

Appendix E

Focal Species Impact/Mitigation Scoring Sheets

Appendix E. Focal Species Impact/Mitigation Scoring Sheets

Table E-1. Impact/Mitigation Scoring for vernal pool fairy shrimp in the EACCS study area.

Vernal pool fairy shrimp	5	4	3	2	1	0	Score
Closest suitable vernal pool habitat to impact/mitigation area	On-site	Within 250 feet	Greater than 250 feet but hydrologically connected	--	--	Greater than 250-feet and not hydrologically connected	
Aquatic land covers impacted/mitigated	Vernal pools	Other aquatic features that can support species	--	--	--	All others; none	
Upland land covers impacted/mitigated	Grassland	Oak woodland, Rural residential, ruderal	--	--		All others; none	
Does project effect/protect hydrology in the watershed in a way that would degrade/improve vernal pool habitats downstream	Yes					No	
Inside Altamont Hills Core Area identified in Vernal Pool Recovery Plan	Yes					No	
Inside designated Critical Habitat	Yes	--	--	--	--	No	
On parcels with an approved management plan for this species.	Yes	--	--	--	No	--	
Total Score							
<p>Note: The ratio of mitigation to impact depends on the location of the mitigation. The acres of mitigation for a given project would be determined using the ratios shown in Table 3-4. Habitat quality of the impact site would be scored using this table and the habitat quality of a mitigation site would need to meet or exceed that value.</p>							

Appendix E. Continued

Table E-2. Impact/Mitigation Scoring for longhorn fairy shrimp in the EACCS study area.

Longhorn fairy shrimp	5	4	3	2	1	0	Score
Closest suitable vernal pool/sandstone pool habitat to impact/ mitigation area	On-site	Within 250 feet	-- Greater than 250 feet but hydrologically connected	--	--	Greater than 250-feet and not hydrologically connected	
Aquatic land covers impacted/ mitigated	Sandstone pools	Vernal pools	Other aquatic features that can support species	--	--	All others; none	
Upland land covers impacted/ mitigated	Grassland	Oak woodland, Rural residential, ruderal	--	--		All others; none	
Does project effect/protect hydrology in the watershed in a way that would degrade/improve vernal pool habitats downstream	Yes					No	
Inside Altamont Hills Core Area identified in Vernal Pool Recovery Plan	Yes					No	
Inside designated Critical Habitat	Yes	--	--	--	--	No	
On parcels with an approved management plan for this species.	Yes	--	--	--	No	--	
Total Score							
<p>Note: The ratio of mitigation to impact depends on the location of the mitigation. The acres of mitigation for a given project would be determined using the ratios shown in Table 3-5. Habitat quality of the impact site would be scored using this table and the habitat quality of a mitigation site would need to meet or exceed that value.</p>							

Appendix E. Continued

Table E-3. Impact/Mitigation Scoring for Callippe silverspot butterfly in the EACCS study area.

Callippe silverspot butterfly	5	4	3	2	1	0	Score
Impact/ Mitigation occurs in:	CZ1/CZ8/CZ11/ CZ12/CZ14/CZ 15/CZ16	--	--	--	--	All others	
Presence of host/nectar plants	On-site	Within 0.25- mile of site	>0.25-mile but <0.5-mile	--	--	> 0.5-mile	
Land covers impacted/ mitigated	--	--	Grassland	Oak woodland	--	All others	
On parcels with an approved management plan for this species.	Yes	--	--	--	No	--	
Total Score							
Note: The ratio of mitigation to impact depends on the location of the mitigation. The acres of mitigation for a given project would be determined using the ratios shown in Table 3-6. Habitat quality of the impact site and the mitigation site would be scored using this table.							

Appendix E. Continued

Table E-4. Impact/Mitigation Scoring for California tiger salamander in the EACCS study area.

