

BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

A Petition to List the Southern California/Central Coast Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU) of Mountain Lions as Threatened under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA)



A Mountain Lion in the Verdugo Mountains with Glendale and Los Angeles in the background.
Photo: NPS

Center for Biological Diversity and the Mountain Lion Foundation
June 25, 2019



Notice of Petition

For action pursuant to Section 670.1, Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR) and Division 3, Chapter 1.5, Article 2 of the California Fish and Game Code (Sections 2070 *et seq.*) relating to listing and delisting endangered and threatened species of plants and animals.

I. SPECIES BEING PETITIONED:

Species Name: Mountain Lion (*Puma concolor*). Southern California/Central Coast Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU)

II. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Listing as Threatened or Endangered

The Center for Biological Diversity and the Mountain Lion Foundation submit this petition to list mountain lions (*Puma concolor*) in Southern and Central California as Threatened or Endangered pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act (California Fish and Game Code §§ 2050 *et seq.*, “CESA”). This petition demonstrates that Southern and Central California mountain lions are eligible for and warrant listing under CESA based on the factors specified in the statute and implementing regulations. Specifically, petitioners request listing as Threatened an Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU) comprised of the following recognized mountain lion subpopulations:

1. Santa Ana Mountains
2. Eastern Peninsular Range
3. San Gabriel/San Bernardino Mountains
4. Central Coast South (Santa Monica Mountains)
5. Central Coast North (Santa Cruz Mountains)
6. Central Coast Central

Alternatively, as detailed in the petition, in the event the Commission determines that these six populations collectively either do not comprise a single Southern California/Central Coast ESU or otherwise do not meet the criteria for listing as Threatened, petitioners request the Commission consider whether any of these populations, singularly or in combination, comprise one or more ESUs and meet the criteria for listing as Threatened or Endangered pursuant to CESA.

III. AUTHORS OF PETITION:

Tiffany Yap, D.Env/PhD
Brendan Cummings
Center for Biological Diversity
1212 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, California 94612
(510) 847-5838
tyap@biologicaldiversity.org
bcummings@biologicaldiversity.org

J.P. Rose
Center for Biological Diversity
660 South Figueroa Street, Suite 1000
Los Angeles, California 90017
(213) 785-5406
jrose@biologicaldiversity.org

I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, all statements made in this petition are true and complete.


Signature:  _____ Date: 6/25/19 _____

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
1 Introduction.....	7
2 Life History.....	7
2.1 Species Description	7
2.2 Taxonomy and Population Genetics	8
2.2.1 Effective Population Size and Extinction Risk.....	11
2.2.2 Central Coast North (CC-N) Mountain Lion Population.....	13
2.2.3 Central Coast Central (CC-C) Mountain Lion Population	13
2.2.4 Central Coast South (CC-S) Mountain Lion Population	13
2.2.5 Santa Ana Mountains (SAM) Mountain Lion Population	14
2.2.6 San Gabriel/San Bernardino Mountains (SGSB) Mountain Lion Population	15
2.2.7 Eastern Peninsular Range (EPR) Mountain Lion Population	15
2.3 Reproduction and Growth	16
2.4 Diet and Foraging Ecology	17
2.5 Habitat Requirements.....	19
2.6 Survivorship and Mortality	21
3 Southern California and Central Coast Mountain Lions Comprise an Evolutionarily Significant Unit.....	22
3.1 CESA Provides for Listing of ESUs	22
3.2 Southern California and Central Coast Mountain Lions are Significantly Reproductively Isolated from Other Populations and Form an ESU	23
3.3 Proposed Boundary of the Southern California/Central Coast ESU.....	25
3.4 Southern California and Central Coast Mountains Lions are Essential to the Region’s Biodiversity.....	28
3.5 Californians Derive Aesthetic, Recreational, and Economic Value from Southern California and Central Coast Mountain Lions	29
4 Historical and Current Distribution	30
4.1 Central Coast North (CC-N) Mountain Lion Population.....	32
4.2 Central Coast Central (CC-C) Mountain Lion Population.....	32
4.3 Central Coast South (CC-S) Mountain Lion Population.....	32
4.4 San Gabriel/San Bernardino Mountains (SGSB) Mountain Lion Population.....	33
4.5 Santa Ana Mountains (SAM) Mountain Lion Population	33

4.6	Eastern Peninsular Range (EPR) Mountain Lion Population	33
5	Abundance and Population Trends	34
5.1	Central Coast North (CC-N) Mountain Lion Population	35
5.2	Central Coast Central (CC-C) Mountain Lion Population.....	35
5.3	Central Coast South (CC-S) Mountain Lion Population.....	36
5.4	Santa Ana Mountains (SAM) Population.....	38
5.5	San Gabriel/San Bernardino Mountains (SGSB) Population.....	39
5.6	Eastern Peninsular Range (EPR) Population	39
6	Factors Affecting Ability to Survive and Reproduce	40
6.1	Low Genetic Diversity and Inbreeding Depression	42
6.2	Vehicle Strikes	44
6.3	Depredation and Illegal Kills	46
6.4	Intraspecific Strife	48
6.5	Abandonment	49
6.6	Poisoning from Rodenticides and Other Environmental Toxicants.....	50
6.7	Wildfires.....	51
6.8	Climate Change	52
7	Degree and Immediacy of Threat	53
8	Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms	54
8.1	State Regulatory Mechanisms.....	54
8.1.1	CDFW Departmental Bulletins.....	55
8.1.2	California Environmental Quality Act.....	56
8.1.3	Significant Natural Areas Program.....	58
8.1.4	Natural Community Conservation Planning Act	59
8.2	Federal Regulatory Mechanisms	61
8.2.1	National Environmental Policy Act.....	61
8.3	Regional and Local Plans and Policies	62
8.3.1	Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area General Management Plan...	62
8.3.2	Ventura County Wildlife Connectivity Ordinance	63
8.3.3	Los Angeles County Significant Ecological Areas Program.....	63
8.4	Future Development Will Further Threaten the Survival of Southern California Mountain Lions.....	63
8.5	Future Development Will Further Threaten the Survival of Central Coast Mountain Lions..	67

9 CESA Listing for Southern California and Central Coast Mountain Lions Would Supplement Proposition 117’s Protections. 69

 9.1 CESA listing is consistent with Proposition 117. 69

 9.2 CESA listing would further the goals of Proposition 117..... 69

10 Recommended Management and Recovery Actions 70

11 References..... 73

Executive Summary

The Center for Biological Diversity and the Mountain Lion Foundation submit this petition to list mountain lions (*Puma concolor*; cougar, puma) in Southern and Central Coastal California as “threatened” or “endangered” pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (California Fish and Game Code §§ 2050 et seq.). Following Section 670.1, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, petitioners present scientific information regarding life history, population trend, range, distribution, abundance, kind of habitat necessary for survival, factors affecting the ability to survive and reproduce, degree and immediacy of threat, impact of existing management efforts, suggestions for future management, availability of sources and information, and a detailed distribution map.

Specifically, petitioners request listing as a “threatened species” an evolutionarily significant unit (ESU) comprised of the following recognized mountain lion subpopulations:

1. Santa Ana Mountains
2. Eastern Peninsular Range
3. San Gabriel/San Bernardino Mountains
4. Central Coast South (Santa Monica Mountains)
5. Central Coast North (Santa Cruz Mountains)
6. Central Coast Central

As demonstrated in this petition, mountain lions in these areas comprise an ESU (referred to as the “Southern California/Central Coast ESU”) and meet the statutory definition of a “threatened species.”

The California Fish and Game Commission has long recognized that ESUs can be designated and listed under CESA, and this interpretation of CESA has been upheld by the courts. *See California Forestry Assn. v. California Fish & Game Com.* (2007) 156 Cal.App.4th 1535, 1540 (“Consistent with the policy of the CESA, we will hold that the term ‘species or subspecies’ includes evolutionarily significant units”); *Central Coast Forest Assn. v. Fish & Game Com.* (2018) 18 Cal.App.5th 1191, 1197, fn. 4 [“*CCFA IP*”] (“An ESU is included within the term ‘species or subspecies’ in sections 2062 and 2067.”). While the ESU concept has primarily been applied to fish, the Commission recently listed an ESU of a mammal, the Pacific Fisher, as a “threatened species.” *See* 14 C.C.R. 670.5(b)(6)(J) (“Fisher (*Pekania pennant*) Southern Sierra Nevada Evolutionarily Significant Unit”).

Under CESA, a “threatened species” is “a native species or subspecies of a ... mammal... that, although not presently threatened with extinction, is likely to become an endangered species in the foreseeable future in the absence of the special protection and management efforts” Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2067. An animal is an “endangered species” when it is “in serious danger of becoming extinct throughout all, or a significant portion, of its range due to one or more causes, including loss of habitat, change in habitat, overexploitation, predation, competition, or disease.” Cal. Fish & Game § 2062.

Certain populations of the Southern California/Central Coast mountain lion ESU are already “in serious danger of becoming extinct” (e.g. Santa Ana and Santa Monica mountains), and if assessed separately, would individually meet the definition of an “endangered species.” When considered as a whole, the Southern California/Central Coast ESU is not at imminent risk of extinction but still faces significant and growing threats that ultimately threaten the viability of the entire ESU; it consequently meets the definition of a “threatened species.”

Currently, there is no reliable estimate of mountain lion abundance in California. In 1984 the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) estimated between 4,000-6,000 adult mountain lions in the state (Mansfield and Weaver 1984). However, CDFW acknowledges that this estimate is outdated and likely overestimates mountain lion abundance. CDFW is currently undertaking a large-scale research effort to estimate mountain lion numbers throughout California.

While reliable absolute abundance estimates are unavailable, recent genetic research has led to estimates of effective population size for California mountain lion populations.¹ These estimates highlight the genetic isolation among California mountain lion populations and raise significant concerns for the continued viability of mountain lions in Southern California and along the Central Coast.

Researchers have recently identified 10 genetically distinct mountain lion populations in California (Figure ES-1) (derived from Gustafson et al. 2018). Nine of these populations occur almost exclusively in California, while one is centered in Nevada but extends into the northeastern corner of California.

The abundance of mountain lions in the North Coast and inland populations (Western Sierra Nevada, Eastern Sierra Nevada, and the genetic cluster centered in the state of Nevada) is not well established; however, these populations are better connected than Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions, and they show relatively high levels of genetic diversity. Gustafson et al. (2018) suggest that these four populations may comprise an ESU. While these populations should be monitored and managed to ensure their continued viability, petitioners do not seek protection of these populations as an ESU under CESA at this time.

Considering the genetic source-sink dynamics among the remaining six populations, petitioners demonstrate that the populations along the Central Coast and in Southern California collectively comprise an ESU that warrants protection under CESA.² The Southern California/Central Coast ESU is comprised of six genetically distinct mountain lion populations: Central Coast North (CC-N, which includes mountain lions in the Santa Cruz Mountains and East Bay), Central Coast

¹ At its simplest, effective population size is the number of animals contributing offspring to the next generation. It is an important measure of the genetic health of a population.

² As explained *infra* at Section 3.0, these remaining populations can be grouped into one or several potential ESUs. Petitioners believe that for purposes of listing under CESA, treating them as a single ESU is supported by the best available science. Moreover, a single ESU also is the most pragmatic from a management perspective, as recovery of the individual populations ultimately depends upon maintaining and/or reestablishing connectivity between them. *See CCFA II*, 18 Cal.App.5th 1191, 1237 (“[T]he nature of the ESU designation is such that genetics alone are not determinative: One must look beyond genetics to questions of policy to determine which populations to include in an ESU.”)(quotations omitted).

Central (CC-C), Central Coast South (CC-S, which includes the mountain lions in the Santa Monica Mountains), San Gabriel/San Bernardino Mountains (SGSB), Santa Ana Mountains (SAM), and Eastern Peninsular Range (EPR) (Gustafson et al. 2018).




Figure ES-1. Map of genetically distinct mountain lion populations and major roadways in California based on data collected from 1992-2016 (the division and status of these populations could change over time and with further research). The black lines show the proposed Southern California/Central Coast ESU boundary. Derived from Gustafson et al. (2018). Genetics data source: Kyle Gustafson, PhD, Department of Biology and Environmental Health, Missouri Southern State University, and Holly Ernest, DVM, PhD, Department of Veterinary Sciences, Program in Ecology, University of Wyoming, Laramie. Roads data source: ESRI.

The boundary of the Southern California/Central Coast ESU is proposed in Figure ES-1, and includes mountain lions that occur south of the San Francisco Bay and I-80, west of I-5 to the intersection of I-5 and SR-58, south of SR-58 to I-15, south of the I-15 from the SR-58 intersection to the California-Nevada border, and, for the purposes of CESA, as far south as the California-Mexico border. These boundaries are recommended as they include virtually all mountain lions associated with the six populations comprising the ESU and are also unambiguous and readily discernable for purposes of management. We recommend including mountain lions in the Tehachapi and Sierra Pelona Mountains south of SR-58 in this ESU. While most mountain lions sampled from this region share some genetic affinities with Western Sierra Nevada (WSN) animals, many also show genetic connections with CC-S, SAM, EPR and SGSB mountain lions. This area serves not just as a connecting link between mountain lion populations comprising the Southern California/Central Coast ESU, but also between this ESU and all other California mountain lions and is therefore essential for the overall genetic health of mountain lions in the state.

While Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions face a multitude of threats, the greatest challenges stem from habitat loss and fragmentation and the consequent impact on their genetic health. Most of the populations comprising the ESU have low genetic diversity and effective population sizes, which puts them at increased risk of extinction (Ernest et al. 2003; Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015; Benson et al. 2016; Gustafson et al. 2018; Benson et al. 2019). The populations most at risk are the SAM, CC-S, SGSB, and CC-N populations. Due to extreme isolation caused by roads and development, the SAM and CC-S, populations exhibit high levels of inbreeding, and, with the exception of the endangered Florida panther, have the lowest genetic diversity observed for the species globally (Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2014; Gustafson et al. 2018; Benson et al. 2019). The SGSB and CC-N similarly have low observed genetic diversity and effective population sizes, and they reside in areas of significant isolation and habitat fragmentation, which also puts them at increased risk (Gustafson et al. 2018). And although the CC-C and EPR populations have slightly higher levels of genetic diversity and effective population sizes, high rates of development, habitat loss and fragmentation, and human-caused mortalities in both areas could lead to a similar fate of isolation, genetic drift, low effective population size, and increased risk of extinction in the foreseeable future.

Although minimum viable effective population size has been found to vary depending on the species (Frankham 1995; Traill et al. 2010), general conservation management practice over the past few decades has followed a 50/500 rule, under which an effective population size of 50 is assumed sufficient to prevent inbreeding depression in the short term (over the duration of five generations) and an effective population size of 500 is sufficient to retain evolutionary potential in perpetuity (Traill et al. 2010; Frankham et al. 2014). It is clear that Central Coast and Southern California mountain lion populations are genetically compromised and face significant risk of extinction in both the short- and long-term. Five of the six populations have effective population sizes well below 50 (from lowest to highest: CC-S, SGSB, SAM, CC-N, EPR), and one population (CC-C) is just barely above that threshold at $N_e = 56.6$ (Table ES-1) (Gustafson et al. 2018).

Table ES-1. Effective population size from Gustafson et al. (2018) and estimated total adult population of Central Coast and Southern California Mountain Lion Populations.

Population	Effective Population Size (N_e)	Estimated Total (Adult) Population (N)¹
Central Coast North (CC-N)	16.6	33-66
Central Coast Central (CC-C)	56.6	113-226
Central Coast South (CC-S)	2.7 ²	5-10
Santa Ana Mountains (SAM)	15.6 ³	31-62
San Gabriel/ San Bernardino Mountains (SGSB)	5	10-20
Eastern Peninsular Range (EPR)	31.6	63-126
Total		255-510

¹Calculations are based on the estimated ratio of effective to total adult population size (N_e/N) of Florida panthers being 0.25 to 0.5 (Ballou et al. 1989). This ratio was used in the USFWS Florida Panther Recovery Plan (USFWS 2008). Petitioners recognize that these derived population estimates, while informative, are not definitive and will likely be superseded by new population estimates being developed by CDFW.

²Benson et al. (2019) calculated an N_e of 4 for the Santa Monica Mountains population within the CC-S. Applying the Ballou et al. (1989) factors would lead to an estimate of 8-16 mountain lions in this area, which is roughly consistent with current estimates of this well-monitored population.

³Several studies provide N_e calculation for the SAM population. Ernest et al. (2014) calculated an N_e of 5.1 and Benson et al. (2019) calculated an N_e of 6. Applying the Ballou et al. (1989) factors to the most recent calculation would lead to an estimate of 12-24 mountain lions in the SAM, which is roughly consistent with current estimates.

Although low effective population sizes standing alone are cause for conservation concern for Southern California and Central Coast mountain lion populations, there are other human-caused factors that further limit their long-term persistence. Habitat loss and fragmentation due to roads and development have led to extreme levels of isolation and high mortality rates. With low genetic diversity and high risk of inbreeding depression due to genetic isolation, vehicle strikes on roads, increased conflicts with humans that lead to depredation kills, high levels of intraspecific strife likely due to limited space and lack of connectivity, rodenticide and other environmental toxicant poisoning, and impacts of more frequent human-caused wildfires and climate change, the small isolated mountain lion populations of Southern California and the Central Coast will likely not persist without the restoration and enhancement of functional connectivity between populations and large blocks of heterogeneous habitats.

Loss of mountain lions in Southern California and the Central Coast would be devastating not just for the mountain lions themselves but also the many species that directly and indirectly rely on them. These top predators are important ecosystem engineers that facilitate healthy ecosystems and allow biodiversity to thrive (Ripple and Beschta 2006; Ripple and Beschta 2008; Ripple et al. 2014; Ruth and Elbroch 2014; Barry et al. 2019; Elbroch and Quigley 2019). As keystone species mountain lions help support plant recruitment in riparian areas, stabilize stream

banks, and sustain healthy habitats for a myriad of aquatic and terrestrial species, including plants, invertebrates, fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals (Ripple and Beschta 2006; Ripple and Beschta 2008; Ripple et al. 2014). Their kills are also an important source of food for multiple terrestrial and avian scavengers (Ruth and Elbroch 2014; Barry et al. 2019; Elbroch and Quigley 2019).

Existing laws and regulations have proven to be inadequate to protect Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions. Although the California Wildlife Protection Act of 1990 (Proposition 117) prohibits hunting of mountain lions and has funded the acquisition of important habitat for preservation, the Act alone does not ensure that core habitats and connectivity are protected from development, highways, or other threats. Moreover, numerous mountain lions are killed each year pursuant to depredation authorizations issued under this regime, and there is no limit to the number of depredation permits a property owner can request or any limit to the number of depredation permits which can be issued for any population. And while CDFW has proactively issued a bulletin detailing a new depredation policy for mountain lions in the CC-S and SAM that requires property owners to first implement non-lethal measures prior to being issued a kill permit, this policy does not apply to other vulnerable populations.

Other environmental laws also are insufficient. State and local agencies continue to interpret the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as allowing for the construction of highways and other development in mountain lion habitat and essential corridor areas without adequate mitigation despite severe impacts of such projects on mountain lions. Agencies likewise have generally interpreted CEQA and the federal National Environmental Policy Act as not requiring implementation of connectivity measures when projects fragment or destroy mountain lion habitat. And perhaps most importantly, Caltrans lacks a clear affirmative mandate to design, build, or improve crossings for mountain lions on existing highways, despite the undisputed role of transportation infrastructure in preventing connectivity and gene flow.

Future human population growth and associated development will further diminish and fragment remaining mountain lion habitat, driving Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions closer to extinction and undermining any chance of recovery. Should state and local agencies continue to build and expand roads and highways and permit construction in wildlife habitat and corridors without ensuring adequate habitat connectivity, the genetic health of mountain lion populations will continue to decline while the number of mountain lions killed by vehicle strikes and other human activity will increase.

Ultimately, without a reversal of these trends, mountain lions will disappear from Southern and Central Coastal California in the coming decades, representing a loss of the species from a significant portion of its range in the state. Nevertheless, most of the threats facing mountain lions can be halted or sufficiently reduced if CDFW is provided with adequate resources and all relevant state and local agencies sufficiently prioritize mountain lion conservation in their decision-making. Legal protection of mountain lions under CESA, along with the attention and resources that such listing will generate, can help ensure the long-term survival of this iconic and ecologically significant species in Southern and Central Coastal California.

The Southern California/Central Coast Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU) of Mountain Lions Warrants Listing as Threatened under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA)

1 Introduction

This petition summarizes available scientific information regarding the natural history of mountain lions, their distribution and abundance in California, population trends and threats, describes the proposed ESU, and discusses the limitations of existing management measures in protecting the species. As demonstrated below, mountain lions in Southern California and along the Central Coast meet the criteria for protection as a threatened species under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), and would benefit greatly from such protection.

2 Life History

2.1 Species Description



Adult female mountain lion (left) and kittens (right). Photos: NPS.

The mountain lion (*Puma concolor*) is also commonly called a puma (from the Inca language Quechua) or cougar (corrupted from *cuguacuarana* from the indigenous Guarani people in Paraguay, Argentina, Bolivia, and Brazil). Adults are large, slender cats with short, muscular limbs and a long tail that is about one third of the animal's total length. Their hind limbs are longer than their fore limbs, which makes them highly adapted for jumping through rugged terrain or pouncing on their prey. They have tawny pelage that can be lighter/whitish on their belly and the undersides of their legs and they have areas of white around the muzzle, throat and chest. They have black fur on the backs of their rounded ears, the tip of their tail, and outlining their muzzle. Their eyes are a grayish brown to golden color, and the nose is pink with a black outline.

Adult body size and weight can vary depending on the geographic range (Iriarte et al. 1990). Mountain lions are smaller and weigh less near the equator and are larger and heavier towards the poles, which likely reflects the size of available prey and the presence of sympatric carnivores (Iriarte et al. 1990). Males are typically larger than females. Males generally weigh 55-65kg with a length of 2.2-2.3m from the nose to the tip of the tail, and females generally weigh 35-45kg with a length of 2.0-2.1m (Currier 1983).

Mountain lion kittens are born weighing approximately 400g, and their eyes and ear canals remain closed for one to two weeks after birth (Currier 1983). They have light coats with dark spots and a white muzzle, chest, and belly. Like the adults, they have black fur on the backs of their rounded ears, the tip of their tail, and outlining their muzzle. Their eyes are initially blue, change to mostly brown within four months, and then change to a golden color at around nine months (Currier 1983). The dark spots on their coat start to fade at 12-14 weeks of age, presumably when a kitten starts to accompany its mother on hunts, but the spots are still distinguishable until the animal is about one year old (Currier 1983). Adult weight is typically reached between the second and fourth year.

2.2 Taxonomy and Population Genetics

The mountain lion is in the order Carnivora and is a member of the cat family Felidae. Unlike the large, roaring cats of the subfamily Pantherinae (*e.g.*, lions, tigers, and leopards), mountain lions are categorized with small, purring cats in the subfamily Felinae (*e.g.*, bobcats, lynxes, ocelots, cheetahs, and jaguarundi). Their scientific name is *Puma concolor*, formerly called *Felis concolor*. Based on molecular and morphological features, it is thought that mountain lions share a common ancestor with cheetahs (*Acinonyx jubatus*) and jaguarundi (*Puma yaguaroundi*).

Mountain lion fossil records in North America date back 300,000 years (Pierce and Bleich 2003); however, they were likely extirpated during a massive extinction event at the end of the Pleistocene, which eliminated about 80% of large vertebrates in North America (Culver et al. 2000; Caragiulo et al. 2013). Genetic studies suggest that after this extinction event, a small number of Central and South American mountain lions migrated north and repopulated North America (Culver et al. 2000; Caragiulo et al. 2013). As a result, existing North American mountain lions exhibit founder effects and have less genetic diversity compared to mountain lions in Central and South America (Culver et al. 2000; Caragiulo et al. 2013).

There is some debate regarding the number of subspecies of mountain lions. Two subspecies are “tentatively” recognized by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Species Survival Commission (SSC) Cat Specialist Group: *Puma concolor concolor* (Linnaeus, 1771) in South America and *Puma concolor couguar* (Kerr, 1792) in North and Central America and possibly northern South America west of the Andes Mountains (Kitchener et al. 2017). However, there are various studies that suggest the divergence of multiple subspecies of mountain lions. About 30 subspecies of mountain lions throughout the Americas have been referenced in the literature, with about 15 subspecies in North America (Young and Goldman 1946; Currier 1983; Pierce and Bleich 2003).

Based on more recent genetic analyses of mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) from mountain lions throughout the Americas, Caragiulo et al. (2013) found that the mountain lions they sampled could be separated into three broad groupings: North America, Central America, and South America, with North American mountain lions having the least variation in mtDNA compared to populations in Central and South America. Although that study genotyped 601 specimens, the distribution of sampling within the broad geographic range was limited compared

to a study conducted by Culver et al. (2000), which analyzed mtDNA from 315 mountain lions sampled from more locations throughout the species' geographic distribution. Culver et al. (2000) found six phylogeographic groupings or subspecies throughout the Americas.

Despite this ongoing debate, the United States Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) has long recognized mountain lion subspecies under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). Two of these subspecies have been protected under the ESA due to low population sizes: the eastern cougar (*Puma concolor couguar*), which was listed as endangered and is now thought to be extinct, with the last recorded occurrence in 1938 (USFWS 2018), and the endangered Florida panther (*Puma concolor coryi*), which is an isolated population that is now restricted primarily to the cypress swamps of southern Florida. In addition, the California mountain lion (*Puma concolor californica*) was recognized by USFWS in response to a 1994 petition by the Mountain Lion Foundation to list the population of California mountain lions in the Santa Ana Mountains as endangered, as those populations that occur within most of California, southern Oregon, western Nevada, and northern Baja California, Mexico (USFWS 1994). Additionally, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) recognizes the Yuma Puma (*Puma concolor browni*) as a (sub)species of special concern that occurs in the desert plains and low mountains along the Colorado River in southeastern California, southwestern Arizona, northeastern Baja California, Mexico, and northwestern Sonora, Mexico (CDFW 1990).

