

Response to Comment Letter P-2

Response to Comment P-2-1

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) assumes the commenter is referring to the fine paid related to the mountain lion shootings at Tejon Ranch in 2011. Please refer to Response to Comment P-6-13 for a discussion of the Service's consideration of this situation.

Response to Comment P-2-2

Please refer to Response to Comment P-2-1.

Response to Comment P-2-3

It is unclear to what increase the commenter is referring. The Tehachapi Uplands Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (TU MSHCP) provides a variety of monitoring commitments specific to California condors, including monitoring of areas used by humans for microtrash; enforcement of the ranchwide ban on lead ammunition; and monitoring of the Condor Study Area by the Tejon Ranch staff biologist to ensure that allowed uses do not compromise the conservation value of the Covered Lands for the California condor, among others. These measures are summarized in Table 2-3 in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and Chapter 4, California Condor, in the TU MSHCP. Moreover, Tejon Ranchcorp (TRC) has committed to provide funding for installing additional global positioning system (GPS) satellite tracking transmitters on condors to allow for continuous, real-time monitoring of wild, free-flying condors currently not carrying such transmitters. Specifically, \$156,000 will be provided to purchase GPS transmitters prior to the issuance of any grading permits affecting suitable condor foraging or roosting habitat. An additional \$26,000 will be provided to assist in funding operations, maintenance, and/or replacement every year afterward for a total of 10 years. This system will enable the immediate location of birds that are not moving relative to the ground, which usually indicates that an injury or illness has occurred. The prompt retrieval of injured or sick birds will allow for the rapid implementation of appropriate medical care or rehabilitation, actions that have saved the life of several condors in the past.

Response to Comment P-2-4

As described in the Supplemental Draft EIS, the California condor has been the focus of an intense recovery program to restore healthy populations to the wild. Between late 1985 and 1987, the Service and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) captured the remaining free-flying California condors to conduct a managed breeding program to stabilize and increase the population. Captive rearing was determined to be necessary to increase the stock of remaining California condors and to maximize genetic diversity among the population. The first two releases of captive-bred California condors took place in the Sespe-Piru California condor critical habitat unit in 1992. Soon after, captive-reared condors were also released into the species' historical range near

the Grand Canyon of Arizona as an experimental nonessential population. By 1998, there were over 50 California condors in the wild.

At the time of the approval of the Tejon Ranch Conservation and Land Use Agreement in June 2008, the number of condors in the wild in California totaled approximately 75, 30 of which occurred in southern California and could potentially utilize Tejon Ranch. As of May 31, 2011, there were 416 California condors in the world population, including 180 in captivity and 236 in the wild (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2012). The wild population includes 113 in central and southern California, of which approximately 40 currently inhabit southern California and have the potential to visit Tejon Ranch. Due to a combination of captive breeding and release and wild nest reproduction, this population is steadily increasing and is expected to continue to increase, barring stochastic catastrophes (Grantham 2007). However, mortality in the wild, primarily as a result of lead poisoning, is currently exceeding natural reproduction (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service unpublished data; Finkelstein et al. 2012), requiring ongoing captive breeding and release to supplement the wild population.

Marcotte, Kimberley

From: Roger_Root@fws.gov
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2012 4:53 PM
To: Zohn, April
Cc: Marcotte, Kimberley
Subject: Fw: TEJON MULTISPECIES DRAFTS

----- Forwarded by Roger Root/VFWO/R1/FWS/DOI on 02/21/2012 04:53 PM -----

Mary Ann Lockhart [REDACTED]

To: fw8tumshcp@fws.gov
cc:
Subject: TEJON MULTISPECIES DRAFTS

02/13/2012 09:45 AM

QUESTIONS FROM MARY ANN LOCKHART, PINE MOUNTAIN CLUB CONCERNING TEJON
MULTIPECIES , ETC

- P-2-1 | 1. Does the situation for which Tejon Corporation was fined in any way change the latest proposed multispecies plan? Will the Ranch be required to do more to protect the Condors? Will they be required to pay for more monitoring by your agency? Will fines be increased?
- P-2-2 | 2. Will the permit to build Tejon Mountain Village be denied because of their "bad behavior?" about the lions?
- P-2-3 | 3. Did TEjon provide the pledged- for- increase of condor monitoring ? Has there been any difference recorded between the number of condors and their locations on the ranch land from the time
- P-2-4 | of the agreement with environmental groups with the ranch to the present day?

Thank you for your attention to these questions.

Most sincerely..

Mary Ann Lockhart
[REDACTED]