California tiger salamander	5	4	3	2	1	0	Score
Closest suitable breeding habitat to site	On-site	Within 500 feet	Between 501 – 1,600 feet	Between 1,601 –2,050 feet	Between 2051–6,900 feet	Greater than 6,900 feet	
Is there occupied habitat within 6,900 feet of site?	Yes	--	--	No	--	--	
Aquatic land covers impacted/mitigated	Wetland, Ponds	--	Stream/River	--	--	All others; none	
Upland land covers impacted/mitigated	Grassland, Oak woodland, Rural residential	Chaparral/ Scrub	Riparian	Conifer woodland	ruderal without refugia habitat	All others; none	
Elevation	Below 3,700 feet	--	--	--	--	Above 3,700 feet	
Presence of ground squirrels/pocket gophers	On site	Within 1,350 feet of site	Between >1,351 but <2,650 feet	Between >2,651 bu <5,300 feet	Between >5,301 but <7,900 feet	> 7,901 feet from site	
Presence of bullfrogs or non-native fish in aquatic resources on site	No	--	Low number; not all aquatic habitats occupied	--	Yes, occurring in high numbers	--	
Create a new barrier between breeding and upland habitat	Documented breeding location	--	Potential breeding location	--	--	No	
Protect linkage between breeding and upland habitat	Documented breeding location	--	Potential breeding location	--	--	No	
Inside designated Critical Habitat	Yes	--	--	--	--	No	
On parcels with an approved management plan for this species.	Yes	--	--	--	No	--	
Total Score							
<p>Note: The ratio of mitigation to impact depends on the location of the mitigation. The acres of mitigation for a given project would be determined using the ratios shown in Table 3-8. Habitat quality of the impact site and the mitigation site would be scored using this table.</p>							

Appendix E. Continued

Table E-5. Impact/Mitigation Scoring for California red-legged frog in the EACCS study area.

California red-legged frog	5	4	3	2	1	0	Score
Closest suitable breeding habitat to site	On-site	< 1-mile	>1-mile but < 2-miles	--	--	Greater than 2-miles	
Is there occupied habitat within 2-miles of site?	Yes	--	--	No	--	--	
Aquatic land covers impacted/mitigated	Wetland, Ponds, Stream/River	--	--	--	--	All others; none	
Upland land covers impacted/mitigated	Riparian, Grassland, Oak woodland, Rural residential	Chaparral/ Scrub	Conifer woodland	Cultivated ag, ruderal	--	All others; none	
Elevation	Below 3,500 feet	--	--	--	--	Above 3,500 feet	
Presence of ground squirrels or other burrowing mammals	On site	< 0.25-mile of site	> 0.25 but ≤ 0.5 miles	> 0.5 but ≤ 1.0 miles	> 1.0 but ≤ 1.5 miles	> 1.5 miles	
Presence of bullfrogs or non-native fish in aquatic resources on site	No	--	Low numbers and not all aquatic habitats are occupied	--	Yes, occurring in high numbers	--	
Create a new barrier between breeding and upland habitat	Documented breeding location	--	Potential breeding location	--	--	No	
Protect linkage between breeding and upland habitat	Documented breeding location	--	Potential breeding location	--	--	No	
Inside East San Francisco Bay core recovery area	Yes					No	
Inside designated Critical Habitat	Yes	--	--	--	--	No	
On parcels with an approved management plan for this species.	Yes	--	--	--	No	--	
Total Score							
<p>Note: The ratio of mitigation to impact depends on the location of the mitigation. The acres of mitigation for a given project would be determined using the ratios shown in Table 3-7. Habitat quality of the impact site and the mitigation site would be scored using this table.</p>							

Appendix E. Continued

Table E-6. Impact/Mitigation Scoring for foothill yellow-legged frog in the EACCS study area.

