Staff Summary for October 8-9, 2025

12. Pacific Pocket Mouse

Today's Item **Information ☐** **Action ☒**

Consider and potentially act on the petition, the Department's evaluation report, and comments received to determine whether listing Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) as threatened or endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) may be warranted.

Summary of Previous/Future Actions

• Received petition	March 25, 2025
• Transmitted petition to Department	April 4, 2025
• Public receipt of petition	April 16-17, 2025
• Received Department's 90-day evaluation report	August 13, 2025
• **Today potentially determine petitioned action may be warranted**	**October 8-9, 2025**

Background

In March 2025, the Commission received from the Center for Biological Diversity a CESA petition to list Pacific pocket mouse as threatened or endangered. The Commission transmitted the petition to the Department for an evaluation and recommendation.

California Fish and Game Code Section 2073.5 requires that the Department evaluate the petition and submit a written evaluation with a recommendation to the Commission; the Commission publicly received the Department's evaluation report (exhibits 2 and 3) at its August 2025 meeting. The evaluation report delineates each of the categories of information required for a petition, evaluates the sufficiency of the available scientific information for each of the required components, and incorporates additional relevant information that the Department possessed or received during the review period. Based on the information contained in the petition and other relevant information, the Department concludes that there is sufficient information to indicate the petitioned action may be warranted.

At today's meeting, the Commission will receive a presentation on the Department's petition evaluation, receive a presentation from the petitioners, and hold a public hearing to receive oral testimony. If the Commission determines listing may be warranted pursuant to Section 2074.2 of the Fish and Game Code, the Department will undertake a one-year status review before the Commission can make a final decision on listing.

CESA and the Commission's listing regulation require that the petition contain specific scientific information related to the status of the species. CESA and case law interpreting it make clear that the Commission must accept a petition when the petition contains sufficient information to lead a reasonable person to conclude there is a substantial possibility the requested listing could occur; the requested listing is tied to the species' status, that is, whether the species' continued existence is in serious danger or is threatened by a number of factors, and in no way relates to economic consequences that might result from listing.

If the Commission determines the petitioned action may be warranted, Pacific pocket mouse becomes a candidate species pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 2074.2. Candidate species are protected during the remainder of the listing process pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 2085.

Significant Public Comments (N/A)

Recommendation

Commission staff: Determine that listing may be warranted; direct staff to issue a notice reflecting this finding and indicating that Pacific pocket mouse is a candidate species.

Department: Accept the petition for further consideration under CESA.

Exhibits

1. Petition, received March 25, 2025
2. Department memo, received July 10, 2025
3. Department 90-day evaluation report, dated July 2025
4. Department presentation

Motion

Moved by _____ and seconded by _____ that the Commission, pursuant to Section 2074.2 of the California Fish and Game Code, finds that the petition to list Pacific pocket mouse a threatened or endangered species does provide sufficient information to indicate that the petitioned action may be warranted based on the information in the record before the Commission, and directs staff to issue a notice reflecting this finding and indicating that Pacific pocket mouse is a candidate species.

OR

Moved by _____ and seconded by _____ that the Commission, pursuant to Section 2074.2 of the California Fish and Game Code, finds that the petition to list Pacific pocket mouse as a threatened or endangered species does not provide sufficient information to indicate that the petitioned action may be warranted based on the information in the record before the Commission.

BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

A Petition to List the Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) as Threatened or Endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA)



Pacific pocket mouse, Dana Point Preserve
Photo credit: Center for Natural Lands Management

Center for Biological Diversity

March 25, 2025

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: Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*)

II. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Listing as Endangered or Threatened

The Center for Biological Diversity submits this petition to list the Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) as Threatened or Endangered pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act (California Fish and Game Code §§ 2050 et seq., "CESA").

This petition demonstrates that the Pacific pocket mouse is eligible for and warrants listing under CESA based on the factors specified in the statute and implementing regulations. A species 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 Code § 2062. A "threatened species" is one "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.

As detailed in this petition, given the Pacific pocket mouse's extremely restricted range with only three extant populations, limited remaining habitat, and known threats, listing as an endangered or threatened species clearly "may be warranted." We respectfully request the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Fish and Game Commission should make such recommendations and findings pursuant to their respective authorities. Cal. Fish & Game Code §§ 2073.5 & 2074.2.

I. AUTHORS OF PETITION:

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

Lisa T. Belenky, