conclusion

The Conservancy's Permit violates California law and policy. The City submits this written protest of the Permit because, as set forth above: (1) no appropriate notice was provided to the City prior to the Department's determination that a CEQA exemption applies or prior to approval of the Permit; (2) the Permit's approval of deer eradication conflicts with applicable City ordinances; and (3) complete eradication of the deer is unnecessary and unreasonable, as reasonable alternatives should first be attempted and considered.

We are available to confer with the Department about this matter. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,



Scott Haskell Campbell
of BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

cc: Lauren Dennhardt, ldennhardt@catalinaconservancy.org
City of Avalon, City Council Members (via e-mail only)
David Maistros, City of Avalon, City Manager (via e-mail only)
Ann Marshall, City of Avalon, Mayor (via e-mail only)

EXHIBIT O

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FIRE DEPARTMENT

1320 NORTH EASTERN AVENUE
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90063-3294
(323) 881-2401
www.fire.lacounty.gov

ANTHONY C. MARRONE
FIRE CHIEF
FORESTER & FIRE WARDEN

"Proud Protectors of Life, the Environment, and Property"

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
HILDA L. SOLIS, CHAIR
FIRST DISTRICT
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
SECOND DISTRICT
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
THIRD DISTRICT
JANICE HAHN
FOURTH DISTRICT
KATHRYN BARGER
FIFTH DISTRICT

January 7, 2026

TO: THE HONORABLE JANICE HAHN
SUPERVISOR, FOURTH DISTRICT

FROM: ANTHONY C. MARRONE, FIRE CHIEF

MULE DEER MANAGEMENT ON CATALINA ISLAND

This memorandum outlines the key facts, operational considerations, and recommended course of action regarding mule deer management on Catalina Island, with a focus on ecosystem impacts, wildfire behavior, and fuels management.

Background

Mule deer are a non-native species on Catalina Island. Scientific research indicates that mule deer browsing can influence vegetation dynamics, particularly following disturbance events such as wildfire. Fire return intervals of less than seven years significantly increase the likelihood of vegetation type conversion from chaparral to grassland.

The most recent large wildfire on the island was the Island Fire in 2007. While grass fuels are considered more receptive to ignition and rapid spread, they generate a significantly lower Energy Release Component (ERC) than chaparral fuels and are generally more manageable during suppression operations.

Ecological Considerations

Catalina Island supports a unique ecosystem with native and endemic plant and animal species. In the island's natural condition, the island fox serves as the apex predator, preying on smaller native mammals. Removal of mule deer would reduce invasive plant seed dispersal and allow vegetation communities to trend toward native conditions. If mule deer are removed, the introduced bison would remain the only non-native large herbivore on the island.

However, mule deer browsing also impacts native vegetation. Highly palatable native species are preferentially consumed, potentially inhibiting regeneration and facilitating the spread of invasive plants. Without population control, deer numbers may increase, exacerbating vegetation type conversion following disturbance events.

Fire and Fuels Management Considerations

From a wildfire risk perspective, complete removal of mule deer presents operational concerns. In the absence of herbivory, chaparral fuel loads would increase, resulting in higher tons per acre and elevated ERC values. Fuel age classes exceeding 25 years are extremely difficult to manage during wildfire incidents and significantly increase suppression complexity.

Increased fuel loading would elevate wildfire risk to developed areas, particularly in Avalon and other locations where heavy fuels are present within 200 feet of structures. Conversely, maintaining a reduced mule deer population can provide a measurable reduction in understory vegetation and seedling establishment, moderating fuel continuity and, under certain conditions, improving firefighting effectiveness depending on weather, fuels, and topography.

Conclusion

Both ecological integrity and wildfire risk must be considered in mule deer management decisions. An actively managed population provides the most balanced approach, limiting long-term vegetation type conversion while helping moderate fuel loading in proximity to communities.

If mule deer are fully removed, additional long-term costs would be incurred to implement and maintain a comprehensive fuels management program, particularly adjacent to developed areas. Active population management represents a lower-cost alternative with measurable fire risk reduction benefits.

Recommendations

Based on these considerations, it is recommended that land managers determine an appropriate ecological balance through an actively managed mule deer population. Population regulation should focus on minimizing type conversion and long-term habitat

change, with particular emphasis on removing female does as the most effective population management strategy. If a decision is made to remove all mule deer from the island, a comprehensive fuels management program should be implemented, especially in areas adjacent to development and human occupancy.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (323) 881-6180.

ACM:es

c: Kyla Coates
Chloe Cheney-Rice

EXHIBIT P

Catalina Island Climate Resiliency & Restoration Strategy

Catalina Island ecological communities are no longer threatened with extinction and can thrive in the future.



Table of Contents

Authors and citations 3

Overview 4

Goal with Scientific Collections Permit 4

Introduction 4

Methods 5

Assessment of management strategies 5

Pre and post monitoring 5

Landscape-level restoration strategy 5

Strategy structure 7

Project 1. Landscape-level Restoration Plan 9

Project 2. Seed farm facility 14

Mission 14

Introduction 15

Goals and Deliverables 16161616

Infrastructure Plan and Options 16

Volunteer and Staff 19

Project 3. Deer Management 20

Project management 21

Teams 21

First 90 Days 22

Risk Management & Mitigation 23

Conclusion 24

Authors and citations

This report was constructed with the help of many individuals.

Here at the Catalina Island Conservancy, it includes Lauren Dennhardt, Emily Hamblen, Kevin Alison, Makenzie Henk, Cayman Lanzone, and Rachel Boyce. Outside of the Conservancy, we relied on Travis Brooks of Land IQ.

This draft was prepared by Lauren Dennhardt on December 28th, 2022.

Overview

Project objective/scope: Our overall objectives are to ensure that flora and fauna are no longer threatened with extinction, and to build resiliency into our ecological communities. The critical first steps to allow for these objectives is to manage the non-native mule deer population on the island and implement our landscape level restoration plan.

Project priorities:

1) Allow for restoration and recovery efforts to succeed on Catalina Island, so plants no longer need to be caged and we can implement landscape level restoration. Currently, all restoration efforts have to occur inside an exclosure or plants need to be individually caged. Much of the island is type converted into invasive annual grasses. On Catalina we could reverse this with invasive grass management paired with seeding, but while deer are still present, these efforts would be fruitless. This would result in more habitat for native fauna such as the Catalina Island shrew and the Catalina Island fox.

2) Ensure that flora and fauna are no longer threatened with extinction or extirpation. Deer target island endemic species, meaning that there are higher densities of deer resistant plants on the landscape. Deer target the plant species unique to Catalina Island, which creates an overrepresentation of common mainland species. Already 32 plant species have been extirpated from the island. This year we prevented the Catalina nightshade from going extinct.

3) Prevent further suffering of deer on Catalina Island (they are at 8x the density as they are on mainland). Deer are suffering on the island from starvation and thirst. Hunting does not work as a way of managing populations due to lack of interest and expense. Fawns are found dead frequently in the streets of Avalon. Deer encounters in town with people are common because of their desperation for food resources, which is problematic because it is likely more deer are born from human feeding, exacerbating the problem, along with habituating deer to humans – creating conflict and allowing for spread of zoonotic diseases. Management by hunting results in more animals being killed than complete removal of deer from the island.

Goal with Scientific Collections Permit

Introduction

Our goal is to restore the island to be more climate resilient and biodiverse. The critical event that needs to occur is to manage the deer population. The carrying capacity for deer on Catalina Island is zero since they are non-native species with documented detrimental effects on local flora. To achieve this goal, we need to assess all management options in collaboration with CDFW. Our goal is to choose a methodology that is humane, effective, and financially feasible.

Within this overall strategy, we plan to monitor how deer management impacts the Island's flora and fauna. Additionally, the biggest experimental piece is to begin major landscape-level restoration on Catalina Island.

Methods

Assessment of management strategies

Our plan is to reach out to experts on various management strategies and receive recommendations on the best overall methodology. We will use an Environmental Impact Statement to assess each option and open it up to public review. This method will be thorough and extensively managed to move the project forward.

Pre and post monitoring

The Catalina Island Conservancy has a long history of historical vegetation monitoring. For this project, we will go back to our Land Bird Monitoring Sites to collect data on land birds and vegetation. We have extensive data from surveys in 2001, 2002, and 2007. We will resurvey locations using the belt transect method in 2023-2028 to monitor 1) how has vegetation changed since the goat and pig efforts, and 2) to have a marker for pre and post deer management.

A total of 80 points scattered throughout the island will be resurveyed (Figure 1). They will include a bird survey, vegetation analysis via the belt-transect method, and photomonitoring.



Figure 1. Locations of Land Bird Monitoring on Catalina Island.

Landscape-level restoration strategy

After deer management, there will immediately need to be a plan for management on the island. We have hired Land IQ to help develop our management plan post-deer management. They will begin January 2023 and complete by June 2024. This plan will consider invasive species management, seed

bulking and processing, and strategies to convert invasive grasslands and degraded habitat into biodiverse locations. Details on that plan are outlined in Project one.

Strategy structure

To achieve these priorities, we at the Catalina Island Conservancy have determined there are three large projects that need to occur simultaneously 1) Construction of a landscape level restoration plan, 2) building a seed farm, and 3) management of deer.

These three projects together form our Catalina Island Climate Resiliency & Restoration Strategy (Fig. 2). The vast majority of all three will be completed by 2026. The overall strategy timeline can be found in Table 1.





Figure 2. Three projects that constitute the Catalina Island Climate Resiliency and Restoration Strategy.



Start	Finish	Deliverable
Jan-23	Jun-23	Existing Conditions Summary Report
Feb-23	Jan-24	Geodata for Restoration work
May-23	Mar-24	Landscape-scale Habitat Restoration Modeling Report
Apr-23	Jun-24	Landscape-scale Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Plan
Jun-24	Dec-24	Landscape Grant Development Support
Jan-25	Dec-25	Site Preparation
Jan-23	Jun-23	Seed Farm Assessment
Jul-23	Dec-23	Permitting, hire contractors, for seed farm
Jan-24	Dec-24	Build Seed Farm & collect seeds
Jan-25	Dec-25	Grow-out, and seeds processed
Jan-23	Apr-23	Restoration Internal Communications Strategy Developed
Apr-23	Jun-23	Restoration External Communications Strategy Developed
Mar-23	Jun-25	Monitoring island
Jul-23	Jun-24	Implementation of Communications Strategies
Feb-23	Jun-24	Restoration CEQA process
Jan-23	Dec-23	Logistic strategy for deer maanagement
Oct-24	Dec-25	Deer management

Table 1. Timeline for the three different projects within our Climate Resiliency and Restoration Strategy. The landscape-level restoration plan (orange), seed farm (blue), and deer management (yellow) with rough timelines. NOTE: Deer management will extend out into 2026.

Project 1. Landscape-level Restoration Plan

Author: Travis Brooks, Land IQ

At the request of the Catalina Island Conservancy (CIC), Land IQ has developed this proposal to support planning for landscape-scale habitat restoration and enhancement of Santa Catalina Island. After the end of cattle ranching in the 1950s and the removal of non-native ungulates (wild goats and pigs) in the 2000s, there was an expectation that rangeland would passively recover its pre-disturbance native habitat. While there are areas where native cover and diversity increased, there remain large parts of the Island that remain "stuck" due to the legacy effects of land use (e.g., cattle grazing, nonnative browsing, cultivation of soils, erosion of topsoil), changes to the natural fire frequency (e.g., increased fire frequency, more intense fires due to increased aridity), loss of the native seed bank over time, and the introduction of invasive Mediterranean forbs (e.g., nonnative annual grasses and mustards). Some of these factors remain and will be intensified under projections of climate change (e.g., increased summer maximum intensity, decreased winter precipitation). Not all areas on the Island remain "stuck" in type-converted or degraded habitat types. But, for many of those areas that did recover native vegetation, they are overrepresented by the "weedier" native shrubs that can quickly colonize disturbed soils (e.g., *Baccharis* spp. from large number of wind-blown seed), and are resistant or non-palatable to browsing pressure from nonnative deer that remain on the Island. There are plans to remove the deer from the Island and the habitat restoration planning will assume that the deer population has been significantly reduced soon. Some consider habitat that has naturally revegetated with deer-resistant native species as having been "invaded" and lower quality; we will consider the value of these revegetated areas against the likely historic vegetation communities and the requirements of the endemic, locally rare, and at-risk wildlife and rare plants that are key to the biodiversity of the Island.

In the context of accelerating impacts from changing climate and an ecosystem that has on-going and legacy impacts from nonnative species introductions, increased fire frequency, cattle grazing, road, and dam construction—what are strategies that CIC can use to restore and enhance the native and endemic biodiversity of the Island over large areas?

Land IQ in collaboration with UCLA Professor Travis Longcore, PhD, have developed this scope of work to develop spatial models to direct CIC habitat restoration and enhancement efforts in areas that balance the goal of restoring large areas of the Island with the mission of conserving endemic biodiversity. Next, we will prepare a Landscape-Scale Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Plan (HREP) to guide CIC planning and implementation of cost-effective restoration over large areas (100s to 1000s of acres) leveraging natural-rainfall and seed-based restoration methods. And last, we will collaborate with CIC staff to develop a project proposal for funding consideration to begin implementation of the Landscape-Scale HREP. We will work with the CIC Project Manager, Lauren Dennhardt, to integrate information from two other planning efforts that are currently in development, the nonnative deer managementproject, and the seed farm bulking project (in collaboration with Irvine Ranch Conservancy).