In California, researchers have recently identified 10 genetically distinct mountain lion populations in California and Nevada, nine of which have core areas in California (Figure 1) (Gustafson et al. 2018). In the study, 992 mountain lions from throughout California and Nevada were genotyped using 42 microsatellite loci to identify regional populations and evaluate functional connectedness between the populations (Gustafson et al. 2018). The divergence of these populations is likely the result of habitat fragmentation caused by roads and development (Ernest et al. 2003; Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015; Benson et al. 2016a; Gustafson et al. 2017; Gustafson et al. 2018; Benson et al. 2019). According to Gustafson et al. (2018), mountain lions in the North Coast and inland populations (Nevada, Eastern Sierra Nevada, Western Sierra Nevada) appear to be better-connected than those in the south and along the central coast, with relatively larger effective population sizes and higher levels of genetic diversity. The authors suggest that these populations may comprise an evolutionarily significant unit (ESU). Considering the genetic source-sink dynamics among the remaining populations (Gustafson et al. 2018), petitioners demonstrate that the populations in Southern California and along the Central Coast collectively comprise an ESU (referred to as the "Southern California/Central Coast ESU"). See *Section 3.0 Southern California and Central Coast Mountain Lions Comprise and Evolutionarily Significant Unit* for more discussion.

The Southern California/Central Coast ESU is comprised of six genetically distinct mountain lion populations: Central Coast North (CC-N, which includes mountain lions in the Santa Cruz Mountains), Central Coast Central (CC-C), Central Coast South (CC-S, which includes mountain lions in the Santa Monica Mountains), San Gabriel/San Bernardino Mountains (SGSB), Santa Ana Mountains (SAM), and Eastern Peninsular Range (EPR) (Figure 1) (Gustafson et al. 2018). Most of these populations appear to be struggling with low genetic diversity and effective population sizes, which puts them at increased risk of extinction (Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015; Benson et al. 2016a; Gustafson et al. 2018;

Benson et al. 2019). The populations struggling the most include the SAM, CC-S, SGSB, and CC-N populations. Although the CC-C and EPR have slightly higher levels of genetic diversity and effective population sizes, high rates of development in both areas could lead to a similar fate of isolation, genetic drift, low effective population size, and increased risk of extinction in the foreseeable future.




Figure 1. Map of genetically distinct mountain lion populations in California. The Central Coast North (CC-N), Central Coast Central (CC-C), Central Coast South (CC-S), San Gabriel/San Bernardino (SGSB), Santa Ana Mountains (SAM), and Eastern Peninsular Range (EPR) mountain lion populations should be considered an evolutionarily significant unit (ESU). Each color represents a genetically distinct mountain lion population. White dots are individual animals sampled. Source: Gustafson et al. (2018).

Although discrete populations have been identified in Southern California mountain ranges, other mountain lions have been regularly observed outside of the CC-S, SAM, SGSB, and EPR core areas, including transient and resident mountain lions in the Mojave and Colorado deserts and along the Lower Colorado River (*i.e.*, Yuma mountain lion [*Puma concolor browni*], a recognized subspecies of special concern). These populations presumably occur in low

densities due to limited resources, such as lower prey abundance/vulnerability or less suitable habitat. In fact, Kucera (1998) states that habitat within the Yuma mountain lion range is generally considered to be of low or no suitability for mountain lions. Relatively low density populations are inferred by the larger ranges of mountain lions in desert environments; four individual Yuma mountain lions had home ranges of 389km² to 1621km², which is much larger than other California mountain lion home ranges (Grigione et al. 2002; Riley et al. 2014; Zeller et al. 2017; see *Section 2.5 Habitat Requirements* for more details) but similar to those estimated for other desert mountain lions (Kucera 1998). This petition considers these low-density transients and resident lions as included within the Southern California/Central Coast ESU.

2.2.1 Effective Population Size and Extinction Risk

It has been established that genetic factors play a critical role in extinction risk. Inbreeding depression, loss of genetic diversity, and accumulation of deleterious mutations can lead to elevated extinction risk due to reduced reproductive fitness and evolutionary potential (*i.e.*, the ability to adapt to change) (Spielman et al. 2004; Frankham 2005; Traill et al. 2010). Effective population size (N_e) is a key metric used to assess a population's genetic viability and its chances of long-term persistence. Effective population size is an estimate of the size of an idealized population that would lose heterozygosity (*i.e.*, genetic diversity) at the same rate as the observed population; it indicates a population's rates of inbreeding and genetic drift (changes in allele frequencies over generations based purely on chance). A lower effective population size indicates a higher risk of inbreeding depression. Factors that affect effective population size include census population size (*i.e.*, the total number of individuals within a population), breeding sex ratio, variance in reproductive success, and population density. Several characteristics of these mountain lion populations, including small census population size, low density, female-biased sex ratios, and skewed male reproductive success, reduce effective population size, which suggests that these populations have an increased risk of inbreeding depression and extinction (Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015; Benson et al. 2016a; Gustafson et al. 2018; Benson et al. 2019).

The minimum effective population size for a population to persist has been debated (*e.g.*, Jamieson and Allendorf 2012; Frankham et al. 2014). Although minimum viable effective population size has been found to vary depending on the species (Frankham 1995), general conservation management practice over the past few decades has followed a 50/500 rule, which purports that an effective population size of 50 is sufficient to prevent inbreeding depression in the short term (over the duration of five generations) and an effective population size of 500 is sufficient to retain evolutionary potential in perpetuity (Frankham et al. 2014). In a 2012 review, Jamieson and Allendorf (2012) concluded that the 50/500 rule is a useful guiding principle in conservation management when genetic concerns are likely to affect the short- and long-term viability of populations. However, Frankham et al. (2014) later revised the 50/500 rule and recommended an effective population size of 100 to limit the loss of total fitness to <10% in the short-term and an effective population size of 1,000 to retain evolutionary potential for fitness in perpetuity, while recognizing that fragmented populations should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Whether the 50/500 or 100/1,000 rule is considered, it is clear that Central Coast and Southern California mountain lion populations are genetically imperiled and face extinction in both the short- and long-term. Five of the six populations have effective population sizes well below 50 (from lowest to highest, according to Gustafson et al. 2018: CC-S, SGSB, SAM, CC-N, EPR), and the remaining population (CC-C) is just barely above that threshold at $N_e = 56.6$ (Table 1) (Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2014; Benson et al. 2016a; Gustafson et al. 2018; Benson et al. 2019). Although the ratio of effective to total adult population size (N_e/N) varies by species, the effective population size is often much lower than the total adult population size (Frankham 1995). Several studies indicate that the N_e/N in wild vertebrate populations ranges from 0.2 to 0.5 (Ballou et al. 1989; Mace and Lande 1991; Spong et al. 2000; Laundré and Clark 2003). Ballou et al. (1989) estimated the N_e/N to be 0.25-0.5 in their population viability assessment of the Florida Panther, which aligns with other studies on big cats (Frankham 1995; Spong et al. 2000). This range was used in the USFWS’s Florida Panther Recovery Plan (USFWS 2008), and, if applied to the Central Coast and Southern California mountain lion populations, the total number of mountain lions in the areas combined would be 255 to 510 individuals (Table 1). This is well below the recommended minimum viable population size of at least 5,000 adult individuals for the long-term persistence of a population (Frankham 1995; Reed et al. 2003; Traill et al. 2010).

Table 1. Effective population size and estimated total adult population of Central Coast and Southern California Mountain Lion Populations from Gustafson et al. (2018).

Population	Effective Population Size (N_e)	Estimated Total (Adult) Population (N)¹
Central Coast North (CC-N)	16.6	33-66
Central Coast Central (CC-C)	56.6	113-226
Central Coast South (CC-S)	2.7 ²	5-10
Santa Ana Mountains (SAM)	15.6 ³	31-62
San Gabriel/ San Bernardino Mountains (SGSB)	5	10-20
Eastern Peninsular Range (EPR)	31.6	63-126
Total		255-510

¹Calculations are based on the estimated ratio of effective to total adult population size (N_e/N) of Florida panthers being 0.25 to 0.5 (Ballou et al. 1989). This ratio was used in the USFWS Florida Panther Recovery Plan (USFWS 2008). Petitioners recognize that these derived population estimates, while informative, are not definitive and will likely be superseded by new population estimates being developed by CDFW.

²Benson et al. (2019) calculate an N_e of 4 for the Santa Monica Mountains population within the CC-S. Applying the Ballou et al. (1989) factors would lead to an estimate of 8-16 mountain lions in this area, which is roughly consistent with current estimates of this well-monitored population.

³Several studies provide N_e calculation for the SAM population. Ernest et al. (2014) calculated an N_e of 5.1 and Benson et al. (2019) calculated an N_e of 6. Applying the Ballou et al. (1989) factors to the most recent calculation would lead to an estimate of 12-24 mountain lions in the SAM, which is roughly consistent with current estimates

Habitat loss and fragmentation due to roads and development have led to extreme levels of isolation in these populations, which have lowered their effective population sizes and, ultimately, their ability to survive and reproduce with a diverse gene pool (Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2014; Benson et al. 2016a; Gustafson et al. 2018; Benson et al. 2019). However, re-establishing gene flow among isolated subpopulations of a species can increase effective population size and reduce extinction risk (Frankham et al. 2014). Thus, the implementation of wildlife crossing infrastructure at existing barriers along with the preservation of intact, heterogeneous habitats would facilitate connectivity among Central Coast and Southern California mountain lion populations and significantly improve their chances of long-term survival.

2.2.2 Central Coast North (CC-N) Mountain Lion Population

In a statewide study, Gustafson et al. (2018) found that the CC-N population clustered genetically with the CC-C and CC-S populations. The population exhibited evidence of a previous genetic bottleneck and was found to have low genetic diversity and a low effective population size ($N_e = 16.6$). There is some evidence, though weak, that suggests the CC-N population is a source population, with limited gene flow with the other Central Coast populations and the Western and Eastern Sierra Nevada populations (Gustafson et al. 2018). CDFW has identified that the Santa Cruz Mountains population, which occurs within the CC-N area, is struggling due to fragmentation from roads and development as well as lack of protected habitat (Dellinger 2019). The low genetic diversity and effective population size threaten both the short- and long-term survival of the CC-N population.

2.2.3 Central Coast Central (CC-C) Mountain Lion Population

The CC-C mountain lion population has been found to exhibit a previous genetic bottleneck (Gustafson et al. 2018). It has intermediate levels of genetic diversity and the highest effective population size ($N_e = 56.6$) among the Central Coast and Southern California populations (Gustafson et al. 2018). Although this effective population size exceeds the older standard of 50 to prevent in-breeding depression in the short-term, it falls well below the recommended newer standard of 100 and is insufficient for the long-term persistence of the population. This population was found to be clustered genetically with the CC-N and CC-S populations and identified as a source population with limited gene flow with other Central Coast populations, the Western and Eastern Sierra Nevada populations, and the SGSB population (Gustafson et al. 2018). Although the CC-C population appears to be the healthiest population in the Central Coast and Southern California, the lack of sufficient protected lands and high rates of development and habitat fragmentation in the area threaten the persistence of this population (Dellinger 2019).

2.2.4 Central Coast South (CC-S) Mountain Lion Population

The CC-S mountain lion population has been found to exhibit a prior genetic bottleneck, with low genetic diversity and an extremely low effective population size ($N_e = 2.7$ to 4) (Riley et al. 2014; Benson et al. 2016a; Gustafson et al. 2018; Benson et al. 2019). This population was

found to be clustered genetically with the CC-N and CC-C populations and identified as a genetic sink population, with limited gene flow from mountain lions along the Central Coast and in the Sierra Nevada (Gustafson et al. 2018).

A recent population viability analysis focused on the Santa Monica Mountains population, a subpopulation within the CC-S that has been severely isolated due to roads and development, found that if the population remains isolated with little or no immigration (similar to what is currently being observed in the area), the population could experience high levels of genetic erosion, with 40-57% loss of predicted heterozygosity within 50 years (Benson et al. 2016a). When considering just demographic processes with little or no immigration and no inbreeding depression, the population was predicted to have a 15-22% chance of extinction within 50 years (Benson et al. 2016a; Benson et al. 2019). However, if inbreeding depression occurs, which is a strong possibility given the predicted substantial loss of genetic diversity and the documentation of father-daughter, grandfather-granddaughter, and grandmother-grandson inbreeding within the population (*e.g.*, Riley et al. 2014)³, population growth will likely decline and chances of extinction within 50 years is predicted to be 99.7%, with a median time to extinction of 15.1 years (Benson et al. 2016a; Benson et al. 2019).

2.2.5 Santa Ana Mountains (SAM) Mountain Lion Population

The SAM mountain lion population has been found to have the lowest genetic diversity of all populations in California, with levels nearly as low as the endangered Florida panther (Ernest et al. 2014; Gustafson et al. 2017; Gustafson et al. 2018; Benson et al. 2019). This population is also estimated to have a low effective population size ($N_e = 5.1$ to 15.6) and high levels of relatedness and inbreeding (Ernest et al. 2014; Gustafson et al. 2018; Benson et al. 2019). The SAM population was found to be a genetic sink population, with limited gene flow with the EPR population (Gustafson et al. 2018). In a 16-year study (2001-2016) seven migrants (out of 146 sampled animals), were detected via genetics and GPS collar tracking to have crossed the I-15 between the EPR and SAM (three males from the EPR to SAM, four males from the SAM to the EPR); only one migrant is known to have reproduced (Gustafson et al. 2017). Low genetic diversity and effective population size in the SAM are indicative of a genetic bottleneck that is estimated to have occurred 40-80 years ago, around the time when urban development and multi-lane highway construction boomed in Southern California (Ernest et al. 2014; Gustafson et al. 2018). This population was also found to be largely disconnected from all the other California populations, along with the EPR population.

A recent population viability analysis found that if the population remains isolated with little or no immigration (similar to what is currently being observed in the area), the population could experience further genetic erosion, with 28-49% loss of predicted heterozygosity within 50 years (Benson et al. 2019). When considering just demographic processes with little or no immigration and no inbreeding depression, the population was predicted to have a 16-21% chance of extinction within 50 years. However, to avoid inbreeding depression in wild populations, loss in heterozygosity should be less than 5-10% over 100-200 years (Soule et al. 1986; Benson et al. 2016a), which suggests that inbreeding depression in the SAM population is

³ Inbreeding has been documented in the SMM population in Riley et al. 2014 and in ongoing studies by the NPS. More information from the NPS is available here: <https://www.nps.gov/samo/learn/nature/puma-profiles.htm>

a strong possibility. In addition, evidence of potential inbreeding depression has been observed in the population (*e.g.*, kinked tails coupled with low genetic diversity, Figure 2, Ernest et al. 2014). When inbreeding depression was considered in the population viability analysis, population growth will likely decline and chances of extinction within 50 years is predicted to be 100%, with a median time to extinction of 11.7 years (Benson et al. 2019).




Figure 2. Two SAM mountain lions with a kink at the base of the tail (A) and near the tip of the tail (B). These individuals had among the lowest genetic diversity measured in the study. Source: Ernest et al. 2014.

2.2.6 San Gabriel/San Bernardino Mountains (SGSB) Mountain Lion Population

According to Gustafson et al. (2018), the SGSB mountain lion population exhibits extremely low genetic diversity and effective population size ($N_e = 5$), though the sample size from SGSB was low. They were also found to be a sink population, with limited gene flow with populations in the Western Sierra Nevada, CC-C, and the EPR (Gustafson et al. 2018). Although genetic studies on this population are limited, patterns of isolation, loss of genetic diversity, and low effective population size are similar to those of the SAM and CC-S populations and likely indicate a high risk of extinction. Not only is the population's long-term survival at stake, but the geographic location of the SGSB population is paramount. Despite only limited gene flow between the SGSB population and the Western Sierra Nevada, CC-C, and EPR, this population represents a critical linkage between mountain lion populations in the northern, central coast, and southern mountain ranges of California (Gustafson et al. 2018). Restoration and enhancement of connectivity is key for the continued survival of the SGSB population as well as the Central Coast and Southern California mountain lion populations.

2.2.7 Eastern Peninsular Range (EPR) Mountain Lion Population

Gustafson et al. (2018) found that the EPR population exhibits a prior genetic bottleneck. Although the population was found to have a higher effective population size than the other Southern California mountain lion populations ($N_e = 31.6$), this is still well below the older standard of 50 to prevent in-breeding depression in the short-term and is insufficient for the long-term persistence of the population. In addition, the EPR population was found to be largely disconnected from all the other California populations, with limited gene flow and low connectivity with the SAM and SGSB populations (Gustafson et al. 2018). With continued development in San Diego, Riverside, and Imperial Counties, the EPR population could have a

similar fate of isolation, genetic drift and inbreeding, and risk of extinction as the other Central Coast and Southern California populations.

As mentioned previously, there are records for mountain lions outside of the core mountain ranges in Southern California, which are likely transients or residents of smaller populations. For example, the Yuma mountain lion has been recognized by CDFW as a subspecies of special concern, and likely occurs in low density in the desert plains and low mountains of the Colorado River Valley. Genetic studies on the Yuma mountain lion are limited, and no samples were obtained from that area for the study conducted by Gustafson et al. (2018). However, the low densities of transients and smaller populations in areas where roads and development threaten connectivity make them part of the EPR and larger Southern California population, and as such, they are considered a conservation concern and are included in this petition.

2.3 *Reproduction and Growth*



Dens are often in rocky outcrops (left) or in dense vegetation (right). Photos: NPS.

Mountain lions are polygamous breeders, and mates likely locate each other with auditory and olfactory signals (Currier 1983). They may reproduce at any time of year, though seasonal pulses have been documented and the timing of reproduction may be affected by prey abundance or climate (Pierce and Bleich 2003). In North America, kitten births are most common between April and September (Currier 1983; Beier 1995; Pierce and Bleich 2003).

Pairs generally mate for about 2-5 days (Beier et al. 1995), though there are instances in which pairs have been recorded traveling together for up to 16 days (Seidensticker et al. 1973). During this time they vocalize frequently, travel little, will sometimes share a kill, and copulate up to 70 times per day (Seidensticker et al. 1973; Beier et al. 1995; Pierce and Bleich 2003). Female estrous cycles last an estimated 4-12 days, and it is hypothesized that numerous acts of copulation stimulate ovulation and improve chances of successful fertilization (Pierce and Bleich 2003, Kitchener 1991). If the litter is born dead or removed within 24 hours of birth, females will go into estrous within a few weeks (Currier 1983). In addition, competing males have been

known to commit infanticide⁴, presumably to trigger estrous in females, though scientists are still investigating what drives this behavior.

Gestation lasts 82-96 days (Young and Goldman 1946; Currier 1983). Litter size ranges from 1-6, though 2-4 kittens per litter are typical (Pierce and Bleich 2003; Beier et al 2010; Riley et al. 2014). Females average larger litters during their first year of reproduction and tend towards smaller litters when they are older (Pierce and Bleich 2003). The sex ratio of litters has generally been found to be equal (Pierce and Bleich 2003). Females keep their kittens in dens located in rocky terrain or in dense vegetation that provide cover (Young and Goldman 1946), and they may move their young to several different dens until the young are weaned at about 2-3 months old (Pierce and Bleich 2003). Denning mountain lions have been found to avoid roads and stay at a distance from human disturbance four times greater (~600m) than non-reproductive mountain lions (~150m) (Wilmers et al. 2013).

Females care for their young for 1-2 years, at which point the mother comes into estrous and either abandons the cubs or acts aggressively towards them to prevent them from following her, as older males will kill cubs (Young and Goldman 1946; Seidensticker et al. 1973; Currier 1983; Beier 1995; Pierce and Bleich 2003). Newly independent young have been found to stay in the area where the mother leaves them for 2-3 weeks, and then disperse away from the direction their mother left (Beier 1995). Typically 50% of females stay in their natal range and 50% disperse while all males disperse, and siblings sometimes travel for a short time together (Pierce and Bleich 2003; Logan and Sweanor 2010). Subadult mountain lions may disperse up to 500km from their natal home ranges as they explore and establish their own territories (Pierce and Bleich 2003).

Mountain lions reach sexual maturity at 2-4 years of age. Although they are rarely known to mate until they have an established home range, transient males may occasionally breed with resident females (Hornocker 1970; Seidensticker et al. 1973; Currier 1983).

2.4 *Diet and Foraging Ecology*



Mountain lion cub feasting on a deer kill in the Santa Monica Mountains. Photo: NPS.

⁴ Infanticide has been documented in the Santa Monica Mountains mountain lion population. More information from the NPS is available here: <https://www.nps.gov/samo/learn/nature/puma-profiles.htm>

Large ungulates, especially deer, are the preferred prey of mountain lions, making up about 70% of their diet (Currier 1983; Iriarte et al. 1990). Hornocker (1970) estimated that the average adult mountain lion consumes 860-1,300kg of large prey annually. However, mountain lions are opportunistic predators, and they have been documented eating a wide variety of other large and smaller prey, including moose, elk, wild horses, burros, pronghorn, bighorn sheep, mountain goats, wild hogs, coyotes, bobcats, porcupines, badgers, rabbits, raccoons, rodents, turkeys, and livestock (Currier 1983; Iriarte et al. 1990; Garcelon unpublished data).

Their diet can vary by prey availability, prey vulnerability, the presence of sympatric carnivores, the season, and the age and sex of the mountain lion (Currier 1983; Iriarte et al. 1990; Knopff et al. 2010; Allen et al. 2014a). For example, deer have been found to make up >90% of the diet in mountain lions in the Santa Monica Mountains and in Northern California (Allen et al. 2014a; Riley et al. 2014), while in Florida wild hogs were found to be the most common prey (Maehr et al. 1990), and in northwestern Sonora, Mexico bighorn sheep were found to be the primary prey (Rosas-Rosas et al. 2003). These observed patterns were likely due to the availability of different prey in different geographic regions. A study conducted in Alberta, Canada, Knopff et al. (2010) found that while adult females were more likely to kill small ungulates (*e.g.*, deer), adult males were more likely to kill larger ungulates (*e.g.*, elk), and subadults relied on both small ungulates and nonungulate prey (*e.g.*, beavers, snow hares). A similar pattern was found in a mountain lion population in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, in which older, larger individuals hunted larger prey and younger, smaller individuals hunted smaller prey (Elbroch and Quigley 2019). In addition, mountain lions were found to prey upon female ungulates in the spring before and during the birthing period, and they would more often prey upon male ungulates in the fall during the rut, highlighting that prey vulnerability may play a role in mountain lion predation (Knopff et al. 2010).



Mountain lion preying on a coyote in Joshua Tree, California. Photo: Brendan Cummings

Mountain lions roam through expansive home ranges in search of prey, often hunting between dusk and dawn. Although they are generally most active at dusk and dawn, their peak activities have been observed to shift to more nocturnal patterns when they are closer to human

disturbance (Van Dyke et al. 1986). Mountain lions are primarily solitary animals and will repeatedly move and wait as they stalk and ambush their prey (Beier et al. 1995). Once within close proximity, mountain lions will lunge at their prey and kill the animal by crushing the trachea and suffocating it or by breaking its neck at the base of the skull with a bite (Currier 1983; Pierce and Bleich 2003). Instead of eating their kill right away, mountain lions drag their kill to a secluded spot to feed. They cover it with brush and other debris and return to feed at night for up to five days (Currier 1983; Beier et al. 1995). However, the presence or perceived presence of humans has been found to reduce overall feeding time (Smith et al. 2015; Smith et al. 2017).

Deer kill rates vary depending on the sex of the mountain lion, whether or not the female has cubs, and surrounding human land use. Male kill rates have been found to range from 35 to 47 ungulates per year, regardless of housing density (Anderson, Jr. and Lindzey 2003; Cooley et al. 2008; Knopff et al. 2010; Smith et al. 2015). However, kill rates for females differ depending on human disturbance. In lower density housing areas, kill rates of solitary females and females with kittens have been found to be 52-60 and 57-68 ungulates per year, respectively, while females in high density housing areas were found to have a kill rate of 81 ungulates per year (Anderson, Jr. and Lindzey 2003; Cooley et al. 2008; Knopff et al. 2010; Smith et al. 2015). This pattern could be driven by reduced time spent at kill sites in more developed areas, indicating that females are not consuming as much of each carcass and therefore need to kill more prey (Smith et al. 2015). This may reflect a trade-off made by females to choose feeding sites closer to human-disturbed areas and expend more energy killing prey in order to reduce potential encounters with males that pose a threat to themselves or their kittens (Benson et al. 2016b). Another factor that may be contributing to higher kill rates in developed areas is that mountain lions expend more energy traveling faster and farther in human-dominated landscapes and therefore require increased caloric intake compared to mountain lions away from developed areas (Wang et al. 2017).

2.5 *Habitat Requirements*

Mountain lions are primarily solitary (except in certain situations, such as when breeding, when females are rearing cubs, or when dispersing with siblings), territorial cats that occur in low density. They require large areas of relatively undisturbed habitats with adequate connectivity to allow for dispersal and gene flow. They have large home ranges that include heterogenous habitats. In the United States these often consist of pine forests, riparian and oak woodlands, streams, chaparral, and grasslands, though they are also known to occur in desert habitats (*e.g.*, Figure 3).




Figure 3. Home ranges of mountain lions being actively studied in 2016 by NPS in and near the Santa Monica Mountains. Source: NPS.

Mountain lions have been found to utilize different habitats within a 24-hour period (Dickson and Beier 2002; Dickson et al. 2005; Dickson and Beier 2006; Kertson et al. 2011; Zeller et al. 2017). Riparian habitats were found to be preferred over grasslands and human-disturbed areas during the day, which likely represents the animals resting in areas with understory vegetation for cover (Dickson and Beier 2002; Dickson et al. 2005). However, nocturnal movement patterns showed that mountain lions utilize a broad range of habitats as they travel through their home ranges and hunt (Dickson et al. 2005). Although riparian vegetation was the highest ranked habitat for nocturnal use, usage of riparian areas was not statistically different from the use of scrub, chaparral, grasslands, or woodlands (Dickson et al. 2005).