Foothill yellow-legged frog	5	4	3	2	1	0	Score
Last documented occurrence within the Conservation Zone	Within one year	1-3 yrs	4-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Greater than 25 yrs, never	
Land covers impacted/mitigated	Perennial stream with riparian corridor	Perennial stream with limited riparian corridor	Ephemeral stream	--	--	All others	
Substrate of stream bottom	Rocky, cobble	--	--	Clay, muddy	Sandy	Other	
Presence of reservoir upstream of site	No	--	Yes	--	--	--	
On parcels with an approved management plan for this species.	Yes	--	--	--	No	--	
Total Score							
Note: The ratio of mitigation to impact depends on the location of the mitigation. The acres of mitigation for a given project would be determined using the ratios shown in Table 3-10. Habitat quality of the impact site and the mitigation site would be scored using this table.							

Appendix E. Continued

Table E-7. Impact/Mitigation Scoring for Alameda whipsnake in the EACCS study area.

Alameda whipsnake	5	4	3	2	1	0	Score
Inside Core Recovery Unit reported in draft Recovery Plan	Yes	--	--	--	--	No	
Inside designated Critical Habitat	Yes	--	--	--	--	No	
High quality shrub habitat (scrub/chaparral especially; on northeast, east, south east, south and southwest Aspects) within one mile of subject site	Yes	--	--	--	No	--	
Land covers impacted/mitigated	Chaparral/Scrub	Grassland, Oak Woodland	Riparian	Conifer Woodland	--	All others	
Presence of rock outcrops	On-site	≤ 0.5-mile	≥ 0.5 but < 1-mile	--	--	> 1 mile	
Presence of important movement corridor reported in draft Recovery Plan	On-site	≤ 0.5-mile	≥ 0.5 but < 1-mile	--	--	> 1 mile	
On parcels with an approved management plan for this species.	Yes	--	--	--	No	--	
Total Score							
Note: The ratio of mitigation to impact depends on the location of the mitigation. The acres of mitigation for a given project would be determined using the ratios shown in Table 3-9. Habitat quality of the impact site and the mitigation site would be scored using this table.							

Appendix E. Continued

Table E-8. Impact/Mitigation Scoring for golden eagle in the EACCS study area.

Golden eagle	5	4	3	2	1	0	Score
Presence of golden eagle nest within 1.0-mile of site	Yes	--	--	--	--	No	
Land covers impacted/ Mitigated	Grassland, Oak woodland	Chaparral and scrub, ruderal	Cultivated ag	Rural residential, Conifer woodland	--	All others	
Presence of ground squirrels	On site	Within 0.25-mile of site	> 0.25 but ≤ 1.0 mile	≥ 1 mile	--	--	
Wind turbines within 0.5-mile of site	No	--	--	--	Yes	On-site	
On parcels with an approved management plan for this species.	Yes	--	--	--	No	--	
Total Score							

Note: The ratio of mitigation to impact depends on the location of the mitigation. The acres of mitigation for a given project would be determined using the ratios shown in Table 3-10. Habitat quality of the impact site and the mitigation site would be scored using this table.

Appendix E. Continued

Table E-9. Impact/Mitigation Scoring for burrowing owl in the EACCS study area.

Burrowing owl	5	4	3	2	1	0	Score
Nearest known burrowing owl nest location to the impact site (within last 3 years)	On-site	Within 0.5-mile of site	> 0.5 but < 2.0 miles	--	> 2.0but ≤ 7.5 miles	> 7.5 miles	
Wind turbines within 0.5-mile of site	No	--	--	--	Yes	On-site	
Land covers impacted/mitigated	Grassland, ruderal	Cultivated ag	Oak woodland	Rural residential	--	All others	
Presence of ground squirrels	On-site	Within 0.25-mile of site	> 0.25 but ≤ 1.0 mile	≥ 1 mile	--	--	
Average height of grass on impacted area	Less than 8-inches	9-24 inches	--	25-36 inches	--	Greater than 36 inches	
On parcels with an approved management plan for this species.	Yes	--	--	--	No	--	
Total Score							

Note: The ratio of mitigation to impact depends on the location of the mitigation. The acres of mitigation for a given project would be determined using the ratios shown in Table 3-10. Habitat quality of the impact site and the mitigation site would be scored using this table.