No.	Tasks and Subtasks	Start	End
1.00	**Task 1. Existing Data Review**	**1/9/23**	**2/6/23**

1.10	Kick-Off Meeting with CIC Staff (Request Datasets & Documents)	Proposed for week of Jan 9	
1.20	CIC Data Transfer to Land IQ		
1.30	Review Spatial Datasets		
1.40	Review Biological Reports		
1.50	Review Records of Past Land Management Activity		
2.00	**Task 2. Existing Conditions Summary Report**	**2/7/23**	**6/8/23**
2.10	Executive Summary		
2.20	Introduction		
2.30	Summarize Existing Available Data (Reviewed in Task 1): Spatial Datasets, Biological Occurrence Data, Ecological Information, Past Land Management Activity		
2.40	Maps: Make Field Maps to Verify in the Field (Task 7)		
2.50	Identify Current Threats to At Risk Biological Resources: Wildlife, Rare Plant, and Vegetation Community		
2.60	Identify Vegetation Communities Impacted (Type-Converted or Degraded) by Past Land Use Practices (livestock grazing, erosion from roads, dams altering hydrology, increased fire frequency and intensity) and Introduction of Nonnative Species (e.g., deer browsing pressure)		
2.70	Maps: Current Threats to Biological Resources x Current (and Historical Occurrences): Fire History, Rare Plant Locations, Vegetation Community Map, Future Change in Climatic Factors Compared to Normals		
2.80	Landscape-Scale Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Project Goals and Objectives		
2.90	Data Gaps and Modeling Needs (e.g., Veg Community Stability, Fire History)		
2.10	Environmental Modeling Datasets Required and Sources of Data (e.g., Past, Normals, Future Projection of Climate; Derive Topography Features from DEM; Wind Direction and Velocity; Salt Spray/Salinity; Cold Air Drainage; Indices; Processing Masks)		
2.11	Species Occurrence Datasets Required and Sources (Keystone Species of Veg Communities; Rare Plants and Wildlife that are Focus of Conservation Efforts)		
2.12	Analytical Methods, Scale of Analysis (e.g., Raster cell size), Modeling Tools/Programs		
2.13	***Deliverable: Draft Existing Conditions Summary Report to CIC for Review***		5/4/23

2.14	CIC Staff Feedback and Review	5/5/23	5/25/23
2.15	Finalize Existing Conditions Summary Report		
2.16	***Deliverable: Final Existing Conditions Summary Report***		6/8/23
3.00	**Task 3. Modeling**	**2/7/23**	**1/29/24**
3.10	Geodata Management and Pre-Processing		
3.20	Manual Digitization of Historical Maps		
3.30	Create Environmental and Species Occurrence Modeling Layers		
3.40	Vegetation Community (and At-Risk Wildlife Habitat?) Suitability Models		
3.50	Review Model Outputs with TL, TB, and Revise HSMs		
3.60	Potential Vegetation Community Map (Weighted Overlay Model: individual veg community x pioneer influence)		
3.70	Weed/Native Habitat Stability Analysis (Kevin Allison re-survey of early 2000s transect and releve sites in Spring 2023)		
3.80	Livestock Grazing Impact Modeling (Legacy Effects from Past Livestock; Different from Broader Impact of Nonnative Deer Browsing); Also Consider Modeling Impact from Road and Dam Construction on Erosion and Hydrology		
3.90	Prioritization Model and Mapping (e.g., Decision Tree Based on Level of Effort Needed to Restore)		
3.10	Preparation of Geodata for Delivery to CIC		
3.11	***Deliverable: Geodata Delivery to CIC***		1/29/24
4.00	**Task 4. Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Opportunities Modeling Report**	**5/16/23**	**3/4/24**
4.10	Introduction and Methods Sections		
4.20	Maps: Existing Environmental Conditions and Occurrence Data for Key Taxa Groups, and Species of Conservation Focus		
4.30	Maps: Veg Community Suitability Maps and Weighted Composite Veg Suitability Map		
4.40	Maps: Stability Analysis Maps		
4.50	Maps: Livestock Grazing Impact Map		
4.60	Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Priorities		
4.70	State-Transition Models for Key Vegetation Communities Targeted for Habitat Restoration (i.e., identify key mechanisms for restoring native habitat)		
4.80	Priority Maps: Areas Likely to Passively Recover with Removal of Nonnative Browsers		
4.90	Priority Maps: Areas that Require Active Intervention to Restore or Enhance Native Habitat		