Nocturnal patterns of movement and stasis suggest that mountain lions generally avoid areas with human disturbance (*i.e.*, residential developments and two-lane paved roads) and use a variety of habitats to stalk and pursue their prey (Dickson and Beier 2002; Dickson et al. 2005). In addition, Dickson and Beier (2006) found that when mountain lions were traveling or hunting, they preferred canyon bottoms and gentle slopes and used steeper slopes and ridgelines to a lesser extent. And Benson et al. (2016b) found that mountain lions tend to choose feeding sites on steeper slopes in habitats with dense understory vegetation, such as chaparral, scrub, and upland forest. Although mountain lions will use moderately disturbed areas as they travel and hunt (Wilmers et al. 2013; Gray et al. 2016), occupancy is lower in developed areas and they are more likely to use developed areas if they border open spaces (Wang et al. 2015). Thus, mountain lions require a habitat mosaic that provides sufficient room to roam away from human-disturbed areas and connected to expansive, intact, heterogeneous habitats (Beier 1995; Dickson and Beier 2002; Dickson et al. 2005; Kertson et al. 2011; Zeller et al. 2017).

Home range size can vary depending on geographic area, season, sex, reproductive status, and prey density (Currier 1983; Grigione et al. 2002; Riley et al. 2014). Males generally have

much larger home ranges than females, and females with cubs tend to have even smaller home ranges (Beier et al. 1995; Grigione et al. 2002). Male home ranges tend to include partially or entirely overlapping female home ranges, and to a limited extent, they may partially overlap with other male home ranges (Figure 3) (Seidensticker et al. 1973; Currier 1983; Pierce and Bleich 2003). Mountain lions mark their home ranges with scrapings in the ground, often containing urine or feces (Seidensticker et al. 1973). Males make scrapings more often than females (Allen et al. 2014b), and females may only make scrapings when they are in estrous (Seidensticker et al. 1973; Currier 1983; Pierce and Bleich 2003).

Seasonal variation in home range size can differ depending on geographic area. Grigione et al. (2002), found strong influences of seasonality in average mountain lion home ranges in the Sierra Nevada mountains, with much larger home ranges in the summer (541km² for females, 723km² for males) compared to those in the winter (349km² for females, 569km² for males). These patterns likely reflect the abundance and distribution of deer – during the winter deer would be concentrated at lower elevations, which allowed mountain lions to reduce their home ranges, while in the summer deer could disperse to higher elevations and the mountain lions would expand their ranges accordingly (Grigione et al. 2002). However, seasonal variation was not as pronounced and had the reverse trend in Coastal California mountain ranges, including in the SAM, where the average area of winter home ranges was slightly larger (100km² for females, 350km² for males) than summer home ranges (90km² for females, 300km² for males) (Grigione et al. 2002). These differences were not statistically significant, and this pattern is likely due to the moderate year-round climate in the coastal ranges, where prey abundance and distribution does not exhibit as extreme shifts as those in the Sierra Nevada (Grigione et al. 2002). This generally aligns with Zeller et al. (2017), who found that mountain lion home ranges in the SAM and EPR ranged from 41-497 km², with mean home range sizes of 188km² for females and 316 km² for males. And Riley et al. (2014) found that CC-S mountain lions had home ranges similar in size to the SAM and EPR mountain lions, with female home ranges being 100-200km² and male home ranges being 300-500 km². According to the Santa Cruz Puma Project, in the Santa Cruz Mountains female home ranges are on average about 100 km² and male home ranges are about 230 km² (Santa Cruz Puma Project 2015). Although studies are limited regarding the home range size of the CC-C and SGSB mountain lions, given their close proximity and similar seasonality to other Central Coast and Southern California populations, they are likely similar.

2.6 *Survivorship and Mortality*

According to the National Park Service (NPS), mountain lions can live up to 13 years in the wild. As a top carnivore with no natural predators, conspecifics and humans are the main drivers of mountain lion survivorship and mortality. Although studies regarding kitten (<18 months), subadult (18-30 months), and adult (>30 months) survivorship are limited, some long-term studies of radio-collared mountain lions on the CC-S, SAM, and EPR provide valuable insights for these Central Coast and Southern California populations (Beier and Barrett 1993; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015).

In a study conducted in the CC-S area (which encompasses the Santa Monica Mountains, Simi Hills, and Santa Susana Mountains) that included 42 mountain lions from 2002 to 2012, Riley et al. (2014) found an annual adult survival of $\geq 75\%$, though Benson et al. (2016a) found

lower subadult survival rates. Although adult survival in the CC-S is similar to previous studies conducted in California and the southwestern US (Beier 1993; Logan and Sweaner 2001), it is higher than what was found in the SAM and EPR populations during the same time period. From following 74 radio-collared mountain lions from 2001 to 2013, Vickers et al. (2015) found an annual survival rate across all age groups of 56.5% and 55.4% in the SAM and EPR, respectively.



In the Santa Monica Mountains: Female mountain lion P-23 hunted down a deer on Mulholland Drive (left). In 2018 she was killed by a vehicle strike on Malibu Canyon Road. An uncollared mountain lion killed by a vehicle strike on Malibu Canyon Road in 2004 (right). Photos: NPS

Vehicle strikes, depredation kills, and intraspecific strife (including male aggression towards conspecifics and infanticide) are the primary causes of mortality in the Central Coast and Southern California populations (Beier 1993; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015). Other known causes of death in California mountain lion populations include rodenticide poisoning, disease, poaching/illegally killing, starvation/abandonment, public safety removal, and human-caused wildfires (Beier 1993; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015). Causes of mortality will be discussed more in depth in *Section 5.0 Abundance and Population Trends* and *Section 6.0 Factors Affecting Ability to Survive and Reproduce*.

3 Southern California and Central Coast Mountain Lions Comprise an Evolutionarily Significant Unit

3.1 CESA Provides for Listing of ESUs

CESA defines an “endangered species” as a species or subspecies of animal or plant that is in serious danger of becoming extinct through either all or “a significant portion” of its range. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2062.) A “threatened species” is likely to become an endangered species in the foreseeable future in the absence of special protection and management efforts. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2067.) CDFW has concluded—and appellate courts have upheld—that the term “range” is construed to refer to the range of a species or subspecies *within* California, not the worldwide range of the species or subspecies. (*California Forestry Assn. v. California Fish & Game Com.* (2007) 156 Cal.App.4th 1535, 1550-551.) This means that a species or subspecies which may not be endangered in other states or countries may still be endangered within California. Courts also have confirmed that the phrase “significant portion” of

a range authorizes CDFW to designate certain populations of a species or subspecies as “evolutionarily significant units” or “ESUs” and list such populations as endangered under CESA. (*Id.* at 1549; *Central Coast Forest Assn. v. Fish & Game Com.* (2018) 18 Cal.App.5th 1191, 1236-37 [“CCFA I^P”].) In other words, ESUs are a population of a species or subspecies “that is considered distinct for purposes of conservation.” (*Central Coast Forest Assn. v. Fish & Game Com.* (2012) 211 Cal.App.4th 1433, 1439 fn 5 [depublished] [“CCFA I^P”].)

CDFW has confirmed that the use of ESUs to evaluate the status of species pursuant to CESA is appropriate.⁵ In the *Status Review of Fisher*, CDFW designated fishers in northern California and the southern Sierra Nevada as two separate ESUs based upon the reproductive isolation of these fisher populations and the degree of genetic differentiation between them. In designating these ESUs, CDFW highlighted the need to maintain “geographically widespread and genetically diverse” populations of the species.

3.2 *Southern California and Central Coast Mountain Lions are Significantly Reproductively Isolated from Other Populations and Form an ESU*

Southern California and Central Coast mountain lion populations could be grouped into one or several potential ESUs. However, petitioners believe that for purposes of listing under CESA, treating the CC-N, CC-C, CC-S, SAM, SGSB, and EPR populations as a single Southern California/Central Coast ESU is both supported by the best available science and makes sense from a management perspective. Gustafson et al. (2018) suggest that the North Coast and inland populations (Nevada, Eastern Sierra Nevada, and Western Sierra Nevada) may form an ESU (hereinafter “North Coast/Inland ESU”) given that they were found to be genetically diverse and well-connected. Due to extreme isolation and high levels of human-caused mortalities, functional connectivity between Southern California and Central Coast mountain lion populations and the healthier North Coast/Inland ESU has become severely impaired (Gustafson et al. 2018, see further discussion in *Section 2.2 Taxonomy and Population Genetics* and *Section 6.0 Factors Affecting Ability to Survive and Reproduce*). There is a tenuous link made up of small mountain ranges (*i.e.*, Tehachapi and Sierra Pelona Mountains) that connect the North Coast/Inland ESU with the proposed Southern California/Central Coast ESU. Thus, although there is some (limited) connectivity between the North Coast/Inland ESU and the proposed ESU, as a practical matter under current management the two ESUs are functionally isolated.

Southern California and Central Coast populations have lower levels of genetic diversity and are relatively disconnected from each other compared to North Coast and inland populations. The Central Coast populations form a genetic cluster while the SAM and EPR populations form a second, less connected genetic cluster (Figure 4) (Gustafson et al. 2018). The SGSB population, though isolated, is most genetically similar to the Western Sierra Nevada, CC-C, and EPR populations, which indicates that it is an important intersection for statewide genetic connectivity (Figure 4) (Gustafson et al. 2018).

Genetic source-sink dynamics are informative in determining gene flow among the populations and how they are connected. Five genetic source populations were identified: the

⁵ California Department of Fish and Wildlife, *Status Review of Fisher* (June 10, 2015), available at <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=101470>.

Eastern and Western Sierra Nevada populations, CC-N, CC-C, and EPR (Gustafson et al. 2018). The Sierra Nevada populations were the greatest genetic source populations and the CC-N population had only weak evidence of being a source population (Gustafson et al. 2018). The CC-S, SGSB, and SAM were identified as genetic sink populations with limited connectivity to source populations (Figure 4) (Gustafson et al. 2018). Maintaining and reestablishing genetic connectivity with source populations like the CC-C, EPR, and Western Sierra Nevada populations are important for the long-term viability of Southern California and Central Coast populations (Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015; Benson et al. 2016a; Gray et al. 2016; Gustafson et al. 2017). This underscores the importance of the Tehachapi and Sierra Pelona Mountains as the key remaining linkage, though tenuous, for statewide genetic connectivity.




Figure 4. Functional connectedness of California mountain lion populations. Each color represents a genetically distinct population. In (a), the results of the discriminant analysis of principal components shows connectivity among California mountain lions. The x-axis represents latitude with north to the left and south to the right. The y-axis represents longitude, separating the Central Coast populations from Southern California populations. In (b), estimated migration rates between populations are shown. Source-sink dynamics are indicated by positive (source) or negative (sink) net migration rates. Source: Gustafson et al. (2018).

While genetics as currently understood could support several different ESU formulations, petitioners believe a single Southern California/Central Coast ESU is the most pragmatic from a management perspective, as recovery of the individual subpopulations ultimately depends upon maintaining and/or reestablishing connectivity between them. *See CCFA II*, 18 Cal.App.5th 1191, 1237 (“[T]he nature of the ESU designation is such that genetics alone are not determinative: One must look beyond genetics to questions of policy to determine which populations to include in an ESU.”) (quotations omitted). Designating Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions as an ESU would help ensure “geographically widespread and genetically diverse” populations of mountain lions in California.

While petitioners believe that listing of a single Southern California/Central Coast ESU as threatened is both a permissible and prudent course of action for the Commission, petitioners also request that as additional data become available over the course of CDFW conducting its status review that the agency also assess other possible ESU formulations for Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions. One such formulation would be to group all three Central Coast populations (CC-N, CC-C and CC-S) into one ESU, with the remaining three

populations placed into a second ESU (SAM, EPR and SGSB). Alternatively, the Central Coast populations could be treated as one ESU, SAM and EPR as a second ESU, and SGSB separately listed as a third ESU. Petitioners believe the genetic data in Gustafson et al. (2018) could support each of these alternative formulations. Lastly, given each of the six populations at issue are themselves already genetically distinguishable and occupy significant portions of the range of mountain lions in California, each could be separately treated as an ESU. Under this formulation, the SAM and CC-S populations would clearly warrant endangered listing, the CC-C and EPR populations would warrant threatened listing, and the CC-N and SGSB populations would warrant at least threatened and likely endangered listing.

3.3 Proposed Boundary of the Southern California/Central Coast ESU

We propose the Southern California/Central Coast ESU to include mountain lions that occur in areas east of the Pacific Ocean, south of the San Francisco Bay Area waters and I-80, west of I-5 to the intersection of I-5 and SR-58 at Bowerbank/Buttonwillow, south of SR-58 to I-15, south of the I-15 from the SR-58 intersection to the California-Nevada border, and, for the purposes of CESA, north of the California-Mexico border (Figure 5). These boundaries are recommended as they include virtually all mountain lions associated with the six populations comprising the ESU and are also unambiguous and readily discernable for purposes of management.⁶

⁶ In the event the Commission determines that the proposed ESU should instead be treated as separate Southern California (SAM, EPR, SGSB) and Central Coast (CS-N, CS-C, CS-S) ESUs, we propose the boundary between them to be delimited by I-5 and I-710.




Figure 5. Map of the Southern California/Central Coast ESU boundary. Derived from Gustafson et al. (2018). Genetics data source: Kyle Gustafson, PhD, Department of Biology and Environmental Health, Missouri Southern State University, and Holly Ernest, DVM, PhD, Department of Veterinary Sciences, Program in Ecology, University of Wyoming, Laramie. Roads data source: ESRI.

We recommend including mountain lions in the Tehachapi and Sierra Pelona Mountains south of SR-58 in the Southern California/Central Coast ESU. While most mountain lions sampled from this region share some genetic affinities with Western Sierra Nevada (WSN) animals, individuals sampled in the Tehachapi Mountains and surrounding areas, including the Sierra Pelona Mountains in the Angeles National Forest and the Los Padres National Forest, had genetic structures made up of multiple genetic populations from the northern, central coastal, and southern populations (Figure 6). This area serves not just as a connecting link between mountain lion populations comprising the Southern California/Central Coast ESU, but also between this ESU and all other California mountain lions. The Tehachapi and Sierra Pelona Mountains are the last remaining linkages for statewide genetic connectivity and are critical for the overall genetic health of Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions. Consequently, mountain lions in these areas should be considered part of the listed entity.




Figure 6. Map of mountain lion genetic structure in and surrounding the Tehachapi and Sierra Pelona Mountains, the last remaining linkage between the coastal, southern, and northern populations. Data source: Kyle Gustafson, PhD, Department of Biology and Environmental Health, Missouri Southern State University, and Holly Ernest, DVM, PhD, Department of Veterinary Sciences, Program in Ecology, University of Wyoming, Laramie.

3.4 *Southern California and Central Coast Mountains Lions are Essential to the Region's Biodiversity*

Additional support for designation of a Southern California/Central Coast ESU is provided by the fact that mountain lions are a keystone species critical to maintaining biodiversity in coastal California's ecosystems. The loss of these mountain lions—which are the only remaining large predator in the region—would lead to a trophic cascade wherein deer populations would increase and overgraze vegetation due to the lack of predation and lack of risk of predation, causing other repercussions to other species and habitats (Ripple and Beschta 2006; Ripple and Beschta 2008; Ripple et al. 2014). In addition, their kills are an important source of food for multiple terrestrial and avian scavengers (Ruth and Elbroch 2014; Elbroch et al. 2017; Barry et al. 2019).

Ripple and Beschta (2006) highlighted the critical role of mountain lions in western ecosystems by comparing habitat quality and the levels of biodiversity in two separate areas of Zion National Park – Zion Canyon, which mountain lions generally avoid due to high human presence, and North Creek, which mountain lions inhabit due to less human presence. The sustained lack of mountain lions in Zion Canyon has led to an unnaturally high density of deer, which has had profound impacts on Zion Canyon ecosystems. Ripple and Beschta (2006) observed Zion Canyon had low numbers of hydrophytic plants, wildflowers, amphibians, lizards, and butterflies while North Creek had significantly higher numbers in each of these categories.

North Creek riparian areas had well vegetated and stable banks while Zion Canyon lacked bank vegetation and its banks were continuing to erode (Ripple and Beschta 2006). The study noted that such geomorphic transformation of stream channels where mountain lions were absent were caused by plant loss on stream banks, which led to high levels of erosion and sedimentation, less shading and higher water temperatures, a larger width:depth ratio in streams, loss of hydrologic connectivity with historical floodplains, and loss of a wide variety of species, including native plants, benthic invertebrates, butterflies, fish, amphibians, and reptiles (Ripple and Beschta 2006).

The study concluded that removing a large carnivore from an ecosystem “appears to have [] profound effects on lower trophic levels, as well as multiple indicators of ecosystem status and native species abundance.” (Ripple and Beschta 2006.) A similar study found that in Yosemite Valley—where mountain lions are largely absent due to high human presence—deer populations have expanded leading to a lack of oak recruitment and a decrease in biodiversity (Ripple and Beschta 2008). And their kills support disproportionately high levels of mammal, bird, and invertebrate diversity (Ruth and Elbroch 2014; Elbroch et al. 2017; Barry et al. 2019) and may even play a role in tree and other vegetation growth (Ruth and Elbroch 2014). In sum, extinction of Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions would result in degraded habitats and reduced abundance and diversity of other species, likely undermining the biological diversity, ecosystem function, and resilience of California's coastal regions.

3.5 *Californians Derive Aesthetic, Recreational, and Economic Value from Southern California and Central Coast Mountain Lions*

The people of California derive aesthetic, recreational, economic, spiritual, scientific, educational, and emotional value from Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions. For instance, the City of Los Angeles has designated October 22 as “P-22 day” to honor a young (and mate-less) male mountain lion that lives in Griffith Park and to acknowledge the importance of Southern California mountain lions to the region. Many people view mountain lions as a symbol of wildness and cherish landscapes that still are home to these predators. People from within and beyond the region choose to recreate, hike, bike, camp, fish, and hunt in California’s wildlands in part because they enjoy exploring and sharing landscapes with mountain lions. And these activities are a significant economic driver for the state: A report commissioned for California State Parks found that direct outdoor recreation expenditures for Los Angeles, Southern California, the Central Coast and the San Francisco Bay Area totaled nearly \$15 billion per year.⁷ The Outdoor Industry Association concluded that outdoor recreation in California generates \$92 billion of consumer spending annually and directly employs 691,000 Californians—more jobs than the wine and television industry combined.⁸

Mountain lions also provide an economic and social benefit because, by controlling deer populations, they reduce collisions between deer and automobiles. There are 1.2 million deer-vehicle collisions in the United States per year, incurring an estimated \$1.66 billion in damages, 29,000 injuries, and 200 deaths (Gilbert et al. 2016). Impacts of deer-vehicle collisions are particularly severe in the eastern United States where white-tailed deer are overabundant. Gilbert et al. (2016) determined that if mountain lions recolonized the eastern United States, their presence would result in a 22 percent decline in deer-vehicle collisions over thirty years.

It is estimated that 7,000 to 23,000 wildlife vehicle collisions have occurred annually on California roads (Shilling et al. 2017; Shilling et al. 2018; State Farm Insurance Company 2016, 2018). These crashes result in human loss of life, injuries, emotional trauma, and property damages that can add up to \$300-600 million per year (Shilling et al. 2018). If Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions became extinct, there would likely be a significant increase in deer-vehicle collisions in the region, along with associated human fatalities, injuries, and property damage.

An overabundance of deer in the eastern United States is also linked to an increase in ticks, which has led to increased incidences of Lyme disease among humans (Telford 2017; Côté et al. 2004). Lyme disease is now the most common vector-borne illness in the United States, with over 30,000 cases per year, primarily in the eastern United States.⁹ Increases in deer abundance and attendant increases in ticks and tick-borne disease among humans would be

⁷ BBC Research & Consulting, *California Outdoor Recreation Economic Study: Statewide Contribution and Benefits* (2010), available at <https://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/795/files/ca%20outdoor%20rec%20econ%20study-statewide%2011-10-11%20for%20posting.pdf>.

⁸ Outdoor Industry Association, *California Recreation Report*, available at https://outdoorindustry.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/OIA_RecEcoState_CA.pdf.

⁹ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Lyme Disease Data and Surveillance*, available at https://www.cdc.gov/lyme/datasurveillance/index.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Flyme%2Fstats%2Findex.html.

expected if Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions became extinct. Loss of Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions would have far-reaching effects not only on California's ecology, but also on public health and the region's economy.

Protection of Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions under CESA would confirm that this species is a vital member of our ecosystems which is worthy of protection. Conservation of these mountain lions would provide compelling evidence that large carnivores and abundant human populations can co-exist, even in densely populated landscapes (Benson et al. 2019).

4 Historical and Current Distribution

Mountain lions once had the most expansive range of any New World terrestrial mammal (Seidensticker 1991). They roamed most of the Americas (excluding most of Alaska and the northern areas of Canada) from approximately 50° N to 50°S latitude and could be found from sea level to about 4,000m elevation (Young and Goldman 1946, Pierce and Bleich 2003) in habitats varying from dense forests, to dry deserts, savannahs, and swamp lands.

Due to habitat loss and hunting after the arrival of European colonists, the mountain lion's current range has been reduced to one third of its historical range in North America (Figure 7) (Culver et al. 2000; Pierce and Bleich 2003). In the United States, the species' range has been reduced to 15 western states and a small remnant population in Florida (endangered Florida panthers [*Puma concolor coryi*]), with isolated animals occasionally appearing in additional states. Continued hunting pressure and changes in land management practices have pushed most populations into mountainous, relatively unpopulated areas, though isolated populations are known to occur in more urban areas (Currier 1983; Gustafson et al. 2018).




Figure 7. Historical and current range of mountain lions. Source: Hansen 1992.

In California, habitat fragmentation from roads and development has led to highly fragmented, divergent populations (Ernest et al. 2003; Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015; Gustafson et al. 2018). As mentioned in *Section 2.2 Taxonomy and Population Genetics*, nine genetically distinct populations have been identified within California

(Gustafson et al. 2018), with Southern California and Central Coast populations being the most constrained populations (and a tenth population centered in Nevada but extending slightly into California). Those located in highly urbanized areas of Southern California coastal mountain ranges, including the CC-S, SAM, and SGSB populations are especially restricted (Figure 8) (Vickers et al. 2015; Benson et al. 2016a; Gustafson et al. 2018; Benson et al. 2019).




Figure 8. Map of genetically distinct mountain lion populations and major roads in California. The CC-S (which includes the Santa Monica Mountains), SGSB, and SAM populations are exceptionally constrained. The map is based on data collected from 1992-2016 (the division and status of these populations could change over time and with further research. Derived from Gustafson et al. (2018). Genetics data source: Kyle Gustafson, PhD, Department of Biology and Environmental Health, Missouri Southern State University, and Holly Ernest, DVM, PhD, Department of Veterinary Sciences, Program in Ecology, University of Wyoming, Laramie. Roads data source: ESRI.

4.1 Central Coast North (CC-N) Mountain Lion Population

The CC-N mountain lion population occurs mostly within the counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz (Figure 8). The area is almost divided into two portions: an eastern half and a western half. The Santa Cruz Mountains make up the core area of the CC-N, bound by the Pacific Coast to the west, development lining the San Francisco Bay to the north and north west, and Highway 101 to the south. The eastern portion of the CC-N consists of various open space and nature preserves in the Berkeley Hills and Diablo Range bound by development lining the San Francisco Bay and Highway 101 and associated developments to the west, San Pablo Bay and Suisun Bay and associated developments to the north, I-5 to the east, and State Route 130 (SR-130) to the south. Interestingly, the CC-N seems almost bisected by the San Francisco Bay and Highway 101 and associated developments.

4.2 Central Coast Central (CC-C) Mountain Lion Population

The CC-C mountain lion population occurs mostly within the counties of Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Barbara. The area encompasses the central and southern portions of the Southern Coast Ranges, including the Santa Lucia Range, Sierra de Salinas, the Temblor Range, and the Sierra Madre Mountains. It is bound by the Pacific Ocean to the west, Highway 101 and SR-156 and associated development to the north, the I-5 and San Joaquin Valley to the east, and SR-126 and associated developments to the south (Figure 8).

4.3 Central Coast South (CC-S) Mountain Lion Population

The CC-S mountain lion population is limited to the Santa Monica Mountains, Simi Hills, and the Santa Susana Mountains in Ventura and Los Angeles Counties (Figure 8). The Santa Monica Mountains population has the isolated area with about 660 km² within the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area (Riley et al. 2014). The Pacific Ocean lies to the south while the cities of Oxnard, Thousand Oaks, San Fernando Valley, Los Angeles, and Santa Monica and major freeways including Highway 101, Interstate 5 (I-5) and Interstate 405 surround the area and create major movement barriers.

The Simi Hills is a smaller area of open space located north of the Santa Monica Mountains; the areas are bisected by Highway 101. This open space is mostly surrounded by development, including Simi Valley to the northwest, Thousand Oaks to the west, Agoura Hills to the southwest, Calabasas to the southeast, and Woodland Hills, Canoga Park, and Chatsworth to the east.

The Santa Susana Mountains are located north of the Santa Monica Mountains and Simi Hills. The area is generally bordered by freeways and the edges of development and agriculture. SR-118 borders the south and southwest, SR-126 borders the north and northwest, and I-5 borders the east.

4.4 *San Gabriel/San Bernardino Mountains (SGSB) Mountain Lion Population*

The SGSB mountain lion population occurs within the Transverse Ranges located northwest of the City of Los Angeles within Los Angeles, Kern, and San Bernardino Counties (Figure 8). The western and southern boundaries of the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains are lined with urban developments and major freeways, including the San Fernando Valley, cities of San Bernardino, Rancho Cucamonga, and West Covina, and the I-5, I-210, and I-10 freeways. The northern and eastern boundaries of the area are abutted by agriculture, suburban development, high desert, and roads.

4.5 *Santa Ana Mountains (SAM) Mountain Lion Population*

The SAM mountain lion population inhabits about 1,533km² of undeveloped areas of the SAM within Orange, Riverside, and San Diego Counties (Beier and Barrett 1993; Benson et al. 2019). The area is mostly bound by major freeways and development (Figure 8). SR-241 creates the western boundary, SR-91 borders the northwest boundary, I-5 creates the eastern boundary, and agriculture and development border the southern extent. The closest intact habitat known to be used by other mountain lions is to the east/southeast, in the Peninsular Ranges.