Appendix E. Continued

Table E-10. Impact/Mitigation Scoring for tricolored blackbird in the EACCS study area.

Tricolored blackbird	5	4	3	2	1	0	Score
Documented tricolored blackbird nest colony within 0.5-mile of site during previous 3-years.	Yes	--	--	--	--	No	
Acres of emergent vegetation that could support nesting TRBL	>5	3-5	1-3	0.25 – 1	<0.25	0	
Acres of foraging habitat within 2-miles colony site	>1000	501-1000	251-500	100-250	<100	0	
On parcels with an approved management plan for this species.	Yes	--	--	--	No	--	
Total Score							
Note: The ratio of mitigation to impact depends on the location of the mitigation. The acres of mitigation for a given project would be determined using the ratios shown in Table 3-10. Habitat quality of the impact site and the mitigation site would be scored using this table.							

Appendix E. Continued

Table E-11. Impact/Mitigation Scoring for San Joaquin kit fox and America badger in the EACCS study area.

San Joaquin kit fox/American badger	5	4	3	2	1	0	Score
Impact/ Mitigation occurs in:	CZ5CZ6/CZ7/ CZ9/CZ10	--	—CZ4 or CZ13	--	—CZ2, CZ3, CZ11, CZ12	--	
Land covers impacted/ mitigated	Grassland, Rural residential	Chaparral/ Scrub	Oak woodland, Cultivated Ag	Seasonal wetlands, Orchard	, ruderal	All others	
Average Slope	0-5%	> 5 but < 10%	≥ 10 but < 25%	≥25%	--	All others	
Presence of ground squirrels	On site	Within 0.25- mile of site	Within 0.5- mile of site	--	--	Further away	
Linkages and movement	Creation or removal of potential linkage across barrier (e.g., culvert under freeway)	Land adjacent to potential linkage on both sides of barrier (e.g., culvert under freeway)	Land adjacent to potential linkage on one side of barrier (e.g., culvert under freeway)	Land not adjacent to key linkage for species.	--	--	
On parcels with an approved management plan for this species.	Yes	--	--	--	No	--	
Total Score							
Note: The ratio of mitigation to impact depends on the location of the mitigation. The acres of mitigation for a given project would be determined using the ratios shown in Table 3-11. Habitat quality of the impact site and the mitigation site would be scored using this table.							

Appendix E. Continued

Table E-12. Impact/Mitigation Scoring for San Joaquin spearscale in the EACCS study area.

San Joaquin spearscale	5	4	3	2	1	0	Score
Elevation	Below 1,050 feet	--	--	--		Above 1,050 feet	
Land covers impacted/ Mitigated	Valley Sink Scrub	Alkali meadow and scald/alkali wetland	Annual grassland,	Rural residential, ruderal	--	All others	
Within EBCNPS Priority Plant Protection Area	Yes	--	No	--	--	--	
On parcels with an approved management plan for this species.	Yes	--	--	--	No	--	
Total Score							
<p>Note: The ratio of mitigation to impact depends on the location of the mitigation. The acres of mitigation for a given project would be determined using the ratios shown in Table 3-12. Habitat quality of the impact site and the mitigation site would be scored using this table.</p>							

Appendix E. Continued

Table E-13. Impact/Mitigation Scoring for recurved larkspur in the EACCS study area.

Recurved larkspur	5	4	3	2	1	0	Score
Conservation Zones	Inside CZ6 or CZ7	--	--	--	--	Other CZ	
Elevation	100 – 2,000 feet	--	--	--		Above 2,000 feet	
Land covers impacted/mitigated	Valley sink scrub	Alkali meadow and scald	--	Annual grassland,	--	All others	
Within EBCNPS Priority Plant Protection Area	Yes	--	No	--	--	--	
On parcels with an approved management plan for this species.	Yes	--	--	--	No	--	
Total Score							
Note: The ratio of mitigation to impact depends on the location of the mitigation. The acres of mitigation for a given project would be determined using the ratios shown in Table 3-12. Habitat quality of the impact site and the mitigation site would be scored using this table.							