4.10	Priority Maps: Existing Habitat for Key SpeciesOpportunities to Restore, Enhance or Create (if Necessary)		
4.11	Results and Discussion Sections		
4.12	***Deliverable: Draft Modeling Report to CIC for Review***		1/29/24
4.13	CIC Staff Feedback and Review	1/30/24	2/19/24
4.14	Finalize Report		
4.15	***Deliverable: Final Modeling Report***		3/4/24
5.00	**Task 5. Landscape-Scale Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Plan (HREP)**	**4/11/23**	**6/27/24**
5.10	Executive Summary		
5.20	Introduction		
5.30	Goals and Objectives		
5.40	Conceptual Approach		
5.50	Opportunities and Constraints		
5.60	Priorities		
5.70	Weed Management		
5.80	Native Plant Material Addition		
5.90	On-Going Management (including High-Priority Invasive Plant Control)		
5.10	Implementation Challenges and Needs for Future Research		
5.11	***Deliverable: Draft HREP to CIC for Review***		6/3/24
5.12	CIC Staff Feedback and Review	6/4/24	6/24/24
5.13	Finalize Report		
5.14	***Deliverable: Final HREP***		6/27/24
6.00	**Task 6. HREP Implementation Grant Development Support**	**6/28/24**	**12/26/24**
6.10	Professional Services to Support CIC Develop Project Material for Grant Support to Begin Implementation of the HREP		
7.00	**Task 7. Catalina Island Field Work**	**2/21/23**	**5/17/24**
7.10	Field Vegetation Map and Modeling Assessment #1 (Feb 2023; NN) (4 days)	Week of Feb 27 or March 6	
7.20	Interview Staff Regarding Existing Habitat Restoration Operations and Facilities (Feb 2023; TB) (4 days)	Week of Feb 27 or March 6	
7.30	Botanical Collective Rare Plant Meeting (March) (3 days)	3/17/22	3/19/22
7.40	Field Vegetation Map and Modeling Assessment #2 (April 2023) (4 days)	4/17/23	4/20/23
7.50	Field Investigation and Staff Interviews (May 2023)	5/15/23	5/18/23

7.60	HREP Plan Development Staff Visit and Discussions (May 2024)	5/15/24	5/17/24
8.00	**Task 8. Direct Expenses**	**1/9/23**	**12/26/24**

Table 2. Key strategy and objectives developed by Land IQ.

Project 2. Seed farm facility

Authors: Rachel Boyce, Plant Lead Tech; Cayman Lanzone, Conservation Horticulturist; Kevin Alison, Rare Plant Ecologist; Lauren Dennhardt, Ph.D. Director of Conservation

Mission

Produce a reliable source of locally adapted seed for landscape-scale restoration.









Introduction

Our team consulted with Matthew Garrambone and Sunny Saroa from the Irvine Ranch Conservancy to determine a plan for a Native Seed Farm on Catalina Island. This native seed farm will provide plant material to facilitate climate resilience, mitigation, biodiversity, and landscape-scale restoration. As a restoration seed bulking facility (RSBF), the farm is a critical tool to achieve large-scale ecological restoration goals, particularly where the wild harvest is unsustainable. The farm will help protect key biodiversity assets from harvest pressures and provide novel opportunities for research, public exposure, volunteer opportunities, and community building focused on Catalina's native flora.
Large-scale ecological restoration projects demand plant reintroduction and copious quantities of native plant seeds to adequately meet restoration goals. Our current restoration activities make use of seeds harvested from wild populations sourced on Catalina. However, are limited by current field collection and production capacity. This plan aims to minimize pressures on wild populations while ensuring the genetic diversity representative of natural populations is maintained. Considering our circumstances as an island with understudied flora and fauna species morphologically and genetically unique compared to mainland taxa, we want to continue using local provenance seeds and maintain our current gene pools. Outsourcing the production of genetically diverse, Catalina-derived seeds would be an expensive endeavor. Therefore, establishing the capacity to do so on the island would be a valuable investment while maintaining biosecurity control. Our recent visit to the Irvine Ranch Conservancy provided insight into why we should move towards seed bulking and production on the island. Other seed production facilities rarely have large quantities of seed on hand and do not focus their efforts on rare plants. Specialty bulking is on contract and costs $16,000/acre/year at a minimum. Bulking seeds in-house would allow more control over genetic sources, diversity, and selection.

Wild harvesting alone combined with the nursery's current output will not meet our landscape-scale restoration needs. Many of our rare and vulnerable species have dwindling numbers (i.e., Catalina Grass, Lyon's Pygmydaisy) and we cannot risk overharvesting from source populations. These plants have proven difficult to access and survey, having been pushed to the outskirts of the island where browsers cannot reach them. In addition, the number of seeds wild plants produce year to year is highly variable. Therefore, the seed farm would allow us to increase rare plant populations by seed with minimal impact to current wild populations. Currently, our nursery focuses on perennial woody plants and forbs propagation. However, the seed farm would allow us to expand conservation efforts to include perennial grasses and annuals, which are especially challenging to gather seed from in the wild.
We anticipate growing pains during our transition to island-wide restoration efforts. Future demand would exceed the volume of native seeds that we can, economically, and ethically produce. A seed bulking facility could alleviate native plant accessibility issues, provide an efficient space to grow large numbers of rare annuals, and provide a reliable source of seeds. A seed bulking facility would also increase production output by approximately 50% compared to wild collections.

Most actions for this project will be completed in four years with ongoing maintenance extended beyond that timeline. The project will require both internal and external support to complete. This is a living document, as we move forward with this project some of the specifics of the plan may be altered to adapt to stochastic factors (unavailable supplies, labor shortages, new knowledge, etc.). The point of this document is to prepare all members of the Conservation staff for our goals moving forward.