4.6 *Eastern Peninsular Range (EPR) Mountain Lion Population*

The EPR mountain lion population occurs in mountain ranges east of the SAM and south of the San Bernardino Mountains. The EPR is a predominantly north to south range that runs through San Diego, Riverside, and Imperial Counties and the California-Mexico border. They include the San Jacinto, Laguna, and San Ysidro Mountains in California and continue south into the mountain ranges of Baja California, Mexico. The western boundary of the EPR population is lined with roads and urban development, including areas around the cities of Escondido, San Diego, and Chula Vista. Studies regarding the northern, southern, and eastern extent of the population are limited; however, movement patterns documented by Vickers et al. (2015) and Vickers et al. (2017) between 2001 and 2016 suggest that EPR mountain lions generally stay north of the U.S. – Mexico border, along the edges of the desert that borders the east side of the EPR, and south of I-10. Although the EPR population has been found to be largely disconnected from all other California populations, some mountain lion movement was documented traversing between the EPR and SGSB (Vickers et al. 2015), which would have occurred at the northern boundary of the EPR, and there is evidence of limited genetic exchange between the two populations (Gustafson et al. 2018). In addition, one young male mountain lion was documented to the south using the Parque-to-Park Linkage to cross the US-Mexico border several times (where the terrain is too rugged to install a border wall), but he was eventually killed in Mexico in a collision with a vehicle (Vickers et al. 2015; W. Vickers *unpublished data*). Little is known about the mountain lions south of the border, but the movement patterns of EPR mountain lions suggest that they may form a discrete population within the EPR north of the US-Mexico border (Vickers et al. 2015; Vickers et al. 2017).

5 Abundance and Population Trends

According to the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), mountain lion populations are decreasing throughout their remaining range (Nielsen et al. 2015). Mountain lion population densities are generally low, which may be driven by prey density, competition between males for access to females, and mutual avoidance (Pierce and Bleich 2003). In the United States, population densities for mountain lions have been found to range from 0.4 to 4.3 resident adults per 100km² and 0.4 to 7.1 total mountain lions per 100km², though it varies by population and the presence of human-induced pressures (*e.g.*, hunting) (Pierce and Bleich 2003). In California, where hunting has been outlawed but other anthropogenic pressures such as roads and development are present, resident adult and total population densities have been found to be 1.1 and 3.6 per 100 km², respectively (Pierce and Bleich 2003). Adult sex ratio has been reported to be about 2-3:1 in favor of females (Hornocker 1970; Seidensticker et al. 1973; Beier 1993; Santa Cruz Puma Project 2015). These low population densities and female-biased sex ratios further highlight the species' need for expansive, connected, heterogeneous habitats to support viable populations.

It has been estimated that 4,000 to 6,000 adult mountain lions roam California (Mansfield and Weaver 1989). However, CDFW acknowledges that this estimate from 1984 is outdated and relied on density estimates from regional studies to derive a statewide abundance. The agency has since declared that the number of mountain lions throughout the state is unknown, and they have embarked on an intensive statewide research project to better understand mountain lion numbers regionally and throughout the state.¹⁰ Working with other agencies, academic institutions, and non-profits, CDFW plans to have statewide and region-specific mountain lion population estimates by 2022 (Vaughan 2018).

As mentioned in *Section 2.2 Taxonomy and Population Genetics*, one way in which the abundance of mountain lions can be estimated is with the ratio of effective to total adult population size (N_e/N) of 0.25 to 0.5, as was used by USFWS to generate an abundance estimate for the endangered Florida panther (Ballou et al. 1989; USFWS 2008). Using this method with the estimated effective population sizes of the nine genetically distinct mountain lion populations centered in California from Gustafson et al. (2018) and Benson et al. (2019), the statewide total population would be 818 to 1,634 individuals (255 to 510 in the Central Coast and Southern California populations [Table 1], and 563 to 1,124 in the remaining Eastern Sierra Nevada, Western Sierra Nevada, and North Coast populations), which is much lower than the 4,000 to 6,000 estimate. This is also well below the recommended minimum viable population size of at least 5,000 adult individuals for the long-term persistence of a population (Frankham 1995; Reed et al. 2003; Traill et al. 2010). Petitioners recognize that the N_e/N methodology has limitations and is but one method of generating an overall abundance estimate. More studies are needed to determine regional and statewide mountain lion abundance, including CDFW's ongoing efforts which should produce a more scientifically robust statewide abundance estimate.

¹⁰ CDFW 2018 - Commonly Asked Questions About Mountain Lions. Accessed on 11 April 2019 at: <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Mammals/Mountain-Lion/FAQ#359951241-how-many-mountain-lions-are-in-california>

Despite unknown statewide population estimates, researchers have been closely tracking several of the Central Coast and Southern California populations. Through their published studies and reports they provide some insights regarding abundance and population trends for these populations.

5.1 *Central Coast North (CC-N) Mountain Lion Population*

Studies on the CC-N mountain lion population are limited, and abundance and population trends are unknown. However, with an effective population size of 16.6 (Gustafson et al. 2018), and an N_e/N of 0.25 to 0.5 (Ballou et al. 1989; USFWS 2008), the estimated total adult population would be 33 to 66 individuals (see Table 1). As mentioned previously in *Section 2.2 Taxonomy and Population Genetics*, these numbers are grossly insufficient to prevent inbreeding depression in the short term or maintain evolutionary potential in the long term (Jamieson and Allendorf 2012; Frankham et al. 2014).

Gustafson et al. (2018) found that this population has low genetic diversity and a low effective population size, which suggests that it is at increased risk of inbreeding depression within five generations and eventual extinction. Ongoing studies in the Santa Cruz Mountains highlight high levels of human-caused mortalities. Depredation kills are the leading cause of death in collared mountain lions in the Santa Cruz Mountains (Wang et al. 2017), and CDFW reported 34 depredation kills between 2010 and 2016 in the CC-N counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz (see Appendix A¹¹). In addition, at least six mountain lions have been killed by vehicle strikes on Highway 17 in the Santa Cruz Mountains between 2008 and 2018 (Midpensinsula Regional Open Space 2017; Slade 2018) and news outlets reported at least three mountain lions killed by vehicle strikes on the I-280 in San Mateo County between 2014 and 2016 (Wilmers 2014, CBS SF 2015, Kamala 2016). The poor genetic health of the CC-N population is likely due to habitat fragmentation and isolation caused by roads and development combined with high levels of human-caused mortalities. CDFW has identified the Santa Cruz Mountains population as at risk due to current habitat and genetic concerns, at-risk internal habitat and connectivity, limited external connectivity, and lack of protected habitat (Dellinger 2019). Poor connectivity and continued development in the CC-N will likely lead to further isolation, increased human-caused mortalities, decreased genetic diversity, and increased risk of extinction in the foreseeable future.

5.2 *Central Coast Central (CC-C) Mountain Lion Population*

Studies on the CC-C mountain lion population are limited, and abundance and population trends are unknown. However, with an effective population size of 56.6 (Gustafson et al. 2018), and an N_e/N of 0.25 to 0.5 (Ballou et al. 1989; USFWS 2008), the estimated total adult population would be 113 to 226 individuals (see Table 1).

Although Gustafson et al. (2018) found that this population has intermediate levels of genetic diversity and the highest effective population size among the Central Coast and Southern

¹¹ These data were downloaded from the CDFW website; however, they no longer appear to be available online. These numbers have been shown to be low by a factor of two in some areas, likely due to incomplete reporting, and therefore should be considered absolute minimums (W. Vickers, *pers comm*).

California mountain lion populations, with an effective population size of 56.6, it just barely exceeds the older standard of 50 to prevent inbreeding depression in the short-term (Frankham et al. 2014; Gustafson et al. 2018). In addition, it falls well below the recommended newer standard of 100 and is insufficient for the long-term viability of the population (Frankham et al. 2014). And the lack of sufficient protected lands and high rates of development in the area threaten the persistence of this population (Dellinger 2019). Thus, although the CC-C population appears to be the healthiest population in the Central Coast and Southern California, it is still at increased risk of inbreeding depression and extinction, and connectivity to smaller adjacent areas should be improved (Dellinger 2019).

5.3 Central Coast South (CC-S) Mountain Lion Population

The NPS has been studying the CC-S population since 2002, though most studies regarding population dynamics focus on the Santa Monica Mountains mountain lions (Riley et al. 2014; Benson et al. 2019). Since 2002, NPS has collected data from 55 mountain lions within the Santa Monica Mountains and 19 mountain lions from the Simi Hills and Santa Susana Mountains.¹² There are currently 20-25 live mountain lions being tracked in the Santa Monica Mountains, 7-12 of which are adults (born in 2014 or earlier, the status of 5 adults are unknown) and 13 of which are juveniles or subadults (born in 2015 or later).¹³ Given that the Santa Monica Mountains area is relatively small, adult survival rate is high ($\geq 75\%$), and juvenile/subadult survival is low due to intraspecific strife and the inability to disperse, the Santa Monica Mountains population is likely space-limited and these numbers may represent the Santa Monica Mountains' carrying capacity (Riley et al. 2014; Benson et al. 2019). As mentioned previously in *Section 2.2 Taxonomy and Population Genetics*, the extremely low effective population size and total adult population size are grossly insufficient to prevent inbreeding depression in the short term or maintain evolutionary potential in the long term (Jamieson and Allendorf 2012; Frankham et al. 2014). And CDFW has identified the CC-S population as at risk due to current habitat and genetic concerns, at-risk internal habitat and connectivity, limited external connectivity, and lack of protected habitat (Dellinger 2019).

The long-term survival of the Santa Monica Mountains population is severely threatened due to extreme habitat fragmentation and isolation caused by surrounding roads and development that impede movement in or out of the area (Riley et al. 2014). Limited space and lack of connectivity with suitable mountain lion habitat inhibit dispersal for subadults and likely drive unusually high levels of intraspecific strife, which is the most common cause of mortalities in the

¹² The NPS provides puma profiles (last updated August-November 2018) of the marked animals (*i.e.*, tagged or radio-collared) they have been studying in the CC-S, which includes those studied in Riley et al. (2014). Some data presented in this section take these data into account. Accessed on 3 April 2019 at: <https://www.nps.gov/samo/learn/nature/puma-profiles.htm>.

¹³ The adult population in the Santa Monica Mountains is generally consistent with the estimated 0.25 to 0.5 N_e/N ; the Santa Monica Mountains was estimated to have an effective population size of four (Benson et al. 2019), which would suggest a total adult population size of 8 to 16. Interestingly, Gustafson et al. (2018) estimated an effective population size of 2.7 for the greater CC-S population, which would indicate a total adult population of 5 to 10 individuals throughout the Santa Monica Mountains, Simi Hills, and Santa Susana Mountains (see Table 1). There are currently 10 to 17 adult mountain lions being tracked throughout the CC-S area, which would put their N_e/N ratio at 0.16 to 0.27, which is still within the range of other species' N_e/N ratios (Frankham et al. 1995; Ballou et al. 1989; Mace and Lande 1991; Spong et al. 2000; Laundré and Clark 2003).

area (Riley et al. 2014). Although intraspecific strife is known to occur among mountain lions, there have been multiple cases of aggressive adult males killing their siblings, female offspring, and previous mates documented in the Santa Monica Mountains population, and researchers noted that “clearly this is rarely a sound evolutionary strategy as the survivorship of offspring or siblings is traded against the probability of future reproduction” (Riley et al. 2014). For 23 radio-collared individuals within the Santa Monica Mountains for which the cause of death is known, nine deaths were the result of intraspecific strife. Eight of the nine deaths (89%) were of animals less than four years old. In addition, three uncollared mountain lions in the Santa Monica Mountains less than four years old were found dead by intraspecific strife, which brings the total to 12 deaths by intraspecific strife documented in the Santa Monica Mountains between 2002 and 2018.

Although all subadult males and half of subadult females typically disperse from their natal areas (Logan and Sweanor 2010), only one subadult successfully dispersed from the Santa Monica Mountains between 2002 to 2012 – P-22, the famous male mountain lion who successfully crossed Highway 101 and I-405 freeways and established his home range in Griffith Park (Riley et al. 2014). Unfortunately, P-22 is extremely isolated with the smallest home range ever reported for an adult male (26km²), and he has not had any opportunities to mate (Riley et al. 2014). In addition, vehicle strikes account for 17% (4/23) of known radio-collared mountain lion deaths in the Santa Monica Mountains. According to the NPS, most males in the Santa Monica Mountains do not live past the age of two. Thus, many healthy, young animals are not able to disperse from the Santa Monica Mountains, establish their own home ranges, and successfully reproduce.

Conversely, lack of connectivity also inhibits migrants coming from outside the Santa Monica Mountains and contributing to the population’s gene pool. Only two outside mountain lions have been known to immigrate into the Santa Monica Mountains since 2002: P12 (from Simi Hills, alive as of August 2018, age 12) and P45 (from north of Highway 101, status unknown, age would be 6-7 if alive). While there has been no sign of P-45 since February, 2019 and no offspring from him have been detected, P-12 has been fairly prolific in the Santa Monica Mountains, fathering at least eight litters. Although P-12’s appearance initially improved genetic diversity in the Santa Monica Mountains population, consistent immigration in small populations is needed so that the genetic diversity gains of immigrant mountain lions are not lost (Riley et al. 2014; Benson et al. 2016a; Benson et al. 2019). Subsequent inbreeding by P-12 with his daughters and granddaughters and inbreeding already occurring with other breeding adults in the Santa Monica Mountains have led to dangerously low genetic diversity (Riley et al. 2014; Benson et al. 2016a; Gustafson et al. 2018; Benson et al. 2019). With continued isolation, inbreeding, and loss of genetic diversity, there is increasing risk of inbreeding depression and extinction. With inbreeding depression, the probability of extinction within 50 years is predicted to be 99.7 %, with a median time to extinction of 15.1 years (Benson et al. 2016a; Benson et al. 2019).

5.4 Santa Ana Mountains (SAM) Population

Restricted habitat availability and high mortality rates in the SAM likely limits population size, and Benson et al. (2019) estimated that the SAM population is likely comprised of 16 adults and 13 juveniles (kittens and subadults). These numbers are slightly lower than the 31 to 62 adult mountain lions estimated from the SAM population's effective population size of 15.6 (Gustafson et al. 2018) (see Table 1). According to (Benson et al. 2019), high levels of human-caused adult mortalities may limit growth potential in the SAM, and it is uncertain if the population could be larger without as many anthropogenic pressures. In fact, although hunting is illegal in California, mountain lions in Southern California have a lower annual survival than many hunted populations (Vickers 2014). Interestingly, other studies calculated a much lower effective population size of 5.1 (Ernest et al. 2014) and four (Benson et al. 2019), which would align with the suggested carrying capacity. Regardless of which effective population size is used, they are all well below the frequently-used threshold of 50 and insufficient to prevent inbreeding depression in the short-term.

Although population trends are unclear, two long-term studies on radio-collared mountain lions in the SAM provide some insight (Beier 1993; Vickers et al. 2015). In a study that consisted of 32 radio-collared animals in the SAM from 1988 to 1993, researchers found a 75% adult survival rate (Beier and Barrett 1993), which is similar to adult survival rates in other populations, like the CC-S population (Riley et al. 2014). However, in a second, more recent study conducted in the area consisting of 31 marked mountain lions from 2001 to 2013, researchers found a 56.5% survival rate across all sexes and age groups (Vickers et al. 2015). The marked decrease in adult survival rate between the two studies coincides with an increase in the proportion of mortalities caused by vehicle strikes, with the 1988-1993 and the 2001-2013 studies resulting in 32% (10/31) and 46% (6/13) of deaths caused by vehicle strikes, respectively (Beier 1993; Vickers et al. 2015). It also parallels an upward trend of mountain lion mortalities caused by vehicle strikes throughout Southern California over time (Vickers et al. 2015). Other causes of death in the SAM population included depredation kills, illegal killing, disease, intraspecific strife, and human-caused wildfires (Beier and Barrett 1993; Vickers et al. 2015). Depredation kills were found to be 3.4 times more likely with males compared to females (Vickers et al. 2015).

The SAM mountain lion population's high adult mortality rates combined with isolation, small size, low genetic diversity, low effective population size, and limited immigration of new individuals cause demographic instability and put the population at high risk of extinction (Beier 1993; Beier and Barrett 1993; Ernest et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015; Gustafson et al. 2017; Gustafson et al. 2018; Benson et al. 2019). As mentioned previously in *Section 2.2 Taxonomy and Population Genetics*, the extremely low effective population size and total adult population size are insufficient to prevent inbreeding depression in the short term or maintain evolutionary potential in the long term (Jamieson and Allendorf 2012; Frankham et al. 2014). Roads and development prevent dispersal and sustained immigration in the SAM, and lack of consistent gene flow has led to high levels of inter-relatedness and inbreeding (Ernest et al. 2014; Gustafson et al. 2017; Gustafson et al. 2018; Benson et al. 2019). Further genetic erosion is likely without improved connectivity to facilitate immigration (Benson et al. 2019). CDFW has identified the SAM population as at risk due to current habitat and genetic concerns, at-risk internal habitat and

connectivity, limited external connectivity, and lack of protected habitat (Dellinger 2019). If inbreeding depression occurs within this population, population growth will likely decline and the probability of extinction within 50 years is predicted to be 100%, with a median time to extinction of 11.7 years (Benson et al. 2019).

In 13 years, only one radio-collared individual crossed I-15, the major barrier between the SAM and the EPR, and that animal was killed 25 days after his crossing for depredating domestic sheep (Vickers et al. 2015). And although Gustafson et al. (2017) documented three males immigrating into the SAM from the EPR and four males emigrating from the SAM to the EPR over a 15-year period, only one of the males (M86, an immigrant to the SAM) is known to have successfully bred. While M86 improved the SAM population's genetic diversity (Gustafson et al. 2017), high levels of mortalities due to vehicle strikes and depredation/illegal killings likely reduce the number of immigrants that can successfully establish as breeding adults (Vickers et al. 2015). With high levels of adult mortalities due to vehicle strikes, depredation kills affecting 3.4 times more males than females, and a small population with a female-biased adult sex ratio, there is potential for occasional male extinction in the SAM, which could severely limit the short- and long-term viability of the population (Beier and Barrett 1993; Benson et al. 2019).

5.5 *San Gabriel/San Bernardino Mountains (SGSB) Population*

Studies on the SGSB mountain lion population are limited, and the abundance and population trends are unknown. However, with an effective population size of 5 (Gustafson et al. 2018), and an N_e/N of 0.25 to 0.5 (Ballou et al. 1989; USFWS 2008), the estimated total adult population would be 10 to 20 individuals (see Table 1). As mentioned previously in *Section 2.2 Taxonomy and Population Genetics*, these numbers are grossly insufficient to prevent inbreeding depression in the short term or maintain evolutionary potential in the long term (Jamieson and Allendorf 2012; Frankham et al. 2014). And CDFW has identified the SGSB population as at risk due to current habitat and genetic concerns, at-risk internal habitat and connectivity, limited external connectivity, and lack of protected habitat (Dellinger 2019).

Although a population viability study has not been conducted for the SGSB population, given its low genetic diversity, low effective population size, and patterns of isolation due to roads and development creating movement barriers (Gustafson et al. 2018), the SGSB mountain lion population likely has high risk of inbreeding depression and extinction. The loss of this population could undermine genetic connectivity for mountain lions statewide because the SGSB population, along with the Tehachapi and Sierra Pelona Mountains, represents a critical linkage between mountain lion populations in the northern and southern mountain ranges of California (Gustafson et al. 2018). Restoration and enhancement of connectivity in the SGSB and surrounding mountain ranges are key for the continued survival of the SGSB population as well as all of the Central Coast and Southern California mountain lion populations.

5.6 *Eastern Peninsular Range (EPR) Population*

Studies on the EPR mountain lion population are limited and the abundance and population trends are unknown. However, with an effective population size of 31.6 (Benson et al. 2019), and an N_e/N of 0.25 to 0.5 (Ballou et al. 1989; USFWS 2008), the estimated total adult

population would be 63 to 126 individuals (see Table 1). As mentioned previously in *Section 2.2 Taxonomy and Population Genetics*, these numbers are insufficient to prevent inbreeding depression in the short term or maintain evolutionary potential in the long term (Jamieson and Allendorf 2012; Frankham et al. 2014).

Vickers et al. (2015) followed 43 marked mountain lions in the EPR from 2001 to 2013, and their study provides some insight regarding survival rate and causes of mortality. Annual survival rate was found to be 55.4% in the EPR, which is similar to the SAM population (Vickers et al. 2015). The primary causes of death of marked mountain lions were depredation kills (26% [6/23]) and vehicle strikes (17% [4/23]). When assessing mountain lion death data from CDFW from 1981 to 2013, depredation and vehicle strikes accounted for about 70% of mountain lion deaths in the EPR: 40% (62/154) by depredation kills and 30% (46/154) by vehicle strikes (Vickers et al. 2015).

Although the EPR population was found to have the highest genetic diversity and effective population size among the Southern California mountain lion populations (Gustafson et al. 2018), movement and genetic studies have shown that the EPR population is largely disconnected from all other California populations (Ernest et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015; Vickers et al. 2017; Gustafson et al. 2018). And CDFW has identified the EPR population as at risk due to current habitat and genetic concerns, at-risk internal habitat and connectivity, limited external connectivity, and lack of protected habitat (Dellinger 2019). Thus, high human-caused mortality rates combined with continued development in San Diego, Riverside, and Imperial Counties could lead to further isolation, decreased genetic diversity, increased inbreeding depression, and increased risk of extinction.

6 Factors Affecting Ability to Survive and Reproduce



Female mountain lion, P-23, crossing a road in the Santa Monica Mountains. She was struck by a vehicle and found dead near Malibu Canyon Road in January 2018. Photo: NPS

Most, if not all, factors affecting the ability of the Southern California and Central Coast mountain lion populations to survive and reproduce are caused by humans. Lack of wildlife connectivity is the primary driver of their potential demise. Habitat loss and fragmentation due to roads and development have led to extreme levels of isolation and high mortality rates, which are driving these populations towards extinction. Continued development in current suitable

mountain lion habitat further threatens these populations. With low genetic diversity and high risk of inbreeding depression due to genetic isolation, vehicle strikes on roads, increased conflicts with humans that lead to depredation kills, high levels of intraspecific strife likely due to limited space and lack of connectivity, rodenticide and other environmental toxicant poisoning, and impacts of more frequent wildfires and climate change, Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions will likely not persist unless there is a concerted effort to restore and enhance functional connectivity between populations and large blocks of heterogeneous habitats.

The populations in Southern California are especially vulnerable to extinction, which is reflected in a 2005 review conducted by the US Forest Service regarding Land Management Plans in the National Forests of Southern California that states the “greatest concern for the long-term health of mountain lion populations on the national forests of southern California is loss of landscape connectivity between mountain ranges and large blocks of open space on private land.”¹⁴ The review emphasizes that continued development along with new and wider roads degrade habitat linkages and create movement barriers, and “[w]ithout the national forests and linkages between the mountain ranges and other large habitat preserves, there is not much long term potential for mountain lions in southern California.”

Ultimately, the persistence of mountain lions in the Central Coast and Southern California requires maintenance and restoration of connectivity between subpopulations and adequate habitat. The extreme isolation, dangerously low genetic diversity, high levels of inbreeding, and high rates of human-caused mortalities (*e.g.*, vehicle strikes, depredation kills, intra-specific strife due to limited space, rodenticide poisoning, etc.) underscore the urgent need for proactive measures to enhance connectivity (Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015; Benson et al. 2016a; Gustafson et al. 2017; Benson et al. 2019).



Male mountain lion M110 in San Diego County was euthanized by a CDFW warden because he was severely injured and for stated public safety concerns (he was found in a neighborhood close to homes). This occurred days after he was illegally shot by a livestock owner (open wound on right flank). Necropsy results indicated he had two broken legs consistent with a vehicle strike and four different compounds of anticoagulant rodenticides in his blood. Had he not been euthanized, he likely would have died from starvation due to his injuries. Source: Vickers (2014).

¹⁴ Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, *Final Environmental Impact Statement, Land Management Plans, Angeles National Forest Cleveland National Forest Los Padres National Forest San Bernardino National Forest* (Sept. 2005), available at https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5166889.pdf.

Measures to conserve core habitat areas and functional wildlife corridors, like the recently adopted Habitat Connectivity and Wildlife Movement Ordinances in Ventura County,¹⁵ are vital to the preservation of Central Coast and Southern California mountain lion populations, but just protecting land is not enough to ensure their survival. Conserving natural habitats on both sides of freeways and constructing effective crossing infrastructure (*e.g.*, culverts, underpasses, vegetated overpasses, and exclusionary fencing) at existing roads and barriers would facilitate movement and gene flow while reducing mortalities due to vehicle strikes (Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015; Benson et al. 2019). Promoting wider implementation of predator-proof enclosures for domestic animals would further reduce human-caused mortalities by limiting opportunities for potential conflict and reducing the use of depredation permits (Vickers et al. 2015). In addition, changes in depredation permit policy could further reduce mortalities. For example, CDFW adopted a new depredation permit policy based on a 2017 bulletin for mountain lions in the CC-S and SAM areas, which requires affirmative non-lethal alternatives and improved husbandry before kill permits are issued when mountain lion depredations occur in those areas (CDFW 2017; see *Section 8.1.1 CDFW Departmental Bulletins*). Expanding these policies in conjunction with enforceable implementation and reporting requirements across the state, or at least into the SGSB, EPR, CC-N, and CC-C, population areas, would reduce mortalities from this source. Prohibiting the use of second-generation anticoagulants, rodenticides, and other environmental toxicants in California (*i.e.*, with AB 1788, sponsored by Assembly Member Richard Bloom in 2019) would even further reduce human-caused mortalities of mountain lions, as toxicants bioaccumulate up the food chain and can kill mountain lions or weaken their immune systems and make them more susceptible to disease or more vulnerable to conspecifics (Riley et al. 2003; Riley et al. 2007; Serieys et al. 2015). A combination of habitat conservation, implementation of effective road/barrier crossing infrastructure, and outreach and education to property owners and owners of domestic animals combined with depredation permit policy change could save these populations from extinction (Vickers et al. 2015).

