

Kit Fox Habitat Evaluation Form

[\(guidelines\)](#)

Cover Sheet

Project Name _____

Date _____

Project

Location* _____

*Include project vicinity map and project boundary on copy of U.S.G.S. 7.5 minute map (size may be reduced)

U.S.G.S. Quad Map Name

Lat/Long or UTM coordinates (if available)

Project Description:

Project Size _____ **Acres** **Amount of Kit Fox Habitat Affected** _____ **Acres**

Quantity of WHR Habitat Types Impacted (i.e. - 2 acres annual grassland, 3 acres blue oak woodland)

WHR type _____ Acres

WHR type _____ Acres

WHR type _____ Acres

WHR type _____ Acres

Comments: _____

Form Completed By:

Rev 3/02
G:envdiv/forms/kit fox
habitat

San Joaquin Kit Fox Habitat Evaluation form

Is the project area within 10 miles of a recorded San Joaquin kit fox observation or within contiguous suitable habitat as defined in question 2 (A-E)

Yes - Continue with evaluation form

No - Evaluation form/surveys are not necessary

1. Importance of the project area relative to Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California (Williams et al., 1998)
 - A. Project would block or degrade an existing corridor linking core populations or isolate a subpopulation (20)
 - B. Project is within core population (15)
 - C. Project area is identified within satellite populations (12)
 - D. Project area is within a corridor linking satellite populations (10)
 - E. Project area is not within any of the previously described areas but is within known kit fox range (5)

2. Habitat characteristics of project area.
 - A. Annual grassland or saltbush scrub present >50% of site (15)
 - B. Grassland or saltbush scrub present but comprises <50% of project area (10)
 - C. Oak savannah present on >50% of site (8)
 - D. Fallow ag fields or grain/alfalfa crops (7)
 - E. Orchards/vineyards (5)
 - F. Intensively maintained row crops or suitable vegetation absent (0)

3. Isolation of project area.
 - A. Project area surrounded by contiguous kit fox habitat as described in Question 2a-e (15)
 - B. Project area adjacent to at least 40 acres of contiguous habitat or part of an existing corridor (10)
 - C. Project area adjacent to <40 acres of habitat but linked by existing corridor (i.e., river, canal, aqueduct) (7)
 - D. Project area surrounded by ag but less than 200 yards from habitat (5)

- E. Project area completely isolated by row crops or development and is greater than 200 yards from potential habitat (0)
4. Potential for increased mortality as a result of project implementation. Mortality may come from direct (e.g., - construction related) or indirect (e.g., - vehicle strikes due to increases in post development traffic) sources.
- A. Increased mortality likely (10)
 - B. Unknown mortality effects (5)
 - C. No long term effect on mortality (0)
5. Amount of potential kit fox habitat affected. *Revised 03-02*
- A. >320 acres (10)
 - B. 160 - 319 acres (7)
 - C. 80 - 159 acres (5)
 - D. 40 - 79 acres (3)
 - E. < 40 acres (1)
6. Results of project implementation.
- A. Project site will be permanently converted and will no longer support foxes (10)
 - B. Project area will be temporarily impacted but will require periodic disturbance for ongoing maintenance (7)
 - C. Project area will be temporarily impacted and no maintenance necessary (5)
 - D. Project will result in changes to agricultural crops (2)
 - E. No habitat impacts (0)
7. Project Shape
- A. Large Block (10)
 - B. Linear with > 40 foot right-of-way (5)
 - C. Linear with < 40 foot right-of-way (3)
8. Have San Joaquin kit foxes been observed within 3 miles of the project area within the last 10 years?
- A. Yes (10)
 - B. No (0)

Scoring

1. Recovery importance _____
2. Habitat condition _____

- 3. Isolation _____
- 4. Mortality _____
- 5. Quantity of habitat impacted _____
- 6. Project results _____
- 7. Project shape _____
- 8. Recent observations _____

TOTAL _____

Revised 03/02-lpd