Goals and Deliverables

1. *Create an infrastructure plan.*
    - Create a blueprint/site map for facilities
    - Create a timeline for development
    - Permitting
    - Equipment list
    - Approval by the organization
    - Budget
    - Irrigation plan
    - Identify existing infrastructure
2. *Seek and collect seeds.*
    - Develop a list of species and target amounts needed for the farm (from landscape level restoration plan)
    - Develop and update BMPs and standards for seed collection and processing
    - Map populations and areas to collect from
    - Integrate with the Volunteer program
3. *Build Facilities*
    - Get quotes and select contractors
    - Prepare sites
    - Build and update infrastructure
4. *Establish and maintain bulking fields.*
    - Install an irrigation system
    - Weed management/site prep
    - Layout for target species
    - Determine seeding treatment and rates
    - Seeding
    - Planting
    - Weed maintenance
    - Determine the best harvest method
5. *Establish and maintain an inventory system.*
    - Determine the best methodology for tracking seeds
    - Seed testing protocol and system for both rare and common species
    - Refining field to end product tracking
6. *Integrate the facility with our restoration plan.*
    - Choose seeds and integrate systems

Infrastructure Plan and Options

Dog Park

The dog park site would be an ideal location for a bulking field because there is already fencing in place, it would just need some weed management to set it in motion. It is open and sunny, which is ideal for seed drying. It is surrounded by open space, so it would be easily expandable. We could also build a pole barn here for seed processing and storage. Its primary use would be for growing common annual and perennial plants. It would allow for large-volume and large-scale production.





Old Nursery

The old nursery site has a solid foundation of existing infrastructure and is compact in each zone. However, it is home to a few large, rare trees that cannot be removed, so it is a very shaded area. It already has a Conex box that should be reutilized for storing supplies and equipment. This site could be used for processing and drying seeds. It could also be used for starter beds to grow first-generation common plants and second-generation rare plants.







Ackerman Native Plant Nursery

The grow-out area of the Ackerman Native Plant Nursery could be utilized for seed production. It already has irrigation installed and all the infrastructure necessary. We could install raised beds and use this area to grow rare plants. The level of control this site would provide would allow us to easily track the genetics of rare plants.





Volunteer and Staff

Project Management

Management of this project will include planning, species selection, budgeting, inventory analysis, selecting and hiring contractors, prioritization, and data management.

Maintenance and Processing

Maintenance will be the most expensive part of this project. We can hire contractors and use our staff for weed maintenance and irrigation maintenance. Staff and volunteers will handle seed processing.

Seed Production

Seed production will generally include seeding, planting, weed maintenance, irrigation maintenance, harvesting, processing, inventory, weighing, bagging, and dormancy breaking if necessary. Storage and harvest management will be very important. We will also need labor supervision and a field crew.





Project 3. Deer Management

Author: Lauren Dennhardt, PhD

Project structure narrative:

This is a highly complex project – it is a multi-million-dollar project, involves the entire organization, outside stakeholders, and the requirements of the project are undefined. It will change and alter as we learn new information and legal pathways forward. It will rely on technology in some cases that have been proven (helicopter, infrared cameras) and other times unproven (large-scale sterilization). Deer are charismatic and ensuring the public and politicians understand the complexity of the issue and what is at stake is important. We have already learned that deer hunting is an expensive and unsustainable model with reduced interest every year. Our challenge will be to ensure we build the public relations and legal capacity within and outside our organization to handle and adapt to the project. Currently, we have almost found a framework to move forward within current game management and CA legality.

Components of Work Breakdown Structure in project:

A work breakdown structure outlines the key components of the deer management project along with key deliverables.

- Develop/implement a public relations strategy
    - Hire a public relations firm
    - Train staff on public relations
    - Develop a plan for outreach to different stakeholders
    - Reach out to key stakeholders and influencers
- Complete CEQA process
    - Organize and deliver scientific literature on project
    - Talk to experts and hire some to deliver management plans
    - Work closely with CDFW's lawyer to organize and deliver information to the state
    - Develop all possible management outcomes and use structured decision making to choose the best options
    - Wait for public comment period
- Complete logistics plan and implement it
    - Housing for personnel
    - Compensation and funding
    - Helicopter logistics
- Monitor changes to floral and faunal communities
    - Establish long-term vegetation and wildlife monitoring plots
    - Complete monitoring before and after management
- Create a landscape-level restoration plan
    - Hire contractors to develop the plan
    - Have it completed before deer management is executed to apply for a $5 million Wildlife Conservation Board grant, funding conservation department in the future
- Implement management plan
    - Pick a contractor and complete the chosen plan

Project management

The best management strategy for this highly complex project is to use the Agile Scrum Methodology. This methodology promotes collaboration and agile thinking by developing multiple small teams with a specific goal. Each team consists of 3-5 members that can easily be organized and adapt as the project evolves. It requires a strong leader to communicate between teams and keep the project on track for successful completion.