6.1 Low Genetic Diversity and Inbreeding Depression

As detailed in *Section 2.2 Taxonomy and Population Genetics* and *Section 5.0 Abundance and Population Trends*, inbreeding is a serious threat to the persistence of the Central Coast and Southern California mountain lion populations. Inbreeding depression, loss of genetic diversity, and accumulation of deleterious mutations can lead to elevated extinction risk due to reduced reproductive fitness and evolutionary potential (*i.e.*, the ability to adapt to change) (Spielman et al. 2004; Frankham 2005; Traill et al. 2010). Decades of isolation due to roads and development fragmenting habitat and limiting connectivity has led to low genetic diversity and effective population sizes, high levels of inter-relatedness, and dangerous levels of inbreeding, especially in the CC-S, SAM, SGSB, and CC-N populations (Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015; Benson et al. 2016a; Gustafson et al. 2017; Gustafson et al. 2018; Benson et al. 2019). Although demographic and environmental stochasticity (*e.g.*, a disease outbreak, wildfire, drought or flooding) can increase risk of extinction, especially in small populations, inbreeding has also been shown to be an indicator of extinction risk and may impact how populations are able to respond to stochastic events (Frankham and Ralls 1998). In addition, endangered species

¹⁵ More information regarding the Habitat Connectivity and Wildlife Movement Ordinances available at: <https://vcrma.org/habitat-connectivity-and-wildlife-movement-corridors>

tend to have lower genetic diversity than non-endangered species, which suggests that inbreeding and low genetic variation may have an important role in a species' risk of extinction (Frankham and Ralls 1998). Thus, genetic factors should be considered when assessing the status of these populations.

The CC-S, SAM, SGSB, and CC-N populations have been found to have low genetic diversity, with the SAM population's genetic variation nearly as low as the endangered Florida panther's (*Puma concolor coryi*) (Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2014; Gustafson et al. 2017). And, as mentioned previously in *Section 2.2 Taxonomy and Population Genetics*, the CC-S, SGSB, SAM, CC-N, and EPR populations have effective population sizes well below the older and less conservative threshold of 50, while the CC-C population's effective population size is just barely above that threshold at $N_e = 56.6$ (Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2014; Benson et al. 2016a; Gustafson et al. 2018; Benson et al. 2019). These numbers suggest that inbreeding depression could occur within the short-term (over the duration of five generations) and these populations are at increased risk of extinction.

Without improved connectivity, the SAM and Santa Monica Mountains (within the CC-S) populations are predicted to experience continued genetic erosion and losses in heterozygosity of 28-49% and 40-57%, respectively, within 50 years (Benson et al. 2016a; Benson et al. 2019). This could lead to inbreeding depression, which could cause reduced fitness in a variety of ways. In Florida panthers, inbreeding depression led to reproductive issues (*e.g.*, poor sperm quality, low testosterone levels, poor fecundity and recruitment, failure of testes to descend), increased susceptibility to parasites and disease, and physical issues (*e.g.*, atrial septal defect, a deadly congenital heart defect; kinked tails) (Roelke et al. 1993; Johnson et al. 2010). Suffering from shrinking, fragmented habitats, high mortality rates from hunting, and inbreeding depression, the Florida panther population declined to less than 30 individuals, and genetic restoration via the translocation of eight female mountain lions from Texas (*Puma concolor stanleyana*) was needed to prevent their extinction (Johnson et al. 2010).

The SAM and CC-S populations are severely constrained in fragmented habitats with similar numbers as the Florida panther population prior to genetic rescue (Beier and Barrett 1993; Johnson et al. 2010; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015). Although the fragmented populations appear to be stable, high levels of inbreeding have been documented in the Santa Monica Mountains (Riley et al. 2014) and evidence of inbreeding depression (*i.e.*, low genetic diversity and kinked tails) has been observed in the SAM (Ernest et al. 2014). If these populations remain isolated, they will inevitably have the same fate as the Florida panthers. Researchers predict that with inbreeding depression, the SAM and Santa Monica Mountains populations have a 100% and 99.7% chance of becoming extinct within 50 years, with median time to extinction of 11.7 and 15.1 years, respectively (Benson et al. 2019).

The SGSB population was also found to have low genetic diversity and effective population size (Gustafson et al. 2018), which suggests that the population experienced a prior genetic bottleneck and inbreeding is likely. Although genetic studies on this population are limited, it is clear that continued development in and around the SGSB will further isolate the population and lead to more inbreeding and even lower genetic diversity, which will drive the population faster towards extinction. It is important to note that despite only limited gene flow

between the SGSB population and the Western Sierra Nevada, CC-C, and the EPR (Gustafson et al. 2018), this population represents a critical linkage between mountain lion populations in the northern and southern mountain ranges of California. Restoration and enhancement of connectivity is key for the continued survival of the SGSB population as well as all of the other the Central Coast and Southern California mountain lion populations.

Gustafson et al. (2018) found that the EPR population also exhibits a prior genetic bottleneck. The EPR population was found to be largely disconnected from all the other California populations, with limited gene flow and low connectivity with the SAM and SGSB populations (Gustafson et al. 2018). Movement patterns and genetics indicate potential isolation from other populations (Vickers et al. 2015; Gustafson et al. 2017; Gustafson et al. 2018), and continued development in these areas will likely lead to further isolation, genetic drift, and risk of extinction similar to what is being observed in the CC-S, SAM, and SGSB populations.

Although genetic studies are limited for the CC-N population, it was found to have low genetic diversity and low effective population size (Gustafson et al. 2018), which forewarns of inbreeding depression and increased risk of extinction. CDFW has identified the Santa Cruz Mountains mountain lion population, which occurs within the CC-N area, as vulnerable to decline and extinction due to fragmentation from roads and development as well as lack of protected habitat (Dellinger 2019).

Studies suggest that one immigrant every 1-2 years would reduce extinction risk in the SAM and Santa Monica Mountains populations (Beier and Barrett 1993; Gustafson et al. 2017; Benson et al. 2019). This may apply to the other populations with low genetic diversity and effective population size (Gustafson et al. 2018). Increasing connectivity throughout the Central Coast and Southern California would address issues of inbreeding by facilitating movement between populations, increasing effective population size, and reducing high mortality rates driven by vehicle strikes and depredation. Thus, proactive measures to effectively restore and enhance connectivity are needed to minimize risk of inbreeding depression and extinction in Central Coast and Southern California populations.

6.2 *Vehicle Strikes*

In California, an estimated 100 mountain lions are killed every year by vehicle strikes (Pollard 2016). In the Central Coast and Southern California, vehicle strikes represent a significant threat to the persistence of mountain lion populations, though Southern California has more documentation regarding this issue. The number of mortalities caused by vehicle strikes has been increasing in Southern California since the 1980s, and vehicle strikes account for a high proportion of deaths in mountain lions in the SAM, CC-S, and EPR (Beier and Barrett 1993; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015; Vickers et al. 2017). From 1981 to 2013 vehicle strikes accounted for 53% (50/94) of mountain lion deaths in the SAM and 30% of mountain lion deaths in the EPR (46/154) (Vickers et al. 2015). Riley reported that 14% (2/14) of collared mountain lion deaths from 2002 to 2012 were due to vehicle strikes, and the NPS reported that 18 mortalities from vehicle strikes occurred between July 2002 and January 2018 in the CC-S (Figure 9). Although the CC-N population is less studied, there is evidence that vehicle strikes are a significant cause of mortalities in this population; at least six mountain lions have been

killed by vehicle strikes on Highway 17 in the Santa Cruz Mountains between 2008 and 2018 (Midpeninsula Regional Open Space 2017; Slade 2018) and news outlets reported at least three vehicle strikes killing mountain lions on the I-280 in San Mateo County between 2014 and 2016 (Wilmers 2014; CBS San Francisco 2015; Kamala 2016). Similarly, in 2018 at least two mountain lions were reported to have been killed by vehicle strikes in San Luis Obispo County in the CC-C (Tanner 2018). Clearly, vehicle strikes are an important cause of mortality for the Central Coast and Southern California mountain lion populations.



Figure 9. Locations of 18 mountain lion vehicle strikes in the Santa Monica Mountains and surrounding areas from July 2002 to January 2018. Source: NPS

High adult mortality rates can have severe consequences, particularly for small populations with female-biased adult sex ratios and low effective population sizes (Beier and Barrett 1993; Benson et al. 2019). Vehicle strikes have been found to affect males and females equally, regardless of age, which can result in relatively high adult male mortalities (Vickers et al. 2015). Low male adult survival increases the risk of extinction, as it could result in occasional extinctions of breeding males and therefore reduced reproductivity (Benson et al. 2019), which has been previously observed in the SAM (Beier and Barrett 1993). In the Santa Monica Mountains, where adult survival is high, vehicle strikes (along with intraspecific strife) make it more difficult for subadults to successfully disperse, which limits breeding opportunities for mountain lions born in the Santa Monica Mountains (Riley et al. 2014; Benson et al. 2019). Freeways and vehicle strikes also limit the ability for immigrants to enter the Santa Monica Mountains and contribute to the population’s gene pool (Riley et al. 2014; Benson et al. 2019). These patterns highlight the dire outlook for Central Coast and Southern California mountain lion populations due to lack of connectivity between populations and suitable habitat. The continued construction of roads and development and inaction to enhance connectivity threatens the survival of these struggling populations.

6.3 Depredation and Illegal Kills



Mountain lions killed on depredation permits (and one killed by vehicle strike) in San Diego County in 2015. Source: Vickers et al. (2017).

In 1990 California voters passed The California Wildlife Protection Act (Proposition 117), making the mountain lion a “specially protected species” and outlawing mountain lion sport-hunting in California. However, the law requires CDFW to issue depredation permits that allow people to “take” mountain lions when a mountain lion kills or injures domestic animals such as livestock or pets or damages property. The legal definition of “take” is to “hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill” (Cal Fish & Game Code, §86), and the vast majority of permits to take in the three decades since the passage of Proposition 117 have authorized killing one or more mountain lions. The number of depredation permits issued and the number of reported kills has varied over time, and on average over 40% of permits result in reported kills. Since 1990 there has been an average of 97 reported depredation kills every year; however, these estimates are likely low due to underreporting and incomplete records (W. Vickers, *pers comm*). Depredation kills (along with vehicle strikes) account for the majority of mountain lion mortalities in the SAM and EPR (Vickers et al. 2015; Vickers et al. 2017). Although less is known about depredation kill impacts in the CC-N and CC-C, there is evidence that suggests depredation kills could be a significant source of mortality in these populations. In the Santa Cruz Mountains in the CC-N, depredation kills are the leading cause of death in collared mountain lions (Wang et al. 2017), and CDFW reported 34 depredation kills between 2010 and 2016 in the CC-N counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz (see Appendix A¹⁶). Although population dynamics are even less studied in the CC-C, between 2010 and 2016 there were 46 reported depredation kills in the counties of Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Barbara (See Appendix A^{1d}).

¹⁶ These data were downloaded from the CDFW website; however, they no longer appear to be available online. These numbers have been shown to be low by a factor of two in some areas, likely due to incomplete reporting, and therefore should be considered absolute minimums (W. Vickers, *pers comm*).



An illegally killed mountain lion in San Mateo County. Photo: Tiffany Yap

Depredation kills result in more deaths in male mountain lions compared to female mountain lions. Statewide, of mountain lions killed for depredation in 2017, 68% were males (CDFW 2018), and from 1981 to 2013, there were 3.4 times more male than female mountain lions killed for depredating in the SAM and EPR (Vickers et al. 2015). The majority of lions reported killed for depredating were of subadult (1-2 years old) and adult mountain lions (>2 years old) (CDFW 2018), many of which were likely dispersers that may have not yet established home ranges. Dispersing lions often come up against roads and development as they search to establish home ranges (Beier 1995, Vickers 2015, Riley 2014). This suggests that even if individuals are able to navigate across roads and freeways without being struck by vehicles, they often come into conflict with humans, which threatens their survival. This was reflected in the EPR, when the only GPS collared immigrant to have crossed I-15 from 2001 to 2013 arrived from the SAM only to be killed on a depredation permit 25 days after his arrival for depredating a sheep (Vickers et al. 2015). Not only do lions killed for depredating diminish the total abundance of these populations, but because males are predominantly killed, the number of animals that are the primary gene dispersers are also greatly reduced, which further inhibits adequate genetic connectivity (Vickers et al. 2017).

Reported depredation kills do not include mountain lions that are illegally poached or killed, many of which likely go undocumented (Beier and Barrett 1993; Vickers et al. 2015). Illegal kills have been observed in the CC-S, SAM, and EPR (Beier and Barrett 1993; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015) as well as in the CC-N (Yap 2018 *pers observation*), and although 80 mountain lions were reported as being killed under depredation permits in 2017, 89 deaths were being investigated (CDFW 2018).

As mentioned in *Section 6.2 Vehicle Strikes*, high levels of mortalities among male breeders or potential male breeders (*i.e.*, dispersers) can have severe impacts on small, isolated mountain lion populations with female-biased adult sex ratios and low effective population sizes (Beier and Barrett 1993; Benson et al. 2019). Low survival of breeding males increases extinction risk, as occasional breeding male extinctions can occur and therefore reduce reproductivity throughout the population (Beier and Barrett 1993; Benson et al. 2019). And low survival of subadults and adults may limit both dispersers and immigrants from successfully

breeding and increasing genetic diversity (Vickers et al. 2015; Benson et al. 2019). Thus, depredation and illegal kills in conjunction with lack of connectivity between populations and suitable habitat in the Central Coast and Southern California severely limit the potential for these populations to survive and reproduce. Continued development and lack of connectivity will likely push mountain lions into more conflicts with humans, which could increase depredation and retributory kills and further drive these populations towards extinction.

6.4 Intraspecific Strife



Intraspecific strife: a female mountain lion, P-7, was killed by her father, P-1. Photo: NPS

As detailed in *Section 5 Abundance and Population Trends*, intraspecific strife is the leading cause of mortality in the Santa Monica Mountains (Riley et al. 2014). Although intraspecific strife is a common source of mortality in mountain lion populations, (Beier and Barrett 1993; Logan and Sweanor 2001; Allen 2014), unusually high levels of intraspecific strife have been observed in this population (Riley et al. 2014). About 41% (9/22) of deaths in radio-collared mountain lions being tracked from 2002 to 2018 were from intraspecific strife,¹⁷ with multiple cases of aggressive adult males killing their siblings, offspring (male and female), and previous mates (Riley et al. 2014). While males are likely to have larger home ranges to protect food resources and access to females, killing offspring or potential mates has no apparent evolutionary benefit, as it reduces chances of future reproduction (Riley et al. 2014). In addition, infanticide has been documented in the Santa Monica Mountains (Riley et al. 2014), perhaps to trigger the female to come into estrous. These high levels of intraspecific strife are likely due to limited space in the Santa Monica Mountains caused by dispersal barriers (Riley et al. 2014; Benson et al. 2019). As roads and development further encroach on Central Coast and Southern California mountain lion populations, intraspecific strife could become more common; this was

¹⁷ The NPS provides puma profiles (last updated August-November 2018) of the marked animals (*i.e.*, tagged or radio-collared) they have been studying in the CC-S, which includes those studied in Riley et al. (2014). Some data presented in this section take these data into account. Accessed on 3 April 2019 at: <https://www.nps.gov/samo/learn/nature/puma-profiles.htm>.

documented in the SAM on two occasions (one GPS-collared, one previously GPS-collared) since the publication of Vickers et al. (2015) (W. Vickers *unpublished data*). Enhanced connectivity between populations and suitable habitat would facilitate dispersal, which would reduce and/or prevent high levels of intraspecific strife (Riley et al. 2014; Benson et al. 2019) and improve the survival and reproduction rates, especially for the most struggling populations.

6.5 Abandonment



Santa Monica Mountains mountain lion kittens P-57 and P-58 were abandoned by their mother, P-42, a first-time mother who left with male P-27 and never returned. Photo: NPS

Abandonment of kittens is fairly common in the Santa Monica Mountains and accounts for about 23% (5/22) of the known causes of death for marked/collared animals.¹⁸ Although this likely occurs in other mountain lion populations, the causes of abandonment are unclear. There are various reasons why females might abandon their cubs. The cubs could be sick, the female may not be able to take care of them, or perhaps the female was initially protecting them from a mature male. Unfortunately, there is a lack of data regarding why and how often cubs get abandoned. Yet this is one of the main causes of death for mountain lions in the Santa Monica Mountains, which likely affects this already-small population.

Mountain lion cubs can also become orphaned if the mother is killed before they have dispersed. If they are too young to fend for themselves, they likely starve to death or are preyed upon by other predators. If the young are more mobile, they may come up against areas where they are more likely to encounter humans as they search for food. This was seen in November 2017, when a mother mountain lion was killed by a vehicle strike in the SAM and two of her cubs were found roaming near human establishments – one in a backyard and the other along a road (Veklerov 2018). Both were too young to survive on their own and were placed in the Oakland Zoo.

¹⁸ Id.

6.6 Poisoning from Rodenticides and Other Environmental Toxicants



The famous mountain lion of Griffith Park, P-22, suffering from notoedric mange, a parasitic skin disease that has been linked with the ingestion of rodenticide poisoning (left) and mountain lion P-34 found dead on a trail due to rodenticide poisoning (right). Photos: NPS

Although mountain lions are not the primary target of environmental toxicants, such as rodenticides and other pesticides and herbicides, secondary poisoning has been documented in many non-target animals, especially predators (e.g., coyotes (Riley et al. 2003), bobcats (Riley et al. 2007; Serieys et al. 2015), San Joaquin kit fox (McMillin et al. 2008), California fishers (Gabriel et al. 2012), raptors (Lima and Salmon 2010), and many more). Data regarding pesticide poisoning in mountain lions are limited; however, there is evidence that these big cats are likely vulnerable to similar negative impacts that other predators experience, including direct death, weakened immune systems, and vulnerability to predators or conspecifics (Riley et al. 2003; Riley et al. 2007; Serieys et al. 2015; Rudd et al. 2019).

While poisoning can sometimes lead to direct death, rodenticide exposure has also been associated with notoedric mange, a parasitic skin disease that has led to high levels of mortalities, population declines, and even local extirpations in Southern California bobcats (Riley et al. 2007; Serieys et al. 2015). Although the link between rodenticide poisoning and mange is not as clear in mountain lions, since 2002 five mountain lions in the CC-S have been found suffering from mange, and researchers suspect that rodenticide poisoning may have played a role (Reyes-Velarde 2019a). In addition, of four dead mountain lions in the Santa Monica Mountains that were found to have rodenticides in their systems, two died from poisoning and two died from intraspecific strife, and it is possible that indirect effects of poisoning may have prevented the mountain lions from escaping conflict or fighting back (Riley et al. 2007). And rodenticide poisoning is suspected to be the cause of death in mountain lion P-47, who was recently found dead in Santa Monica Mountains (Reyes-Velarde 2019b), and CC-N mountain lion 36m, who was found dead in the Santa Cruz Mountains in 2015 (Wilmers 2015).

The Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) analyzed data provided by CDFW and found that 92% (59/64) of tested mountain lions from throughout the state had detectable levels of anticoagulant rodenticides, which indicates alarmingly high exposure rates (DPR 2018). This has been found to be true in the CC-S as well, where researchers have found that 94% (17/18) of mountain lions tested had traces of rodenticides in their systems (Reyes-Velarde 2019a).

Rodenticides have been implicated in mountain lion mortalities in the CC-S, and in the SAM anticoagulant rodenticide residues were detected in the livers of 100% of deceased animals tested, with up to five different compounds being detected in some animals (Riley et al. 2007; Riley et al. 2014; W. Vickers, *pers comm*). And a study conducted by CDFW and the Integral Ecology Research Center (IERC) has found that mountain lions are being exposed to dangerously high levels of illegal pesticides, such as carbofuran, being used on illegal marijuana grow sites, which can also bioaccumulate and cause health issues (Rudd et al. 2019). Furthermore, it is possible that herbicide exposure from deer could be detrimental to mountain lions as well. Although poisoning from environmental toxicants may not constitute a large proportion of direct deaths (that we are aware of), it is possible that high exposure levels influence other causes of mortalities. Any additional mortalities in the small, isolated Central Coast and Southern California populations suffering from other anthropogenic pressures could impact the short- and long-term survival of these mountain lions.

6.7 Wildfires



After the Woolsey Fire, the body of mountain lion P-64, known to use culverts to cross the Hwy-101 and SR-118 freeways a total of 41 times, was found dead with severely burned paws. Photos: NPS

Although fire is a natural disturbance in California ecosystems, sprawl development with low/intermediate densities extending into habitats that are prone to fire have led to more frequent wildfires that burn larger areas (Syphard et al. 2007; Syphard et al. 2009). Most wildfires in California are caused by human ignitions, like power lines, arson, improperly disposed cigarette butts, debris burning, fireworks, campfires, or sparks from cars or equipment (Keeley and Fotheringham 2003; Syphard et al. 2007; Syphard et al. 2012; Bistinas et al. 2013; Balch et al. 2017; Radeloff et al. 2018; Syphard et al. 2019). In fact, human-caused fires account for 95-97% of all fires in California's Mediterranean habitats (Syphard et al. 2007, Balch et al. 2017). In addition, climate change is leading to hotter, drier conditions that make fires more likely to burn. At least 29 fires throughout California in the last two years were caused by electric power and distribution lines, and transmission lines are suspected to be the cause of last year's Camp Fire and Woolsey Fire (Atkinson 2018; Chandler 2019).

Increased frequency of wildfires poses a threat to the survival of Central Coast and Southern California mountain lions. Although mountain lions are highly mobile and generally able to move away from wildfires, in severe weather conditions wind-driven fires can spread quickly – they can cover 10,000 hectares in one to two days, as embers are blown ahead of the

fires and towards adjacent fuels (*e.g.*, flammable vegetation, structures) (Syphard et al. 2011). If their movement is constrained by roads and development and they are unable to access escape routes, then their chances of surviving wildfires are greatly reduced. Vickers et al. (2015) documented one death of a collared mountain lion in the SAM and one in the EPR due to human-caused wildfires, and the deaths of two collared mountain lions in the CC-S in 2018 have been attributed to the Woolsey Fire.¹⁹ Environmentally stochastic events (*e.g.*, wildfires, flooding) could destabilize small mountain lion populations and make them vulnerable to extinction (Benson et al. 2016a; Benson et al. 2019). In addition, increased frequency of fire ignitions can cause shifts in natural fire regimes, which can lead to large-scale landscape changes, such as vegetation-type conversion or habitat fragmentation, which can impact wide-ranging species like the mountain lion (Jennings 2018).

Increasing landscape connectivity (*e.g.*, by designing corridors, removing barriers, and preserving habitats that are close to each other) is important for resilience to environmentally stochastic events and climate change adaptation (Heller and Zavaleta 2009). Enhanced connectivity that incorporates corridor redundancy (*i.e.* the availability of alternative pathways for movement) would allow for improved functional connectivity and resilience. Compared to a single pathway, multiple connections between habitat patches increase the probability of movement across landscapes by a wider variety of species, and they provide more habitat for low-mobility species while still allowing for their dispersal (Mcrae et al., 2012; Olson & Burnett, 2008; Pinto & Keitt, 2008). In addition, corridor redundancy provides resilience to uncertainty, impacts of climate change, and extreme events, including wildfires, by providing alternate escape routes or refugia for animals seeking safety (Cushman et al., 2013; Mcrae et al., 2008; Mcrae et al., 2012; Olson & Burnett, 2008; Pinto & Keitt, 2008).

6.8 Climate Change

A strong, international scientific consensus has established that human-caused climate change is causing widespread harms to human society and natural systems, and climate change threats are becoming increasingly dangerous. In a 2018 *Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C* from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the leading international scientific body for the assessment of climate change describes the devastating harms that would occur at 2°C warming, highlighting the necessity of limiting warming to 1.5°C to avoid catastrophic impacts to people and life on Earth (IPCC 2018). In addition to warming, many other aspects of global climate are changing. Thousands of studies conducted by researchers around the world have documented changes in surface, atmospheric, and oceanic temperatures; melting glaciers; diminishing snow cover; shrinking sea ice; rising sea levels; ocean acidification; and increasing atmospheric water vapor (USGCRP, 2017).

Climate change is increasing stress on species and ecosystems, causing changes in distribution, phenology, physiology, vital rates, genetics, ecosystem structure and processes, and increasing species extinction risk (Warren et al., 2011). A 2016 analysis found that climate-related local extinctions are already widespread and have occurred in hundreds of species, including almost half of the 976 species surveyed (Wiens 2016). A separate study estimated that nearly half of terrestrial non-flying threatened mammals and nearly one-quarter of threatened

¹⁹ Id.

birds may have already been negatively impacted by climate change in at least part of their distribution (Pacifci et al. 2017). A 2016 meta-analysis reported that climate change is already impacting 82% of key ecological processes that form the foundation of healthy ecosystems and on which humans depend for basic needs (Scheffers et al. 2016). Genes are changing, species' physiology and physical features such as body size are changing, species are moving to try to keep pace with suitable climate space, species are shifting their timing of breeding and migration, and entire ecosystems are under stress (Cahill et al., 2012; Chen et al., 2011; Maclean & Wilson, 2011; Parmesan, 2006; Parmesan & Yohe, 2003; Root et al., 2003; Warren et al., 2011).

Improving landscape connectivity is a key factor for climate change resilience and adaptation (Heller and Zavaleta 2009). Without functional connectivity that provides multiple pathways for mountain lion movement, isolated Central Coast and Southern California mountain lion populations and the prey they depend on may not be able to shift their ranges as available resources shift. Enhanced connectivity that provides redundant corridors for safe passage between suitable habitats would improve chances of survival and reproduction in the face of climate change by increasing the probability of movement across landscapes by a wider variety of species and providing alternate escape routes or refugia for animals seeking safety (Mcrae et al. 2008; Pinto and Keitt 2008; Mcrae et al. 2012; Cushman et al. 2013; Olson and Burnett 2013).