Appendix E. Continued

Table E-14. Impact/Mitigation Scoring for big tarplant in the EACCS study area.

Big tarplant	5	4	3	2	1	0	Score
Conservation Zones	Inside CZ6 or CZ10	Inside CZ5 or CZ9	--	--	--	Other CZ	
Elevation	Below 2,000 feet	--	--	--		Above 2,000 feet	
Land covers impacted/mitigated	Annual grassland, native grassland	--	--	--	--	All others	
Soils present in impact area	Clay, Clay-loam	--	--	--	--	others	
Within EBCNPS Priority Plant Protection Area	Yes	--	No	--	--	--	
On parcels with an approved management plan for this species.	Yes	--	--	--	No	--	
Total Score							
Note: The ratio of mitigation to impact depends on the location of the mitigation. The acres of mitigation for a given project would be determined using the ratios shown in Table 3-12. Habitat quality of the impact site and the mitigation site would be scored using this table.							

Appendix E. Continued

Table E-15. Impact/Mitigation Scoring for Congdon’s tarplant in the EACCS study area.

Congdon’s tarplant	5	4	3	2	1	0	Score
Conservation Zones	Inside CZ2/ CZ3/CZ4/CZ5 /CZ6/CZ7	--	--	--	--	Other CZ	
Elevation	Below 800 feet	--	--	--		Above 800 feet	
Land covers impacted/ mitigated	native grassland,	Annual grassland,	--	Rural residential, Ruderal	--	All others	
Soils present in impact area	Clay, Clay- loam, silty clay loam	--	Alkali or Saline soils	--	--	others	
Within EBCNPS Priority Plant Protection Area	Yes	--	No	--	--	--	
On parcels with an approved management plan for this species.	Yes	--	--	--	No	--	
Total Score							
Note: The ratio of mitigation to impact depends on the location of the mitigation. The acres of mitigation for a given project would be determined using the ratios shown in Table 3-12. Habitat quality of the impact site and the mitigation site would be scored using this table.							

Appendix E. Continued

Table E-16. Impact/Mitigation Scoring for Palmate-bracted bird’s beak in the EACCS study area.

Palmate-bracted bird’s beak	5	4	3	2	1	0	Score
Conservation Zones	Inside CZ4	--	--	--	--	Other CZ	
Elevation	Below 500 feet	--	--	--		Above 500 feet	
Land covers impacted/ mitigated	chenopod scrub	Annual grassland,	--	Rural residential, ruderal	--	All others	
Does project effect/protect hydrology in the watershed in a way that would degrade/improve vernal pool habitats downstream	Yes					No	
Soils present in impact area	Alkali soils	--	--	--	--	others	
Within EBCNPS Priority Plant Protection Area	Yes	--	No	--	--	--	
On parcels with an approved management plan for this species.	Yes	--	--	--	No	--	
Total Score							
<p>Note: The ratio of mitigation to impact depends on the location of the mitigation. The acres of mitigation for a given project would be determined using the ratios shown in Table 3-12. Habitat quality of the impact site and the mitigation site would be scored using this table.</p>							

Appendix E. Continued

Table E-17. Impact/Mitigation Scoring for Livermore tarplant in the EACCS study area.

Livermore tarplant	5	4	3	2	1	0	Score
Conservation Zones	Inside CZ2 or CZ4	--	--	--	--	Other CZ	
Elevation	500-600 feet	--	--	--		Above 600 feet	
Land covers impacted/mitigated	Alkali meadow and scald	-	--	Annual grassland	--	All others	
Within EBCNPS Priority Plant Protection Area	Yes	--	No	--	--	--	
On parcels with an approved management plan for this species.	Yes	--	--	--	No	--	
Total Score							
<p>Note: The ratio of mitigation to impact depends on the location of the mitigation. The acres of mitigation for a given project would be determined using the ratios shown in Table 3-12. Habitat quality of the impact site and the mitigation site would be scored using this table.</p>							