Teams

- Teams for deer project (NOTE: Lauren Dennhardt will facilitate and communicate all information between groups).
    - Political Team –
        - Goal: Navigate politics outside of Conservancy, identify risks before they emerge, ensure everything is OK in Sacramento.
        - Team: Kim Delfino (Lobbyist, Founder of Earth Advocacy), Brendan Cummings (Director of Conservation, Center for Biological Diversity), Hallie Kutak (Staff Attorney, Center for Biological Diversity), & Debbie Sivas (Director of Environmental & Natural Resources Law and Policy Program).
    - Public Relations & Communication Team –
        - Goal: Keep consistent communication inside the organization, provide strategy for City of Avalon, provide strategy for inside Conservancy, identify key stakeholders to engage → move neutrals to positives; negatives to neutrals; develop & implement external communications strategy
        - Team: Hillary Holt (Community Learning Manager), Gina Nelson (Senior Manager, Membership & Growth Marketing), , Chris Young, Jes Boudevin, and Kim Sudhalter & Howard (La Brea Public Relations Firm).
    - Logistics Team –
        - Goal: Determine best management strategy, identify alternative management strategies, solve logistics – locations for helicopter, communication, housing, fueling, and overcoming hurdles.
        - Team: John Knapp (Senior Island Scientist, The Nature Conservancy), Chris Young (Senior Operations Manager, Conservancy), Tim Kielpinski (Chief Operating Officer), and White Buffalo Team.
    - Legal Team –
        - Goal: Prepare for potential lawsuits and mitigate ones as they inevitably appear
        - Team: Need to have a lawyer on retainer – identify a good option in conjunction with Jill Corral (CFO), Tony Michaels (Benefactor member), and Victoria Seaver (Board member).
    - Restoration Team –
        - Goal: Prepare a plan for post-deer Catalina, how to move “stuck” ecosystems. Plan for post-deer management future.
        - Team: Emily Hamblen (Senior Wildlife Biologist), plant conservation manager, Travis Brooks (Land IQ), Travis Longcore (Adjunct professor, UCLA Institute of the Environment and Sustainability), Daniel Wehner (GIS program manager).
    - Science Team –

- Goal: Prepare documents to support CEQA process and provide feedback on key aspects of logistics.
- Team: Emily Hamblen (Senior Wildlife Biologist), Kevin Alison (Rare Plant Ecologist), plant conservation manager, and Makenzie Henk (Wildlife Biologist)

First 90 Days

January

- Form & solidify teams for deer project
- Collect support letters for deer project
- Go to Sacramento to meet Valerie Termini with Tony Michaels & Kim Delfino – our main contact at CDFW for the duration of project; ensure that CDFW is comfortable moving forward – present deer plan
- Complete stakeholder map and begin building out a communications strategy, including a guide on discussing project for CIC staff
- Complete plans for Islands of California Botanical Collaborative meeting on Catalina, will use as leverage for comms strategy
- Have rare plant ecologist determine locations for pre-vegetation surveys in conjunction with wildlife team to capture fauna.

February

- Bring Kim Delfino to island to train Conservation, Development, and Education teams on handling difficult questions on deer
- Have one-on-one conversations with CIC staff on deer project and why it's important.
- Develop plan for community outreach – develop map of key people to reach out to about deer and determine who has those conversations.
- Begin biweekly meetings with senior wildlife biologist, plant conservation manager, GIS manager, and director of conservation operations. Keep open communication with team, determine path forward on Environmental Impact Review. NOTE: this will take a lot of team effort
- Conservation team begins monitoring locations for pre-deer management.

March

- Begin conversations with people of Avalon individually – only those who are key community members
- Begin mapping out logistics of deer management plan – helicopter, personnel, fundraising, etc. Put it all on people's radar.
- Hire lawyer on retainer for the Conservancy with help of senior leadership
- Develop external communications plan with deer communications team.
- Host the ICBC meeting, use it as leverage for communicating the deer issue.

Risk Management & Mitigation

Mitigating risk will be critical for project completion. Although we are unable to foresee all risk, there are some important aspects below that we will need to address before they occur. I have used a failure mode and effects analysis to outline some of the likely risks we will encounter in this project and given them both an unmitigated and mitigated score (Table 1). These will further be developed and refined by our teams.