7 Degree and Immediacy of Threat

As demonstrated in the previous sections, Central Coast and Southern California mountain lions are at risk of extirpation under current conditions. Roads and development have fractured connectivity, which has led to the separation of at least six isolated, genetically distinct populations in the CC-N, CC-C, CC-S, SAM, SGSB, and EPR (Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015; Benson et al. 2016a; Benson et al. 2019). Due to extreme isolation and high levels of human-caused mortalities, the SAM and CC-S mountain lions have low genetic diversity, low effective population sizes, and high levels of inbreeding (Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015; Benson et al. 2016a; Benson et al. 2019). Benson et al. (2019) predicted high losses of heterozygosity in the SAM and Santa Monica Mountains populations, which suggests that inbreeding depression is imminent. If inbreeding depression occurs, the SAM and Santa Monica Mountains/CC-S populations will likely go extinct within 50 years, with median times to extinction of 11.7 years and 15.1 years, respectively (Benson et al. 2019). With similarly low genetic diversity and effective population size, the SGSB and CC-N populations likely have a similar fate. And although the CC-C and EPR populations appear to be slightly healthier with more genetic diversity and a higher effective population size, these populations have effective population sizes that are still well below the most recent recommended threshold to prevent inbreeding depression in the short-term (Frankham et al. 2014; Gustafson et al. 2018); continued development in these areas could propel these populations towards extinction more quickly. Clearly, Central Coast and Southern California mountain lion populations are succumbing to anthropogenic pressures, and without immediate action to restore and enhance connectivity between the populations and suitable habitat, they will be lost, potentially within our lifetimes.

Immediate action is critical for the long-term persistence of Central Coast and Southern California mountain lions and the health of Central Coast and Southern California ecosystems. Connectivity between the populations and suitable habitat must be restored and enhanced to facilitate movement and gene flow while reducing human-caused mortalities. Anthropogenic pressures, especially vehicle strikes and depredation kills, should be minimized to help the recovery of these populations. Although translocation of outbred animals has been shown to be effective to increase genetic diversity (Johnson et al. 2010), this would only be a short-term, unsustainable solution given the current level of isolation of these populations (Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015; Benson et al. 2016a; Benson et al. 2019). Strategically-placed road/barrier crossing infrastructure that allows for dispersal and gene flow and reduces mortalities would be a more comprehensive, long-term solution to save these populations in perpetuity. And the preservation of intact linkages, especially the Tehachapi and Sierra Pelona Mountains, is essential to maintain statewide genetic connectivity. Immediate regulatory action under the CESA is needed to enhance connectivity among Central Coast and Southern California mountain lion populations and suitable habitat to ensure the conservation of these iconic big cats.

8 Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms

8.1 State Regulatory Mechanisms

Proposition 117

The California Wildlife Protection Act of 1990 (Proposition 117) declared that the mountain lion is a “specially protected mammal under the laws of this state.” (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 4800(a).) Proposition 117 acknowledged that mountain lion habitat in the Santa Monica Mountains, Santa Ana Mountains, Santa Susana Mountains, and Simi Hills is disappearing rapidly and that “[s]mall and often isolated wildlife populations are forced to depend upon these shrinking habitat areas within the heavily urbanizing areas of this state.” (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2780(d).) Proposition 117 further found that “[c]orridors of natural habitat must be preserved to maintain the genetic integrity of California’s wildlife.” (*Id.*)

In order to preserve mountain lion populations in California, Proposition 117 mandated that mountain lions are not to be considered a “game mammal,” such that hunting is generally prohibited. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 3950.1(a).) Subject to certain exceptions, Proposition 117 makes it unlawful to take, injure, possess, transport, import, or sell a mountain lion. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 4800(b).) Nonetheless, a mountain lion may still be removed or killed if it is “perceived to be an imminent threat to public health or safety” or is perceived by CDFW to be “an imminent threat to the survival of any threatened, endangered, candidate, or fully protected sheep species.” (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 4801.) Mountain lions that have not been designated an “imminent threat to public health or safety” may still be removed via nonlethal means. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 4801.5(a).)

A person whose livestock or other property has been damaged or destroyed by a mountain lion may request a permit to “take” the mountain lion. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 4802.) CDFW is required to immediately take action to confirm that there has been a

depredation. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 4803.) If CDFW is satisfied that there has been a depredation, CDFW “shall promptly issue a permit to take the depredating mountain lion.” (*Id.*) There is no limit to the number of depredation permits a property owner can request from CDFW. In addition, mountain lions that are encountered while pursuing or inflicting injury on livestock or domestic animals may be taken immediately without the need for a permit. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 4807.)

While Proposition 117 prohibits all hunting of mountain lions as well as the purposeful killing of mountain lions in most circumstances, it does not contain provisions to ensure that connectivity between core habitats for the Southern California or Central Coast mountain lions will be protected. As discussed above in *Section 6.0 Factors Affecting the Ability to Survive and Reproduce*, the primary threat to Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions is not hunting—it is habitat fragmentation and the lack of crossing infrastructure, which has led to major declines in genetic diversity, high levels of inbreeding, and high levels of human-caused mortalities via vehicle strikes, depredation kills, and intraspecific strife due to limited space and the inability for young mountain lions to disperse.

8.1.1 CDFW Departmental Bulletins

CDFW has issued “Departmental Bulletins” relating to mountain lions. The most recent bulletin was issued in December 2017 and applied specifically to the Santa Monica Mountains and SAM mountain lion populations (the “2017 Bulletin”) (CDFW 2017).²⁰ The 2017 Bulletin acknowledged (1) the lack of genetic diversity in the Santa Monica Mountains and SAM mountain lion populations and (2) that human population growth and anthropogenic barriers are restricting connectivity with other mountain lion populations. In order to reduce unnecessary killings of mountain lions in the Santa Monica Mountains and SAM populations, the 2017 Bulletin provides that any person reporting a depredation (a “reporting party”) may be issued a first permit to employ non-lethal measures to deter mountain lions from further depredation, and a second permit to “haze” a depredating mountain lion. In the first instance, the reporting party would institute economically feasible measures designed to reduce the potential for attracting mountain lions such as removing the carcasses of depredated animals, installing or repairing and consistently using enclosures to exclude mountain lions, or employing guardian animals in the immediate vicinity of livestock or other domestic animals. The 2017 Bulletin provides that CDFW would not be required to issue a lethal depredation permit until (1) a third depredation event has occurred, and (2) CDFW has confirmed that the reporting party has already implemented all reasonable preventative measures.

In January of 2018, CDFW adopted the 2017 Bulletin’s new depredation permit policy. Although this provides some additional protections and will likely reduce lethal take of mountain lions in the Santa Monica Mountains and the SAM, researchers have documented instances wherein domestic animal owners killed mountain lions in these areas without complying with CDFW instructions under the new policy (W. Vickers, *pers comm*). The 2017 Bulletin does not apply to other vulnerable populations, like the SGSB, EPR, CC-N, and CC-C mountain lions. In

²⁰ California Department of Fish and Wildlife, *Human/Wildlife Interactions in California: Mountain Lion Depredation, Public Safety, and Animal Welfare – Amendment to Department Bulletin 2013-02* (Dec. 15, 2017), available at <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=153021>.

addition, the new policy is not designed to ensure protection of habitat or connectivity necessary for the continued survival of the Santa Monica Mountains and SAM mountain lion populations and is insufficient to ameliorate the anthropogenic mortalities related to potential extirpation.

8.1.2 California Environmental Quality Act

The California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) is California’s landmark environmental law and establishes a state policy to prevent the “elimination of fish or wildlife species due to man’s activities, ensure that fish and wildlife populations do not drop below self-perpetuating levels, and preserve for future generations representations of all plant and animal communities....” (Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21001(c)). Towards this end, state and local agencies are required to analyze and disclose the impacts of any discretionary decision or activity. CEQA contains a substantive mandate that agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or mitigation measures which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects. (Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21002.)

CEQA requires a “mandatory finding of significance” if a project may “substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species.” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15065(a)(1).) CDFW has interpreted this provision to apply to species of special concern, which are species that are “experiencing, or formerly experienced, serious (noncyclical) population declines or range retractions (not reversed) that, if continued or resumed, could qualify it for State threatened or endangered status.”²¹ CDFW further provides that species of special concern “should be considered during the environmental review process.” (*Id.*; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15380.) Thus, a potentially substantial impact on a species of special concern, threatened species, or endangered species could be construed as “per se” significant under CEQA. (*Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cordova* (2007) 40 Cal.4th 412, 449.) And under CEQA, when an effect is “significant,” the lead agency approving the project must make a finding that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project to avoid or mitigate its significant impacts, or that such changes are within the responsibility of another agency, or that mitigation is infeasible. (Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21081(a).) These provisions therefore provide some protections to species that are listed as species of special concern, threatened, or endangered.

However, Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions are not listed as a species of special concern or as threatened or endangered, such that a project that has the potential to significantly impact one of these populations would not necessarily qualify as a “significant effect” under a lead agency’s interpretation of CEQA. In such case, CEQA’s substantive mandate to adopt all feasible alternatives or mitigation measures might not be triggered.

CEQA also requires a “mandatory finding of significance” if a project may “substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community.” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15065.) Moreover, CEQA’s “Environmental Checklist” in Appendix G of the CEQA

²¹ California Department of Fish and Wildlife, *Species of Special Concern*, available at <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/SSC>.

Guidelines characterizes a project's effects as "significant" if the project would "interfere substantially with the movement of any native [] wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors...."

While these provisions might theoretically offer some protection for Southern California or Central Coast mountain lions, in practice they have not provided sufficient protection. Under CEQA, lead agencies have discretion to develop their own thresholds of significance. (*East Sacramento Partnerships for a Livable City v. City of Sacramento* (2016) 5 Cal.App.5th 281, 300; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15064(d)). This allows local agencies—who are often under pressure from developers to approve projects—to make significance determinations that are inconsistent with independent scientific analysis, including CDFW's analysis. For instance, in December 2017, the City of Temecula approved a 200-acre mixed use project called the Altair Specific Plan that would allow development in the last remaining viable linkage for the SAM mountain lion population between the Santa Ana Mountains and Peninsular Ranges. The City determined that impacts to mountain lions were not significant despite strong disagreement by CDFW, USFWS, and independent mountain lion experts.²² CDFW warned the City of Temecula that the SAM population has "extremely low genetic diversity which is attributed to low gene flow between the small Santa Ana Mountains population and the larger population in the Peninsular Ranges" and that development is contributing to this genetic decay. (*Id.*) CDFW concluded that "increased human activity associated with the proposed Civic Site at this sensitive location would [] be detrimental to facilitating the movement of mountain lions across Interstate Highway 15 (I-15) to the Peninsular Range." (*Id.*)

Even when a lead agency acknowledges that an effect is "significant," CEQA allows a lead agency to adopt a "statement of overriding considerations" and approve a project if the agency finds that other factors outweigh the environmental costs of the project or that further mitigation is infeasible. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15093(b); Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21081.) This means that even if a project may have a significant effect on a "wildlife population" like the CC-S, SAM, SGSB, or EPR mountain lions, an agency could interpret CEQA as still allowing approval of the project. CEQA in practice is therefore inadequate to protect the Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions.

Finally, as noted above, the lack of adequate wildlife connectivity and wildlife crossings is the primary factor driving Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions closer to extinction. Yet, agencies have not interpreted CEQA (or the National Environmental Policy Act, discussed further below) as including a clear legal mechanism for mitigation for impacts on wildlife connectivity. For example, in the Final Environmental Impact Report/Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project (the "Northwest 138 EIR"), Caltrans and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority wrote: "The proposed project has the potential to directly or indirectly impact wildlife movement throughout the project limits. However, with the inclusion of the proposed avoidance and minimization measures, impact levels are expected to be relatively low. Exact acres of impacts to wildlife corridors are unable to be quantified, and currently there is no real

²² City of Temecula, *Altair Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report* (Oct. 2017), available at <https://temeculaca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/4513/Altair-Specific-Plan-Final-Environmental-Impact-Report-FEIR>.

mechanism for compensatory mitigation for these types of impacts.”²³ The Northwest 138 EIR also contained no analysis of the highway’s impacts on mountain lions, given that they are not presently listed as threatened or endangered.

Indeed, CDFW has urged lead agencies to consider wildlife connectivity in CEQA planning documents, without success. For instance, the Los Angeles County General Plan Draft EIR concluded that the buildout of the General Plan “will impact regional wildlife linkages” and have a “significant adverse effect on wildlife movement.”²⁴ The Draft EIR concluded that policies proposed in the General Plan “do not provide for mitigation for loss of wildlife movement opportunities. If development impacts regional wildlife linkages and impedes wildlife movement, connectivity will be lost on a regional scale in these vital landscape corridors and linkages. Thus impacts to wildlife movement remain significant at the General Plan level.” (*Id.*) In commenting on the Draft EIR, CDFW specifically objected to this conclusion:

The Department does not concur with the conclusion in the DPEIR that unavoidable loss of wildlife movement opportunities or nursery sites within or outside of an SEA does not warrant mitigation. Without mitigation, the Project and subsequent projects would result in direct and cumulative loss of biological diversity. Mitigation opportunities for wildlife corridors and nursery sites are best established during large scale planning efforts such as this General Plan. Wildlife corridor areas can be delineated and set aside in the General Plan for current and future conservation efforts. An assessment could be placed on development within the Project area to secure the acquisition of these critical linkages and sites, therefore reducing impacts to wildlife corridors and nursery sites and ensuring biological diversity.²⁵

In responding to this comment, Los Angeles County refused to implement CDFW’s recommendations, claiming “it cannot be assumed that wildlife corridor areas for future conservation that can be set aside because those properties may not become publicly owned.” (*Id.*) Los Angeles County’s responses to CDFW’s recommendations underscore that lead agencies have not interpreted CEQA to include a clear legal mechanism for mitigation for impacts on wildlife connectivity, even though such connectivity is critical to the survival of Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions.

8.1.3 Significant Natural Areas Program

The Significant Natural Areas Program (“SNAP”) requires CDFW to develop and maintain a spatial data system that identifies those areas in the state that are most essential for maintaining habitat connectivity, including wildlife corridors and habitat linkages. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 1932(b).) SNAP also requires CDFW to consult with other government agencies and stakeholders to identify natural areas deemed to be most significant. (Cal. Fish & Game

²³ State of California Department of Transportation, *Northwest State Route 138 Corridor Improvement Project Final Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact State and Section 4(f) Evaluation* (June 2017), available at <https://www.metro.net/projects/nw138/nw138-FEIR-FEIS/>.

²⁴ County of Los Angeles, *Los Angeles County General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report* (June 2014), available at http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/gp_2035_deir.pdf.

²⁵ County of Los Angeles, *Los Angeles County General Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report* (March 2015), available at http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/gp_2035_lac-gpu-final-eir-final.pdf.

Code § 1932(f.) SNAP further requires CDFW to seek maintenance and perpetuation of the state’s most significant natural areas for present and future generations in the most feasible manner. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 1932(g).)

However, SNAP does not require or authorize any particular land use action or decision. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 1932.5.) Likewise, SNAP does not change or prevent the change of use of any area identified pursuant to the program. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 1933.) It therefore does not *require* any particular natural areas to be conserved. Because of this, it is insufficient to protection wildlife connectivity essential to the survival of Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions.

8.1.4 Natural Community Conservation Planning Act

The Natural Community Conservation Planning Act is a voluntary conservation planning mechanism for proposed development projects within a planning area to avoid or minimize impacts to wildlife. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2801(f).) The NCCP Act is designed to promote coordination among agencies and landowners to conserve unfragmented habitat areas and multihabitat management. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2801(d).)²⁶

There are no Natural Community Conservation Plans (“NCCPs”) that cover the Santa Monica Mountains or San Gabriel Mountains. There are a few NCCPs that cover portions of the Santa Ana Mountains and Eastern Peninsular Ranges, some of which also act as “habitat conservation plans” or “HCPs” pursuant to the Federal Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. § 1539). These include the County of Orange (Central Coastal) NCCP/HCP, the Orange County Transportation Authority NCCP/HCP, Western Riverside County Multiple Species HCP, San Diego Multiple Habitat Conservation Program, San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program, and the San Diego North County Multiple Species Conservation Plan. There also is an NCCP that covers the Coachella Valley and portions of the San Bernardino Mountains called the Coachella Valley NCCP/HCP.

Of these NCCPs, only four “cover” portions of the Southern California mountain lion populations: (1) Western Riverside County Multiple Species HCP; (2) San Diego Multiple Habitat Conservation Program; (3) San Diego County Multiple Species Conservation Program; and (4) San Diego North County Multiple Species Conservation Plan.²⁷ Below is a discussion of each as they relate to mountain lions:

- (1) The Western Riverside County Multiple Species HCP acknowledges that the SAM mountain lion population is at high risk of extirpation due to demographical instability unless there is a “movement connection between the Santa Ana Mountains

²⁶ The NCCP Act also is described on CDFW’s website at <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/conservation/planning/NCCP>.

²⁷ California Department of Fish and Wildlife, *Conservation Plans By Species*, available at <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=108719&inline>. Both San Diego Gas & Electric and San Diego County Water Authority are permittees of HCPs/NCCPs covering mountain lions, but these only apply to activities undertaken by these entities.

- and the Palomar Mountains.”²⁸ However, mountain lions are considered to be “adequately conserved.”²⁹ As such, the Western Riverside County Multiple Species HCP offers little protection for the SAM mountain lion population. While this HCP does identify linkages designed to ensure connectivity for mountain lions, the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority has failed to enforce the HCP to protect such linkages when permittees such as the City of Temecula approve development that would severely constrict or impair such linkages.
- (2) The San Diego Multiple Habitat Conservation Program is an NCCP and HCP that purportedly covers mountain lions, but the program readily concedes that mountain lions (as well as deer) “were not a major consideration in linkage design.”³⁰ In addition, the EIR/EIS states that “[d]ue to the limited availability of habitat in the study area, implementation of the MHCP is not expected to substantially increase or decrease the population viability of the mountain lion.”³¹ The EIR/EIS likewise concludes there are no major populations or critical locations for the mountain lion within the plan area, and concludes it is “adequately conserved” under the plan. (*Id.*)
- (3) The San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program is an NCCP and HCP that covers 900 square miles in the southwestern portion of the San Diego. The Program lists mountain lions as “conserved” and states that mountain lions “will be covered by the MSCP because 81% of the core areas (105,000± acres) that support its habitat will be conserved.”³² While the Program generally notes that linkage areas were designed to accommodate “large animal movement,” the Program does not identify any linkages designed for mountain lions or any specific measures designed to protect them. Likewise, while the Program states that “[s]pecific design criteria for linkages and road crossings/undercrossings are included in subarea plans,” not all subarea plans are complete.

²⁸ Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority, *Western Riverside County MSHCP Species Accounts*, available at http://wrcrca.conserveriverside.com/wrcrca/Permit_Docs/MSHCP_Docs/volume2/vol2-secb_Mammals.pdf.

²⁹ Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority, *Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan*, available at http://wrcrca.conserveriverside.com/wrcrca/Permit_Docs/MSHCP_Docs/volume1/Vol1-sec2.pdf.

³⁰ San Diego Association of Governments, *San Diego Multiple Habitat Conservation Program Biological Monitoring and Management Plan (Volume III)* (Mar. 2003), available at https://www.sandag.org/programs/environment/habitat_preservation/mhcp_vol3.pdf.

³¹ San Diego Association of Governments, *Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report for Threatened and Endangered Species Due to Urban Growth within the Multiple Habitat Conservation Program Planning Area* (Mar. 2003), available at https://www.sandag.org/programs/environment/habitat_preservation/mhcp_eir_voll.pdf.

³² County of San Diego, *Final Multiple Species Conservation Program* (Aug. 1998), available at <https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/mscp/docs/SCMSCP/FinalMSCPPProgramPlan.pdf>.

- (4) The San Diego North County Multiple Species Conservation Plan is one of the “subarea” plans anticipated by San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program. However, it has not been completed and is still “in development.”³³
- (5) The Orange County Transportation Authority NCCP/HCP (“OCTA Plan”) lists the mountain lion as a covered species for purposes of the federal HCP, but not for purposes of the NCCP permit. The OCTA Plan acknowledges that despite protection from hunting, annual survival for radio-collared lions is “surprisingly low” at 55.8 percent and that vehicle collisions and depredation permits are primary sources of mortality. The OCTA Plan states that targeted investment in habitat protection is “especially urgent to maintain viability of the Santa Ana Mountains populations.”³⁴ The OCTA Plan does contain four “Species Goals” for mountain lions, including (1) acquiring 1,013 acres of suitable habitat; (2) fencing realignment near the Highway 241 toll road; (3) funding of the North Coal Canyon Restoration Project; and (4) a “wildlife crossing policy” requiring pre-construction surveys to ensure existing crossings “maintain or improve functionality” if modified by new freeway projects. However, despite allowing the expansion of two highways in lion habitat (Projects G and J), the OCTA Plan does not require the construction of any specific wildlife crossings. The OCTA Plan nonetheless claims that impacts on the mountain lion will be offset through these “Species Goals.”

There are no NCCPs that cover the Central Coast. In addition, there are no NCCPs that cover portions of the Santa Cruz Mountains except the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan. However, this Plan does not cover mountain lions.

8.2 Federal Regulatory Mechanisms

8.2.1 National Environmental Policy Act

The National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) is the nation’s charter for protection of the environment. (40 C.F.R. § 1500.1(a).) NEPA is designed to ensure that environmental information is available to the public *before* decisions are made or actions taken and to help public officials make decisions based on an understanding of the environmental consequences. (40 C.F.R. § 1500.1(b)-(c).) Federal agencies must prepare an environmental impact statement (“EIS”) if it is known that an action will significantly affect the environment, or an environmental assessment (“EA”) if the extent of effects are unknown. (42 U.S.C. § 4332; 40 C.F.R. §§ 1502.3 & 1508.9.) NEPA further requires federal agencies to analyze reasonable alternatives to the proposed project. (40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(a)-(c).) NEPA requires the federal agency to consider the degree of adverse effect on a species or its critical habitat designated pursuant to the Federal Endangered Species Act. (*Conservation Cong. v. United States Forest Serv.* (E.D.Cal. 2017) 235 F.Supp.3d 1189, 1207.)

³³ County of San Diego, *Multiple Species Conservation Program*, available at <https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/mscp/>.

³⁴ Orange County Transportation Authority, *Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan* (Nov. 2016), available at <https://www.octa.net/pdf/NCCP%20HCP%20FINAL.pdf>.

However, agencies have not interpreted NEPA as requiring analysis of impacts to populations that are not currently listed as threatened or endangered, such as the Southern California or Central Coast mountain lions. For instance, Caltrans prepared an Initial Study with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment for the State Route 118 Widening Project (the “State Route 118 EA”) in October 2017 pursuant to NEPA and CEQA. The State Route 118 EA contains no analysis of whether adding more traffic lanes to State Route 118 will impact mountain lions or degrade wildlife connectivity even though multiple mountain lions have died recently attempting to cross State Route 118.³⁵

NEPA also is insufficient to protect Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions because courts have interpreted NEPA as primarily a “procedural” statute. While NEPA does require federal agencies to consider detailed information regarding a project’s environmental effects, “NEPA itself does not mandate particular results.” (*Winter v. NRDC, Inc.* (2008) 555 U.S. 7, 23.)

8.3 Regional and Local Plans and Policies

8.3.1 Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area General Management Plan

The Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area General Management Plan (“GMP”) was prepared pursuant to NEPA and provides a framework for the management of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area (“SMMNRA”), which is administered by the National Park Service, California State Parks, and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy. The GMP recognizes that the Santa Monica Mountains mountain lion population’s ability to survive in the face of large-scale habitat fragmentation and destruction is uncertain.³⁶ (GMP at 154.) The GMP states that “it is likely that their persistence [] would depend upon their capability of dispersing to and from other habitat areas beyond the Santa Monica Mountains.” (GMP at 154; see also GMP at 157.) The GMP identifies the “greatest threat” to natural resource preservation in the SMMNRA as “loss of habitat connectivity from increased development and urban encroachment.” (*Id.* at 157.) The GMP concedes that “the situation is especially serious for mountain lions” and lists mountain lions as a “park species of concern.” (*Id.* at 157 & 161.) The GMP agrees that improvements to facilitate wildlife movement across freeways or through developments may be necessary, but does not propose or require any specific actions to improve wildlife movement across freeways or through development.

The preferred alternative in the GMP provides for enhancing connectivity of undisturbed habitats in the SMMNRA by creating large expanses of open space. (*Id.* at 292.) In addition, the Las Virgenes Canyon and Liberty Canyon areas are included within the SMMNRA boundary to help provide wildlife connectivity for mountain lions and other large species. (*Id.* at 293.) Even though the GMP recognizes the threats facing the Santa Monica Mountains mountain lion

³⁵ National Parks Traveler, *Another Mountain Lion Killed Near Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area* (Jan. 27, 2017), available at <https://www.nationalparkstraveler.org/2017/01/another-mountain-lion-killed-near-santa-monica-mountains-national-recreation-area>.

³⁶ National Park Service, U.S. Department of Interior, *Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement* (July 2002), available at <https://www.nps.gov/samo/learn/management/loader.cfm?csModule=security/getfile&PageID=383979>.

population and takes steps to protect this population, the GMP does not apply to lands outside of the SMMNRA and thus is insufficient to address the regional connectivity issues facing the population. Nor does the GMP apply to roads and highways under Caltrans' jurisdiction.

8.3.2 Ventura County Wildlife Connectivity Ordinance

The Ventura County Board of Supervisors adopted an ordinance on March 12, 2019 (the "Connectivity Ordinance") to help facilitate wildlife connectivity and minimize habitat fragmentation for mountain lions, mule deer, California gnatcatchers, bobcats, least bell's vireos, California red-legged frogs, and other species. The Connectivity Ordinance establishes overlay zones called "habitat connectivity and wildlife corridors" ("HCWCs") and "critical wildlife passage areas" ("CWPAAs") in which development standards and permitting requirements apply. Development standards include 200-foot setbacks from surface water features such as streams and wetlands, limits on certain wildlife impermeable fencing, encouraging compact siting of development, and prohibiting non-commercial planting of invasive plants. Two of the linkages targeted in the Connectivity Ordinance are the Santa Monica Mountains – Sierra Madre Mountains connection and the Sierra Madre Mountains – Castaic Connection, which connect wildlife habitat in the Santa Monica Mountains, Santa Susana Mountains, Simi Hills, and Los Padres National Forest.

While the Connectivity Ordinance should help allow wildlife to move more easily through private lands between core habitat areas, it would do little to ensure connectivity across major roads and highways because Ventura County does not have jurisdiction over these areas. The ordinance would, however, establish 200-foot setbacks from the exit and entry points of 25 existing road crossings in order to facilitate wildlife movement through the crossings. Caltrans and its road maintenance and improvement activities are not regulated by the Connectivity Ordinance. The Connectivity Ordinance is therefore a step in the right direction but insufficient on its own to address the threats facing the CC-S mountain lion population.

8.3.3 Los Angeles County Significant Ecological Areas Program

Los Angeles County is currently in the process of updating the Significant Ecological Areas ("SEAs") Ordinance. The draft ordinance is intended to protect biodiversity in SEAs from incompatible development and ensure that projects reduce habitat fragmentation and edge effects by providing technical review of impacts and requiring mitigation.³⁷ Like the Ventura County ordinance, the SEAs designations can lead to compact development and allow wildlife to more easily move across private lands between core habitat areas. However, the SEA ordinance is not specifically designed to protect mountain lions and would not regulate Caltrans and its road maintenance and expansion activities.

8.4 *Future Development Will Further Threaten the Survival of Southern California Mountain Lions*

³⁷ Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, *Significant Ecological Areas Ordinance Update, Public Hearing Draft* (Feb. 14, 2019), available at <http://planning.lacounty.gov/site/sea/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/EX-C-SEA-Ordinance-Public-hearing-Draft-2-14-2019.pdf>

Continued development in Southern California is expected to further impair connectivity between core habitat areas, leading to further decreases in genetic diversity for Southern California mountain lions. In the environmental review for Southern California national forest land management plans, the U.S. Forest Service found that impaired connectivity poses a serious threat to Southern California mountain lions: the “greatest concern for the long-term health of mountain lion populations on the national forests of southern California is loss of landscape connectivity between mountain ranges and large blocks of open space on private land.”³⁸ The review warned that private land development in Southern California is “steadily reducing the habitat linkages that wildlife species need to connect large blocks of national forest land with other public and private natural spaces and habitat reserves.” The review observed that the “widening of the existing highway system and new highways” are a threat to mountain lions because they create barriers to movement. The review concluded that “[w]ithout the national forests and linkages between the mountain ranges and other large habitat preserves, *there is not much long term potential for mountain lions in southern California.*” The review noted that maintenance and restoration of corridors between large wildlands is essential to conserving mountain lions in Southern California

As anticipated by the U.S. Forest Service’s environmental review, private land development is currently being approved on linkage areas without sufficient mitigation for Southern California mountain lions or wildlife connectivity. For instance, the 1,000-acre Northlake Specific Plan (“Northlake”) was approved by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors on April 2, 2019. The Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy (“SMMC”) formally objected to the Board’s approval of Northlake, noting that the development would degrade a known wildlife linkage between the Angeles National Forest and Los Padres National Forest.³⁹ CDFW raised similar concerns about the development because it would impair a linkage that is “highly suitable for regional wildlife movement and connectivity” for mountain lions and other species.⁴⁰ The Board of Supervisors approved Northlake notwithstanding the objections and concerns of SMMC and CDFW.

Likewise, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors tentatively approved the 12,000-acre Centennial Specific Plan (“Centennial”) on December 11, 2018 despite SMMC warning the Board that Centennial “would sever the most optimal five-mile-wide habitat linkage across Highway 128 between I5 and State Route 14.”⁴¹

In the SAM, key linkage and habitat areas remain unprotected and subject to potential or actual development. The Altair Specific Plan discussed in *Section 8 Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms* exemplifies this trend. Other lands in the Santa Ana-Palomar Mountain

³⁸ Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, *Final Environmental Impact Statement, Land Management Plans, Angeles National Forest Cleveland National Forest Los Padres National Forest San Bernardino National Forest* (Sept. 2005), available at https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5166889.pdf.

³⁹ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, *Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report Comments on Northlake Specific Plan Project*, May 22, 2017.

⁴⁰ California Department of Fish and Wildlife, *Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report Comments on Northlake Specific Plan*, June 12, 2017.

⁴¹ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, *Centennial Project Draft Environmental Impact Report Comments County Project No. 02-232*, July 17, 2017.

linkage have been subject to development proposals such as the Temecula Creek Inn (Vickers 2015). The Orange County Board of Supervisors also approved a 6,000-acre development in the Santa Ana Mountains in the “center of puma habitat” (Vickers 2015).⁴²

Development in wildlands and linkages will intensify as Southern California’s population increases. The Southern California Association of Governments (“SCAG”) Program EIR estimates that between 2016 and 2040 the Southern California region will grow by 3.8 million residents and 1.5 million households.⁴³ The SCAG Program EIR concludes that transportation projects within the SCAG region such as “mixed flow lane projects” and “grade separation projects” may result in significant impacts on wildlife movement, including direct habitat removal and fragmentation that would disrupt corridor functionality. The SCAG Program EIR also acknowledges that “an increase in wildlife-roadway interactions as a result of the development of new transportation projects may increase wildlife injury and fatalities.”

The SCAG Program EIR recognizes that “[b]arriers to wildlife movement exist throughout the SCAG region, including large areas of urban development and multilane freeways that cut off regional movement corridors for large migratory species such as mountain lions (*Puma concolor*).” SCAG Program EIR further notes that “wildlife crossings serve to alleviate these barriers and facilitate wildlife movement through the region” and references the planned Liberty Canyon Crossing. However, the Program EIR does not identify any other planned crossings or identify funding for the Liberty Canyon Crossing.

The SCAG Program EIR also confirms that only portions of the lands in the Santa Monica Mountains, SAM, SGSB, and EPR are designated as “open space and recreation” or “undevelopable and protected.” Indeed, much of these lands are designated for single family residential or mixed residential. At this time, there are also “vast areas” in Southern California that are undeveloped but are not designated as open space or are otherwise protected, according to SCAG. In addition, agricultural lands are rapidly being converted to urban development throughout Southern California with an estimated 230,000 acres converted between 1996 and 2004 and up to 700,000 acres may be converted by 2030. In short, SCAG recognizes that wildlife connectivity will become even more impaired in the Southern California region due to anticipated growth, but SCAG does not offer any solutions to address the effects of this impaired connectivity on Southern California mountain lions.

Other studies confirm that much of the remaining mountain lion habitat in Southern California is on unprotected lands and at risk of development. According to Burdett et al. (2010), almost half of suitable mountain lion habitat in Southern California (since 1970) is on private lands, of which 35% will be developed by 2030, and other currently contiguous habitat will become fragmented. Hunter et al. (2003) similarly found that 30% of high suitability mountain lion habitat and 76% of medium suitability mountain lion habitat in Southern California is not protected from development. In addition, Zeller et al. (2017) found that only 35% of resource-

⁴² See also Chris Boucly, “New community coming to South County,” *The Orange County Register* (Mar. 24, 2012), available at <https://www.ocregister.com/2012/03/24/new-community-coming-to-south-county/>

⁴³ Southern California Association of Governments, *Draft Program Environmental Impact Report* (Dec. 2015), available at http://scagrtpscs.net/Documents/2016/peir/draft/2016dPEIR_Complete.pdf.

use patches and 47% of corridors identified in their study area, which encompassed much of the SAM and EPR, were fully protected. Given the extreme isolation, low genetic diversity, and high adult mortality rates from vehicle strikes and depredation kills, increased efforts to protect the species and their habitat are warranted.

Within Riverside County, which covers a significant portion of the Santa Ana Mountains, population growth is expected to be especially high; the Riverside County General Plan predicts that the County's population and housing stock will increase to 3.6 million people and 1.3 million dwelling units by 2035, which constitutes a 65 percent increase.⁴⁴ Within San Bernardino County, which encompasses portions of the San Bernardino and San Gabriel Mountains, more than 630,000 people will be added to the County along with 230,000 homes.⁴⁵ As urban development overtakes mountain lion habitat and linkage areas throughout the region, conflict with mountain lions, and consequent killing of lions under depredation permits will likely increase. Similarly, use of anticoagulant rodenticides and other environmental toxicants in these areas will likely increase, leading to increased illness and fatalities to "non-target organisms" such as Southern California mountain lions.

Caltrans and local transportation agencies are expected to continue building and expanding roads and highways in Southern California to accommodate actual and anticipated vehicles and development. Caltrans' 2018 State Transportation Improvement Program ("STIP") lists many large-scale road and highway projects planned for Southern California.⁴⁶ These include converting SR-71 to a four- and six-lane freeway as well as adding more lanes to the I-15 Freeway adjacent to the SAM,⁴⁷ which already acts as a nearly impenetrable barrier to the SAM and EPR mountain lion populations. As noted in *Section 8 Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms*, Caltrans has certified an EIR/EIS to convert the existing two-lane SR-138 into a four or six-lane highway, which will create major barrier between the Tehachapi Mountains and Angeles National Forest. Caltrans also intends to widen SR-118, which will further impair connectivity between the Santa Monica Mountains and Santa Susana Mountains to the detriment of the Santa Monica Mountains mountain lions. There are numerous other road and highway projects planned for Southern California in the next few years.⁴⁸ These projects will be funded in part by SB 1, which will raise approximately \$52 billion over 10 years.

⁴⁴ County of Riverside, *Riverside County General Plan Environmental Impact Report No. 521* (March 2014), available at https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/14/genplan/general_plan_2014/EnvironmentalImpactReport/03-0_ProjectDescription_2014-04-07.pdf.

⁴⁵ San Bernardino County, *Countywide Plan Growth Forecast*, available at http://countywideplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/CWP_OH_GrowthForecast_FINAL_20180809.pdf.

⁴⁶ California Department of Transportation, *2018 Report on STIP Balances County and Interregional Shares* (Aug. 1, 2018), available at http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/stip/2018-stip/2018_ORANGE_BOOK.pdf.

⁴⁷ Riverside County Transportation Commission, *I-15 Express Lanes Project Southern Extension*, <https://www.rctc.org/i15-express-southern-extension/>

⁴⁸ Kurt Snibbe, "Here are the major highway improvement projects happening in Southern California through 2023," *Orange County Register* (Jan. 23, 2018), <https://www.ocregister.com/2018/01/23/here-are-maps-and-a-list-of-the-major-highway-improvement-projects-in-southern-california/>; Jeong Park, "2019 will be a busy year for big road construction projects in Orange County," *Orange County Register* (Dec. 31, 2018), <https://www.ocregister.com/2018/12/31/2019-will-be-a-busy-year-for-big-road-construction-projects-in-orange-county/>.

Along with this expansion in roads and highways will come an increase in automobile use: SCAG predicts that the number of vehicle miles travelled (“VMT”) in the region is expected to increase 13.3 percent by 2040 (from 448 million VMT per day to 504 million VMT per day). This significant increase in automobile use will further impair connectivity and lead to more collisions between automobiles and lions.

8.5 *Future Development Will Further Threaten the Survival of Central Coast Mountain Lions*

Future development and highway expansion in the San Francisco Bay Area and Central Coast is anticipated to further fragment habitat for Central Coast mountain lion populations and will increase threats to their survival.

The Association of Bay Area Governments’ Plan Bay Area projects that the population of the San Francisco Bay Area is expected to increase from 7.2 million to 9.3 million by 2040—a 30 percent increase.⁴⁹ This includes a 26 percent increase in San Mateo County and a 36 percent increase in Santa Clara County, both of which encompass significant portions of the Santa Cruz Mountains. The Plan Bay Area also envisions a 25 percent increase in housing units in San Mateo County, and a 31 percent increase in Santa Clara County.

The Greenbelt Alliance’s “At Risk” Report (“Greenbelt Report”) estimates that 22,700 acres in San Mateo County are at medium or high risk for development, significant portions of which are in the Santa Cruz Mountains.⁵⁰ The Greenbelt Report shows that only 113,000 acres of the Santa Cruz Mountains are permanently protected and warns that San Mateo County has planned to develop housing in remote areas on the eastern slope of the Santa Cruz Mountains. The Greenbelt Report estimates that Santa Clara County has 54,100 acres at high or medium risk of development, significant portions of which are in the Santa Cruz Mountains and eastern foothills. The Greenbelt Report further shows that while large swaths of the eastern Santa Cruz Mountains are currently at “low risk” for development, only fragmented portions enjoy permanent protection.

Similarly, the EIR for the Plan Bay Area 2040 notes that land use growth footprints overlap with approximately 1,040 acres of “Essential Connectivity Areas” or “ECAs.”⁵¹ The EIR claims these growth footprints are in already urbanized corridors that are degraded so that their function as linkages is limited. The EIR acknowledges that development projects may directly encroach on wildlife corridors, but does not provide any plan to address the effects of such encroachment. In addition, Caltrans has a number of highway improvement projects planned in Santa Clara and San Mateo counties.⁵²

⁴⁹ Metropolitan Transportation Commission and Association of Bay Area Governments, *Bay Area Plan: A Strategy for A Sustainable Region* (July 18, 2013), available at http://files.mtc.ca.gov/pdf/Plan_Bay_Area_FINAL/Plan_Bay_Area.pdf.

⁵⁰ Greenbelt Alliance, *At Risk 2017* (May 2017), available at <https://www.greenbelt.org/at-risk-2017/>.

⁵¹ Metropolitan Transportation Commission and Association of Bay Area Governments, *Draft Environmental Impact Report for Plan Bay Area 2040* (April 2017), available at http://2040.planbayarea.org/cdn/farfuture/JHbwWZgw24OSpVBL0b8cJ5_2KH0dckVexpxYp5McOkI/1499352691/sites/default/files/2017-07/PBA%202040%20DEIR_0_1.pdf.

⁵² Caltrans District 4, *Projects By County*, available at http://www.dot.ca.gov/d4/projects_list.htm.

There also is development pressure on the Pajaro Hills linkage, which is important to the Central Coast North mountain lion population and connects the Santa Cruz Mountains and Gabilan Range.⁵³ The Land Trust of Santa Cruz County notes that while a few large ranches cover most of the Pajaro Hills, many of the properties are parcelized, creating the potential for development which would fragment the landscape. Only 8 percent of the Pajaro Hills is permanently protected.

Growth is expected to increase in the Monterey Bay Area, leading to further fragmentation of natural habitats by urban or exurban development. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments predicts that the population in the Monterey Bay Area will rise from 755,403 in 2015 to 883,300 in 2040.⁵⁴ The Land Trust of Santa Cruz County notes that while high rates of conversion of forests, rangeland and farmland has largely been prevented in Santa Cruz County, exurban development, roads and mining are fragmenting wildlife habitat. Vineyard conversion adjacent to Zayante, Beer Creek, and Summit roads is causing habitat fragmentation in one of the largest intact habitat patches connecting Santa Cruz and Santa Clara counties. The Land Trust of Santa Cruz County estimates that only 44 percent of the large patches of intact habitat are protected. The Conservation Lands Network likewise confirms that much of the Santa Cruz Mountains do not currently qualify as protected areas.⁵⁵

In San Luis Obispo County, the population is expected to increase by 41,650 between 2015 and 2045.⁵⁶ The sparsely populated North Coast region of San Luis Obispo County is currently characterized by ranchlands, rural development, and open space. However, the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (“SLOCOG”) predicts more population growth in this region as compared to other regions. SLOCOG also predicts significant increases in traffic volumes on Highway 101 throughout San Luis Obispo County. The US 101 Corridor Mobility Master Plan also contains various proposals to expand the Interstate 101 freeway in San Luis Obispo County, including adding more lanes to the freeway.⁵⁷ There are also proposals to widen portions of State Route 46, the western portions of which bisect mountain lion habitat. The Caltrans State Route 46 Corridor System Management Plan concedes that widening segments 2 and 3 of State Route 46 “could present additional barriers to animal movements by further dividing large, contiguous wildlife habitat areas.”⁵⁸ There are numerous other road and highway

⁵³ Land Trust of Santa Cruz County, *A Conservation Blueprint* (May 2011), available at https://landtrustsantacruz.org/blueprint/conservation-blueprint_low-res_110522.pdf.

⁵⁴ Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, *2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy* (June 2018), available at http://ambag.org/programs/met_transp_plann/documents/Final_2040_MTP_SCS/AMBAG_MTP-SCS_Final_EntireDocument.pdf.

⁵⁵ Conservation Lands Network, *1.0 Progress Report* (2014), available at <https://www.bayarealands.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CLN-1.0-Progress-Report.pdf>.

⁵⁶ San Luis Obispo Council of Governments, *2019 Regional Transportation Plan Public Review Draft* (Feb. 2019), available at <https://www.dropbox.com/s/6pysudp1g36n4a5/Public%20Rev%20draft.pdf?dl=0>.

⁵⁷ San Luis Obispo County of Governments, *US 101 Corridor Mobility Master Plan* (Sept. 2014), available at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/5_SLOCOG%20101_executive_summary_draft_9%2019%2014.pdf.

⁵⁸ Caltrans, *State Route 46 Corridor System Management Plan* (June 2009), available at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/corridor-mobility/CSMPs/d5_CSMPs/SR%2046/SR-46%20CSMPo100.pdf.

expansion projects planned for Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Barbara counties.⁵⁹ The expansion of existing roads and highways along with increased numbers of automobiles will further impair connectivity in the Central Coast region.

9 CESA Listing for Southern California and Central Coast Mountain Lions Would Supplement Proposition 117's Protections.

9.1 CESA Listing is Consistent with Proposition 117.

CESA protections for Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions are consistent with and supplemental to those established by Proposition 117. Both CESA and Proposition 117 include “take prohibitions”—CESA makes it unlawful for any person or agency to import, export, take, possess, or purchase a listed species. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2080.) By the same token, Proposition 117 makes it unlawful to take, injure, possess, transport, import, or sell a mountain lion. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 4800(b).)

Both CESA and Proposition 117's take prohibitions are subject to certain exceptions. Under CESA, CDFW may authorize that a person, agency, or institution take a listed species “for scientific, educational, or management purposes.” (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2081(a).) CESA defines scientific resources management activities to include “research, census, law enforcement, habitat acquisition, restoration and maintenance, propagation, live trapping, and, transplantation, and, in the extraordinary case where population pressures within a given ecosystem cannot be otherwise relieved, [] regulated taking.” (*San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society v. City of Moreno Valley* (1996) 44 Cal.App.4th 593, 604, quoting Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2061.) The regulations implementing CESA also allow for the take of a listed species for management or law enforcement purposes: “Department wildlife management activities. The possession or take of endangered, threatened, or candidate species by employees and agents of the Department for scientific, educational and management purposes, and for law enforcement purposes, is not prohibited.” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 783.1(c).) As discussed above in *Section 8 Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms*, Proposition 117 also contains exceptions which allow for the take of mountain lions in certain circumstances. These exceptions are sufficiently similar that in most cases take of mountain lions properly authorized by Proposition 117 could be consistent with CESA's exceptions for wildlife management activities or law enforcement purposes. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 783.1(c).)

9.2 CESA Listing Would Further the Goals of Proposition 117.

CESA listing would further Proposition 117's goals of protecting and restoring wildlife habitat as human populations increase. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2780(a).) CESA listing would also help preserve “corridors of natural habitat [] to maintain the genetic integrity” of mountain lions in the Santa Monica Mountains, Santa Ana Mountains, Santa Susana Mountains, Simi Hills, and Coast Range. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2780(a).)

Likewise, CESA requires that “reasonable and prudent alternatives” that will not jeopardize the existence of a listed species be developed in coordination with the project

⁵⁹ Caltrans District 5, *Projects By County*, available at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/d5/>.

proponent and state lead agency consistent with conserving the listed species and maintaining the project purpose to the greatest extent feasible. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2053(b).) In the event that such alternatives are infeasible, individual projects may still be approved if appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2054.) CESA envisions these mandates will be incorporated into the CEQA process. (Cal. Fish & Game Code §§ 2064-2065; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §§ 783.3 & 783.5.)

Consistent with Proposition 117, CESA further provides that it is the policy of the state to conserve and protect listed species and their habitat, including through acquiring lands for habitat. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2052.) Towards this end, CESA directs state agencies to utilize their authority to conserve listed species. (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2055.) If the Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions were listed under CESA, this mandate would apply to, for example, Caltrans, which currently lacks a clear mandate to conserve these lions or habitat connectivity necessary for their continued survival.

CESA authorizes CDFW to develop and implement “nonregulatory recovery plans” for listed species with priority given to species that are or may be “significantly affected by anticipated land use changes, climate change, or changes in aquatic conditions.” (Cal. Fish & Game Code §§ 2079.1(a) & (b).) Given the strong evidence that land use changes will significantly affect (and have already significantly affected) Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions, CDFW could develop and implement a recovery plan for these lions pursuant to this provision.

In sum, CESA listing would build upon the protections in Proposition 117 by establishing an affirmative duty to ensure the survival and recovery of the Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions by, *inter alia*, (1) prohibiting the approval of projects that could jeopardize their continued existence or result in destruction of essential habitat (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2053(a)); (2) requiring state agencies such as Caltrans to utilize their authority to conserve listed species (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2055); and (3) requiring appropriate mitigation measures be implemented for projects that could destroy mountain lion habitat or impair connectivity (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2054).

To the extent there is any tension between the provisions in Proposition 117 and CESA, Proposition 117 is to be “liberally construed to further its purposes.” (Prop. 117 § 9.) Because Proposition 117 and CESA both have similar purposes, Proposition 117 should be construed to be consistent with CESA.

10 Recommended Management and Recovery Actions

Recommendations for the management and recovery of Southern California and Central Coast mountain lion populations are as follows:

1. Design and build crossing infrastructure in strategic locations to improve wildlife connectivity and permeability at existing roads and highways. Crossing infrastructure should include but is not limited to overcrossings, underpasses, culverts, and exclusionary

fencing that guides animals to safer crossing areas. The following crossing locations have been identified by mountain lion experts and should be prioritized for the implementation of crossing infrastructure: 1) I-15 Freeway at Temecula Creek Bridge to enhance the Palomar Linkage and connect the Santa Ana and Eastern Peninsular Mountain Ranges (Gustafson et al. 2017; Zeller et al. 2017; Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2018); 2) I-15 Freeway at “Site 5” as described in Riley et al. (2018); 3) Hwy-101 at West Liberty Canyon. (Riley et al. 2018.)

2. Improve or add large culverts to existing freeways in areas suitable for mountain lion crossing. (Vickers 2015).
3. Dedicate sufficient Wildlife Conservation Board, Habitat Conservation Fund and other state funding sources towards acquiring key mountain lion habitat and for establishment of highway crossing infrastructure.
4. Ensure that suitable habitat exists (through preservation or restoration/enhancement) on both sides of crossing structures and culverts (South Coast Wildlands 2008). Restrict human activity near crossing structures and relocate foot trails away from these structures (South Coast Wildlands 2008).
5. Fully protect mountain lion habitat, including resource-use patches and corridors (Zeller et al. 2017; Vickers et al. 2015). Prohibit large-scale development in primary travel corridors and habitat linkages, such as in and around the last remaining linkage for statewide genetic connectivity in the Tehachapi and Sierra Pelona Mountains (Gustafson et al. 2018) and in corridor areas between the SAM and EPR (Gustafson et al. 2017).
6. Require analysis of region-wide wildlife connectivity in all new development proposals (Gustafson et al. 2018).
7. Reduce depredation conflicts that precipitate mountain lion deaths (Vickers et al. 2015). Develop and implement outreach and education activities to promote use of predator-proof enclosures for domestic animals. (Vickers et al. 2015.) Expand CDFW’s new three-step depredation permit policy in the CC-S and SAM areas to include all mountain lions across the state, or at a minimum, within the SGSB, EPR, CC-N, and CC-C population areas. Enhance the policy with enforceable implementation of non-lethal protective measures and reporting requirements.
8. Prohibit the use of second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides (“SGARs”), such as brodifacoum, bromadiolone, difenacoum, and difethialone in Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions’ core habitat areas and linkages. Limit the use of other pesticides and herbicides that may have negative effects on mountain lion populations in Southern California and the Central Coast.
9. Identify “priority areas” for establishing wildlife passage features for the Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions using the best available science, including data collected by various agencies, academic institutions, and organizations, including

but not limited to the National Park Service, the Karen C. Drayer Wildlife Health Center at UC Davis, the Road Ecology Center at UC Davis, and the Santa Cruz Puma Project at UC Santa Cruz.

10. Require Caltrans to analyze how projects in the State Highway Operation Protection Program and State Transportation Improvement Program can be designed to facilitate wildlife connectivity through wildlife passage features such as culverts, undercrossings, overcrossings, bridges, directional fencing, scuppers, barrier breaks, roadside animal detection systems, etc. Require Caltrans to collect and analyze roadkill data to identify hotspots where mountain lions are killed. Require Caltrans to implement wildlife passage features to the greatest extent feasible and as expeditiously as possible.