	Event / Risk	Unmitigated Likelihood	Unmitigated Impact	Unmitigated Risk Score	Mitigating Action Plan	Mitigated Likelihood	Mitigated Impact	Mitigated Risk Score
		1 (very low) to 10 (very high)	1 (very low) to 10 (very high)			1 (very low) to 10 (very high)	1 (very low) to 10 (very high)	
1	Sabotage within organization	5	5	**25**	Communicate with staff members early in process	2	2	**4**
2	Divisive portrayal of project in media	10	7	**70**	Get ahead of bad portrayal through a PR strategy	10	1	**10**
3	Protests in town	5	2	**10**	Communication with community members	3	1	**3**
4	Staff turnover	7	3	**28**	Build redundancy into process	7	1	**7**
5	Lawsuits	10	10	**100**	Complete CEQA process	10	5	**50**
6	Sabotage on island during management	6	2	**12**	Put operations in inaccessible part of island	1	2	**2**
7	Threats to staff	8	5	**40**	Communicate with staff and community members, prepare action plan	7	4	**28**

Table 1. Unmitigated and mitigated risks associated with deer management project along with scores.

Risk Response Development (RRD) and Response Control (RC)

Initial risk response development and risk response control will be further developed by a team in mid-late 2023.

- Sabotage within organization

-RRD: Address sabotage directly with staff members and human resources. Start a dialogue with their concerns and address it directly.
-RC: Try to contain sabotage and address underlying issue.

- Divisive portrayal of project in media
  -RRD: Go to various media sources, ask them to come to island to learn more and see ecological damage of deer.
  -RC: See if there is a waterfall effect from first story and go to other media outlets to contain story.
- Protests in town
  -RRD: No initial action, do not engage protestors in the moment.
  -RC: Note key people in protest and engage with them one-on-one to see if there is room for discussion.
- Staff turnover
  -RRD: In the short term, handle staff turnover with redundancy built into the system.
  -RC: Quickly replace that person.
- Lawsuits
  -RRD: Use CEQA document to quickly move lawsuits through courts. Have lobbyist make phone calls to move process forward.
  -RC: Discuss with lawyers what potential lawsuits may occur and develop a more informed action plan.
- Sabotage on island during management
  -RRD: Quickly fix or replace whatever was broken or damaged.
  -RC: Find a way to prevent damage in the future through better security or other risk management.
- Threats to staff members
  -RRD: Tell local authorities, bring staff member to HR, and ensure staff member feels safe.
  -RC: Work with community members to reduce threats to staff members, figure out how to make staff member feel safe with mitigation measures.

Conclusion

This project will be the most important conservation action taken by the Conservancy in decades and will require endurance, steadfastness, and strong project management skills. Once this project is complete it will allow for recovery of rare and endemic plant species, revegetation of the landscape, and ecosystems that can support our unique fauna. It is the greatest opportunity we have as an organization to make our mark at preserving biodiversity and relaunching Catalina as a model for landscape-level restoration on islands.

Our strategy is ambitious because Catalina is a unique resource that needs to be properly managed. Catalina is home to over 60 endemic species and largely represents what California looked like pre-European influence with the ability to be accessed from the most populous County in the United States. Our conservation strategy is to push “stuck” ecosystems into a more resilient and biodiverse state. With the efforts of many key stakeholders this can be achieved and used as a model for island restoration globally.

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I, Laura Fera, am employed in the City of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, California. I am over the age eighteen (18) years and am not a party to the within action. My business address is 180 East Ocean Boulevard, Suite 200, Long Beach, California 90802.

On May 27, 2026, I served the foregoing document(s) described as

DECLARATION OF SEAN A. BRADY WITH EXHIBITS K-P IN SUPPORT OF VERIFIED FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT & PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE OR OTHER APPROPRIATE RELIEF

on the interested parties in this action by placing
[ ] the original
[X] a true and correct copy
thereof by the following means, addressed as follows:

Evan Eickmeyer
evan.eickmeyer@doj.ca.gov
Eric Katz
eric.katz@doj.ca.gov
James C. Crowder
james.crowder@doj.ca.gov
Benjamin P. Lempert
benjamin.lempert@doj.ca.gov
Deputy Attorneys General
1300 I Street, Suite 125
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attorneys for Respondent California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Edward T. Schexnayder
schexnayder@smwlaw.com
Orran Balagopalan
obalagopalan@smwlaw.com
Emma Lewis
elewis@smwlaw.com
Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP
550 California Street, Suite 1200
San Francisco, CA 94104
Attorneys for Real Party in Interest Catalina Island Conservancy

Scott Campbell
Scott.campbell@bbklaw.com
Amanda Daams
Amanda.Daams@bbklaw.com
Best Best & Krieger LLP
300 South Grand Ave., 25th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Attorneys for Responsible Party City of Avalon

Rory LoAllen
County of Los Angeles
Office of the County Counsel
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street #648
Los Angeles, CA 90012
rallen@counsel.lacounty.gov
Attorneys for Responsible Party County of Los Angeles

☐ (BY MAIL) As follows: I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under the practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Long Beach, California, in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing an affidavit.

☒ (BY ELECTRONIC MAIL) As follows: I served a true and correct copy by electronic transmission pursuant to CCP 1010.6. Said transmission was reported and completed without error.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed May 27, 2026, at Long Beach, California.



Laura Fera