11 References

- Allen, M., Elbroch, L. M., Casady, D. S., & Wittmer, H. U. (2014). Seasonal variation in the feeding ecology of pumas (*Puma concolor*) in northern California. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 92(5), 397–403.
- Allen, M. L. (2014). *The ecology and behaviour of pumas (Puma concolor) in Northern California, USA*. (Doctoral dissertation, Victoria University of Wellington).
- Allen, M. L., Wittmer, H. U., & Wilmers, C. C. (2014). Puma communication behaviours: understanding functional use and variation among sex and age classes. *Behaviour*, 151(6), 819–840.
- Anderson, Jr., C. R., & Lindzey, F. G. (2003). Estimating Cougar Predation Rates from GPS Location Clusters Author (s): *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 67(2), 307–316.
- Atkinson, W. (2018, December 3). The Link Between Power Lines and Wildfires. *Electrical Contractor Magazine*.
- Balch, J. K., Bradley, B. A., Abatzoglou, J. T., Nagy, R. C., Fusco, E. J., & Mahood, A. L. (2017). Human-started wildfires expand the fire niche across the United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(11), 2946–2951.
- Ballou, J. D., Foose, T. J., Lacey, R. C., & Seal, U. S. (1989). Florida panther (*Felis concolor*) coryi population viability analysis and recommendations. *Captive Breeding Specialist Group, Species Survival Commission, IUCN*, Apple Valley, MN.
- Barry, J. M., Elbroch, L. M., Aiello-Lammens, M. E., Sarno, R. J., Seelye, L., Kusler, A., ... & Grigione, M. M. (2019). Pumas as ecosystem engineers: ungulate carcasses support beetle assemblages in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. *Oecologia*, 189(3), 577–586.
- Beier, Paul. (1993). Determining minimum habitat areas and habitat corridors for cougars. *Conservation Biology*, 7(1), 94–108.
- Beier, Paul. (1995). Dispersal of Juvenile Cougars in Fragmented Habitat. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 59(2), 228–237.
- Beier, P., & Barrett, R. H. (1993). The cougar in the Santa Ana Mountain Range, California. Final report. Orange County Cooperative Mountain Lion Study, Department of Forestry and Resource Management. *University of California, Berkeley, USA*.
- Beier, P., Choate, D., & Barrett, R. H. (1995). Movement patterns of mountain lions during different behaviors. *Journal of Mammalogy*, 76(4), 1056–1070.
- Beier, P., Riley, S.P.D., and Sauvajot, R.M. (2010). Mountain Lions (*Puma concolor*). In *Urban Carnivores: Ecology, Conflict, and Conservation*, S.D. Gehrt, S.P.D. Riley, and B. Cypher, eds. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press), pp. 141–155.
- Benson, J. F., Mahoney, P. J., Sikich, J. A., Serieys, L. E. K., Pollinger, J. P., Ernest, H. B., & Riley, S. P. D. (2016). Interactions between demography, genetics, and landscape connectivity increase extinction probability for a small population of large carnivores in a major metropolitan area. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 283(1837), 20160957.
- Benson, J. F., Mahoney, P. J., Vickers, T. W., Sikich, J. A., Beier, P., Riley, S. P. D., ... Boyce, W. M. (2019). Extinction vortex dynamics of top predators isolated by urbanization. *Ecological Applications*, e01868.
- Benson, J. F., Sikich, J. A., & Riley, S. P. D. (2016). Individual and population level resource selection patterns of mountain lions preying on mule deer along an urban-wildland gradient. *PLoS ONE*, 11(7), 1–16.

- Bistinas, I., Oom, D., Sá, A. C. L., Harrison, S. P., Prentice, I. C., & Pereira, J. M. C. (2013). Relationships between human population density and burned area at continental and global scales. *PLoS ONE*, 8(12), 1–12.
- Burdett, C. L., Crooks, K. R., Theobald, D. M., Wilson, K. R., Boydston, E. E., Lyren, L. M., ... & Boyce, W. M. (2010). Interfacing models of wildlife habitat and human development to predict the future distribution of puma habitat. *Ecosphere*, 1(1), 1-21.
- Cahill, A. E., Aiello-Lammens, M. E., Fisher-Reid, M. C., Hua, X., Karanewsky, C. J., Ryu, H. Y., ... Wiens, J. J. (2012). How does climate change cause extinction? *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 280(1750), 20121890. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2012.1890>
- Caragiulo, A., Dias-Freedman, I., Clark, J. A., Rabinowitz, S., & Amato, G. (2013). Mitochondrial DNA sequence variation and phylogeography of Neotropic pumas (*Puma concolor*). *Mitochondrial DNA*, 25(4), 304–312.
- CBS San Francisco. (2015, January 2). Car Strikes, Kills Mountain Lion On I-280 In San Bruno (WARNING : Contains Graphic Images). *CBS San Francisco*.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). (2017, December 15)
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). (2018). *Report to the Fish and Game Commission Regarding Findings of Necropsies on Mountain Lions Taken Under Depredation Permits in 2017*.
- Chandler, J. (2019, February 8). Edison now facing at least seven lawsuits over Woolsey Fire. *Curbed Los Angeles*.
- Chen, I.-C., Hill, J. K., Ohlemüller, R., Roy, D. B., & Thomas, C. D. (2011). Rapid range shifts of species associated with high levels of climate warming. *Science*, 333, 1024–1026.
- Cooley, H. S., Robinson, H. S., Wielgus, R. B., & Lambert, C. S. (2008). Cougar prey selection in a white-tailed deer and mule deer community. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 72(1), 99–106.
- Côté, S. D., Rooney, T. P., Tremblay, J. P., Dussault, C., & Waller, D. M. (2004). Ecological impacts of deer overabundance. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 35, 113-147.
- Culver, M., Johnson, W. E., Pecon-Slattery, J., & O'Brien, S. J. (2000). Genomic Ancestry of the American Puma. *The American Genetic Association*, 91, 186–197.
- Currier, M. J. (1983). *Felis concolor*. *Mammalian Species*, (200), 1–7.
- Cushman, S. A., McRae, B., Adriaensen, F., Beier, P., Shirley, M., & Zeller, K. (2013). Biological corridors and connectivity. In D. W. Macdonald & K. J. Willis (Eds.), *Key Topics in Conservation Biology 2* (First Edit, pp. 384–403). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Dellinger, J. (2019). *Relationship between habitat and genetics in a wide-ranging large carnivore*. Temecula, CA.
- Department of Pesticide Regulation. (2018). *An Investigation of Anticoagulant Rodenticide Data Submitted to the Department of Pesticide Regulation*.
- Dickson, B. G., & Beier, P. (2002). Home-range and habitat selection by adult cougars in Southern California. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 66(4), 1235–1245.
- Dickson, B. G., & Beier, P. (2006). Quantifying the influence of topographic position on cougar (*Puma concolor*) movement in southern California , USA. *Journal of Zoology*, 271(3), 270–277.
- Dickson, B. G., Jennes, J. S., & Beier, P. (2005). Influence of Vegetation, Topography, and Roads on Cougar Movement in Southern California. *Journal of Wildlife Management*,

- 69(1), 264–276. [https://doi.org/10.2193/0022-541X\(2005\)069<0264:IOVTAR>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.2193/0022-541X(2005)069<0264:IOVTAR>2.0.CO;2)
- Elbroch, L. M., O'Malley, C., Peziol, M., & Quigley, H. B. (2017). Vertebrate diversity benefiting from carrion provided by pumas and other subordinate, apex felids. *Biological Conservation*, 215, 123-131.
- Elbroch, L. M., & Quigley, H. (2019). Age-specific foraging strategies among pumas, and its implications for aiding ungulate populations through carnivore control. *Conservation Science and Practice*, 1(4), e23.
- Ernest, H. B., Boyce, W. M., Bleich, V. C., May, B., Stiver, S. J., & Torres, S. G. (2003). Genetic structure of mountain lion (*Puma concolor*) populations in California. *Conservation Genetics*, (4), 353–366.
- Ernest, H. B., Vickers, T. W., Morrison, S. A., Buchalski, M. R., & Boyce, W. M. (2014). Fractured genetic connectivity threatens a Southern California puma (*Puma concolor*) population. *PLoS ONE*, 9(10).
- Frankham, R. R. (1995). Effective population size/adult population size ratios in wildlife: a review. *Genetics Research*, 66, 95–107. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0016672308009695>
- Frankham, R., & Ralls, K. (1998). Inbreeding leads to extinction. *Nature*, 392(2), 441–442.
- Frankham, R. (2005). Genetics and extinction. *Biological Conservation*, 126, 131–140.
- Frankham, R., Bradshaw, C. J. A., & Brook, B. W. (2014). Genetics in conservation management: Revised recommendations for the 50/500 rules, Red List criteria and population viability analyses. *Biological Conservation*, 170, 56–63.
- Gabriel, M. W., Woods, L. W., Poppenga, R., Sweitzer, R. A., Thompson, C., Matthews, S. M., ... Clifford, D. L. (2012). Anticoagulant rodenticides on our public and community lands : spatial distribution of exposure and poisoning of a rare forest carnivore. *PLoS ONE*, 7(7).
- Gilbert, S. L., Sivy, K. J., Pozzanghera, C. B., DuBour, A., Overduijn, K., Smith, M. M., ... & Prugh, L. R. (2017). Socioeconomic Benefits of Large Carnivore Recolonization Through Reduced Wildlife-Vehicle Collisions. *Conservation Letters*, 10(4), 431-439.
- Gray, M., Wilmers, C. C., Reed, S. E., & Merenlender, A. M. (2016). Landscape feature-based permeability models relate to puma occurrence. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 147, 50–58.
- Grigione, M. M., Beier, P., Hopkins, R. A., Neal, D., Padley, W. D., Schonewald, C. M., & Johnson, M. L. (2002). Ecological and allometric determinants of home-range size for mountain lions (*Puma concolor*). *Animal Conservation*, 5, 317–324.
- Gustafson, K. D., Gagne, R. B., Vickers, T. W., Riley, S. P. D., Wilmers, C. C., Bleich, V. C., ... Ernest, H. B. (2018). Genetic source–sink dynamics among naturally structured and anthropogenically fragmented puma populations. *Conservation Genetics*, 20(2), 215–227.
- Gustafson, K. D., Vickers, T. W., Boyce, W. M., & Ernest, H. B. (2017). A single migrant enhances the genetic diversity of an inbred puma population. *Royal Society Open Science*, 4(5).
- Hansen, K. (1992). *Cougar: the American lion*. Northland Pub.
- Heller, N. E., & Zavaleta, E. S. (2009). Biodiversity management in the face of climate change: A review of 22 years of recommendations. *Biological Conservation*, 142(1), 14–32.
- Hornocker, M. G. (1970). *An analysis of mountain lion predation upon mule deer and elk*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia).
- Hunter, R. D., Fisher, R. N., & Crooks., K. R. (2003). Landscape-level connectivity in coastal southern California, USA, as assessed through carnivore habitat suitability. *Natural Areas Journal*, 23:302-314.

- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2018). *Global Warming of 1.5° C: An IPCC Special Report on the Impacts of Global Warming of 1.5° C Above Pre-industrial Levels and Related Global Greenhouse Gas Emission Pathways, in the Context of Strengthening the Global Response to the Threat of Climate Change, Sustainable Development, and Efforts to Eradicate Poverty*. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Available at: <http://www.ipcc.ch/report/sr15/>
- Iriarte, J. A., Franklin, W. L., Johnson, W. E., & Redford, K. H. (1990). Biogeographic variation of food habits and body size of the America puma. *Oecologia*, 85, 185–190.
- Jamieson, I. G., & Allendorf, F. W. (2012). How does the 50/500 rule apply to MVPs? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 27(10), 578–584.
- Jennings, M. (2018). *Effects of Wildfire on Wildlife and Connectivity*.
- Johnson, W. E., Onorato, D. P., Roelke, M. E., Land, E. D., Cunningham, M., Belden, R. C., ... O'Brien, S. J. (2010). Genetic restoration of the Florida panther. *Science*, 329, 1641–1645.
- Kamala. (2016, July 15). Dead puma found on Hwy 280. *Everything South City*.
- Keeley, J. E., & Fotheringham, C. J. (2003). Impact of Past Present and Future Fire Regimes on North American Mediterranean Shrublands. In *Fire and climatic change in temperate ecosystems of the Western Americas* (pp. 218–262).
- Kertson, B. N., Spencer, R. D., Marzluff, J. M., Hepinstall-Cymerman, J., & Grue, C. E. (2011). Cougar space use and movements in the wildland – urban landscape of western Washington. *Ecological Applications*, 21(8), 2866–2881.
- Kitchener, A. (1991). *The natural history of the wild cats*. Comstock Pub. Associates.
- Kitchener, A. C., Breitenmoser-Würsten, C., Eizirik, E., Gentry, A., Werdelin, L., Wiltin, A., ... Tobe, S. (2017). *A revised taxonomy of the Felidae. The final report of the Cat Classification Task Force of the IUCN/ SSC Cat Specialist Group*. Cat News.
- Knopff, K. H., Knopff, A. A., Kortello, A., & Boyce, M. S. (2010). Cougar kill rate and prey composition in a multiprey system. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 74(7), 1435–1447.
- Kucera, T. E. (1998). Yuma mountain lion, *Felis concolor browni*. In *Terrestrial Mammal Species of Special Concern in California* (pp. 135–138).
- Laundré, J., & Clark, T. W. (2003). Managing puma hunting in the western United States: Through a metapopulation approach. *Animal Conservation*, 6, 159–170.
- Lima, L. L., & Salmon, T. P. (2010). Assessing some potential environmental impacts from agricultural anticoagulant uses. *Proceedings of the Vertebrate Pest Conference*, 24(24), 199–203.
- Logan, K.A., & Sweanor, L.L. (2001). *Desert Puma: Evolutionary Ecology and Conservation of an Enduring Carnivore* (Washington: Island Press).
- Logan, K. A., & Sweanor, L.L. (2010). Behavior and social organization of a solitary carnivore. In *iCougar: Ecology and Conservation* (pp. 105-117).
- Mace, G. M., & Lande, R. (1991). Assessing extinction threats: Toward a reevaluation of IUCN threatened species categories. *Conservation Biology*, 5(2), 148–157.
- Maclean, I. M. D., & Wilson, R. J. (2011). Recent ecological responses to climate change support predictions of high extinction risk. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(30), 12337–12342.
- Maehr, D. S. ., Belden, R. C. ., Land, E. D., & Wilkins, L. (1990). Food habits of panthers in southwest Florida. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 54(3), 420–423.
- Mansfield, T. M., & Weaver, R. A. (1989). The status of mountain lions in California. *Transactions of the Western Section of the Wildlife Society*, 25, 72-76.

- McMillin, S. C., Hosea, R. C., Finlayson, Brian, F., Cypher, B. L., & Mekebri, A. (2008). Anticoagulant rodenticide exposure in an urban population of the San Joaquin kit fox. *Proceedings of the Vertebrate Pest Conference*, 23(23), 163–165.
- Mcrae, B. H., Dickson, B. G., Keitt, T. H., & Shah, V. B. (2008). Using circuit theory to model connectivity in ecology, evolution, and conservation. *Ecology*, 89(10), 2712–2724.
- 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), e52604.
- Midpeninsula Regional Open Space. (2017). *Highway 17 Wildlife Passage and Bay Area Ridge Trail Crossing Lexington Study Area*.
- Nielsen, C., Thompson, D., Kelly, M., & Lopez-Gonzalez, C. A. (2015). Puma concolor (errata version published in 2016). *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*, 2015-4.
- Olson, D. H., & Burnett, K. M. (2013). Geometry of forest landscape connectivity: pathways for persistence. In: Anderson, PD; Ronnenberg, KL, eds. *Density management in the 21st century: West Side Story. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-880. Portland, OR: US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station: 220–238.*, 880, 220-238.
- Pacifici, M., Visconti, P., Butchart, S. H. M., Watson, J. E. M., Cassola, F. M., & Rondinini, C. (2017). Species' traits influenced their response to recent climate change. *Nature Climate Change*, 7(3), 205–208. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate3223>
- Parnesan, C. (2006). Ecological and Evolutionary Responses to Recent Climate Change. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 37, 637–669.
- Parnesan, C., & Yohe, G. (2003). A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across natural systems. *Nature*, 421(2), 37–42. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature01286>
- Pierce, B. M., & Bleich, V. C. (2003). Mountain Lion Puma concolor. In G. A. Feldhamer, B. C. Thompson, & J. A. Chapman (Eds.), *Wild Mammals of North America Biology, Management, and Economics* (2nd ed., pp. 744–757). Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Pinto, N., & Keitt, T. H. (2008). Beyond the least-cost path: Evaluating corridor redundancy using a graph-theoretic approach. *Landscape Ecology*, 24(2), 253–266.
- Pollard, L. (2016, December 27). 100+ Calif. Mountain Lions a Year Killed by Motor Vehicles. *Public News Service*.
- Radeloff, V. C., Helmers, D. P., Kramer, H. A., Mockrin, M. H., Alexandre, P. M., Bar-Massada, A., ... Stewart, S. I. (2018). Rapid growth of the US wildland-urban interface raises wildfire risk. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(13), 3314–3319.
- Reed, D. H., Grady, J. J. O., Brook, B. W., Ballou, J. D., Frankham, R., & Analysis, P. V. (2003). Estimates of minimum viable population sizes for vertebrates and factors influencing those. *Biological Conservation*, 113, 23–34.
- Reyes-Velarde, A. (2019a, March 7). Fifth mountain lion diagnosed with mange, possibly linked to rat poison. *LA Times*.
- Reyes-Velarde, A. (2019b, April 30). Mountain lion dies of rat poison in Santa Monica Mountains. *LA Times*.
- Riley, S. P. D., Bromley, C., Poppengia, R. H., Uzal, F. A., Whited, L., & Sauvajot, R. M. (2007). Anticoagulant Exposure and Notoedric Mange in Bobcats and Mountain Lions in Urban Southern California. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 71(6), 1874–1884.
- Riley, S. P. D., Sauvajot, R. M., Fuller, T. K., York, E. C., Kamradt, D. A., Bromley, C., & Wayne, R. K. (2003). Effects of Urbanization and Habitat Fragmentation on Bobcats and

- Coyotes in Southern California. *Conservation Biology*, 17(2), 566–576.
- Riley, S. P. D., Serieys, L. E. K., Pollinger, J. P., Sikich, J. A., Dalbeck, L., Wayne, R. K., & Ernest, H. B. (2014). Individual behaviors dominate the dynamics of an urban mountain lion population isolated by roads. *Current Biology*, 24(17), 1989–1994.
- Riley, S. P. D., Smith, T., & Vickers, T.W. (2018). Assessment of Wildlife Crossing Sites for the Interstate 15 and Highway 101 Freeways in Southern California.
- Ripple, W. J., & Beschta, R. L. (2006). Linking a cougar decline , trophic cascade , and catastrophic regime shift in Zion National Park. *Biological Conservation*, 133, 397–408.
- Ripple, W. J., & Beschta, R. L. (2008). Trophic cascades involving cougar, mule deer, and black oaks in Yosemite National Park. *Biological Conservation*, 141, 1249–1256.
- Ripple, W. J., Estes, J. A., Beschta, R. L., Wilmers, C. C., Ritchie, E. G., Hebblewhite, M., ... Wirsing, A. J. (2014). Status and ecological effects of the world 's largest carnivores. *Science*, 343(6167), 1241484.
- Roelke, M. E., Martenson, J. S., & O'Brien, S. J. (1993). The consequences of demographic genetic depletion in the endangered reduction and Florida panther. *Current Biology*, 3(6), 340–350.
- Root, T. L., Price, J. T., Hall, K. R., Schneider, S. H., Resenzweig, C., & Pounds, J. A. (2003). Fingerprints of global warming on wild animals and plants. *Nature*, 421, 57–60.
- Rosas-Rosas, O. C., Valdez, R., Bender, L. C., & Daniel, D. (2003). Food habits of pumas in northwestern. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 31(2), 528–535.
- Rudd, J. L., McMillin, S. C., Kenyon Jr., M. W., Poppenga, R. H., Clifford, D. L. (2019). Anticoagulant rodenticide exposure in California mountain lions (*Puma concolor*). Presented at the Western Section of The Wildlife Society Conference, Yosemite, CA.
- Ruth, T. K. & Elbroch, M. (2014). The carcass chronicles: carnivory, nutrient flow, and biodiversity. *Wild Felid Monitor*, 13-17.
- Santa Cruz Puma Project. (2015, May 19). The Journeys of Young Pumas, and Welcome to Puma 56M. *Santa Cruz Puma Project Blog*.
- Scheffers, B. R., De Meester, L., Bridge, T. C. L., Hoffmann, A. A., Pandolfi, J. M., Corlett, R. T., ... Watson, J. E. M. (2016). The broad footprint of climate change from genes to biomes to people. *Science*, 354(6313).
- Seidensticker, J. C., Hornocker, M. G., Wiles, W. V., & Messick, J. P. (1973). Mountain lion social organization in the Idaho primitive area. *Wildlife Monographs*, 35, 3–60.
- Serieys, L. E. K., Armenta, T. C., Moriarty, J. G., Boydston, E. E., Lyren, L. M., Poppenga, R. H., ... Riley, S. P. D. (2015). Anticoagulant rodenticides in urban bobcats: exposure , risk factors and potential effects based on a 16-year study. *Ecotoxicology*.
- Shilling, F. M., Denney, C., Waetjen, D., Harrold, K., Farman, P., & Perez, P. (2018). *Impact of Wildlife-Vehicle Conflict on California Drivers and Animals*.
- Shilling, F. M., Waetjen, D. P., & Harrold, K. (2017). *Impact of Wildlife-Vehicle Conflict on California Drivers and Animals*.
- Slade, S. (2018). Another Mountain Lion Killed on 17. *Land Trust of Santa Cruz County*.
- Smith, J. A., Suraci, J. P., Clinchy, M., Crawford, A., Roberts, D., Zanette, L. Y., & Wilmers, C. C. (2017). Fear of the human 'super predator' reduces feeding time in large carnivores. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 284(1857), 20170433.
- Smith, J. A., Wang, Y., & Wilmers, C. C. (2015). Top carnivores increase their kill rates on prey as a response to human-induced fear. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 282(1802).

- Soule, M., Gilpin, M., Conway, W., & Foose, T. (1986). The Millenium Ark : How Long a Voyage , How Many Staterooms , How Many Passengers ? *Zoo Biology*, 5(2), 101–113.
- South Coast Wildlands. (2008). South coast missing linkages: a wildland network for the south coast ecoregion. *South Coast Wildlands, Fair Oaks, CA*.
- Spielman, D., Brook, B. W., & Frankham, R. (2004). Most species are not driven to extinction before genetic factors impact them. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 101(42), 15261–15264.
- Spong, G., Johansson, M., & Bjorklund, M. (2000). High genetic variation in leopards indicates large and long-term stable effective population size. *Molecular Ecology*, 9, 1773–1782.
- State Farm Insurance Company. (2016). Deer Collision 2015-2016.
- State Farm Insurance Company. (2018). Deer Collision 2017-2018.
- Syphard, A. D., Keeley, J. E., & Brennan, T. J. (2011). Comparing the role of fuel breaks across southern California national forests. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 261(11), 2038–2048.
- 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), e33954.
- Syphard, A. D., Radeloff, V. C., Hawbaker, T. J., & Stewart, S. I. (2009). Conservation threats due to human-caused increases in fire frequency in mediterranean-climate ecosystems. *Conservation Biology*, 23(3), 758–769.
- Syphard, A. D., Radeloff, V. C., Keeley, J. E., Hawbaker, T. J., Clayton, M. K., Stewart, S. I., ... Hammer, R. B. (2007). Human influence on California fire regimes. *Ecological Society of America*, 17(5), 1388–1402.
- Syphard, A. D., Rustigian-romsos, H., Mann, M., Conlisk, E., Moritz, M. A., & Ackerly, D. (2019). The relative influence of climate and housing development on current and projected future fire patterns and structure loss across three California landscapes. *Global Environmental Change*, 56, 41–55.
- Tanner, K. (2018, May 15). Mountain lion killed near Cambria after being hit by a car. *San Luis Obispo Tribune*.
- Telford, S. R. (2017). Deer reduction is a cornerstone of integrated deer tick management. *Journal of Integrated Pest Management*, 8(1).
- Trails, L. W., Brook, B. W., Frankham, R. R., & Bradshaw, C. J. A. (2010). Pragmatic population viability targets in a rapidly changing world. *Biological Conservation*, 143, 28–34.
- U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP). (2017). *Climate Science Special Report Fourth National Climate Assessment*. Washington, D.C. Lander, Wyoming.
- US Fish and Wildlife Service. (2008). *Florida Panther Recovery Plan*. Atlanta, Georgia.
- Van Dyke, F. G., Brocke, R. H., Shaw, H. G., Ackerman, B. B., Hemker, T. P., & Lindzey, F. G. (1986). Reactions of mountain lions to logging and human activity. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 50(1), 95–102.
- Vaughan, M. (2018, July 8). How many mountain lions are in California? We don't know. *San Luis Obispo Tribune*.
- Veklerov, K. (2018 Jan 7). Orphaned mountain lion cubs at Oakland Zoo part of trend in California. *San Francisco Chronicle*.
- Vickers, T. W. (2014). Re: SANDAG contract UCD 12-00606 – Mountain Lion Connectivity Study. Final Report.

- Vickers, T. W., Sanchez, J. N., Johnson, C. K., Morrison, S. A., Botta, R., Smith, T., ... Boyce, W. M. (2015). Survival and mortality of pumas (*Puma concolor*) in a fragmented, urbanizing landscape. *PLoS ONE*, *10*(7), 1–18.
- Vickers, T. W., Zeller, K., Ernest, H., Gustafson, K., & Boyce, W. (2017). Mountain Lion (*Puma concolor*) Connectivity in the North San Diego County Multi-Species Conservation Plan Area, and Assessment of Mountain Lion Habitat Use and Connectivity in Northern San Diego and Southern Riverside and Orange Counties, with Special Focus on Prioritization of North San Diego County MSCP Lands for Conservation, and Identification of Critical Highway Barriers and Solutions. A joint report to the San Diego County Association of Governments and California Department of Wildlife.
- Wang, Y., Allen, M. L., & Wilmers, C. C. (2015). Mesopredator spatial and temporal responses to large predators and human development in the Santa Cruz Mountains of California. *Biological Conservation*, *190*, 23–33.
- Wang, Y., Smith, J. A., & Wilmers, C. C. (2017). Residential development alters behavior, movement, and energetics in a top carnivore. *PLoS ONE*, 1–17.
- Warren, R., Price, J., Fischlin, A., de la Nava Santos, S., & Midgley, G. (2011). Increasing impacts of climate change upon ecosystems with increasing global mean temperature rise. *Climatic Change*, *106*(2), 141–177.
- Wiens, J. J. (2016). Climate-related local extinctions are already widespread among plant and animal species. *PLoS Biology*, *14*(12), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2001104>
- Wilmers, C. C. (2014, October 10). Mountain view puma (46m) killed on Highway 280. *Santa Cruz Puma Project Blog*.
- Wilmers, C.C. (2015, May 2). RIP 36m – Genomics godfather to all pumas! *Santa Cruz Puma Project Blog*.
- Wilmers, C. C., Wang, Y., Nickel, B., Houghtaling, P., Shakeri, Y., Allen, M. L., ... Williams, T. (2013). Scale dependent behavioral responses to human development by a large predator, the puma. *PLoS ONE*, *8*(4).
- Young, S.P., & Goldman, E.A. (1946). Puma, mysterious American cat.
- Zeller, K. A., Vickers, T. W., Ernest, H. B., & Boyce, W. M. (2017). Multi-level, multi-scale resource selection functions and resistance surfaces for conservation planning: Pumas as a case study. *PLoS ONE*, *12*(6), 1–20.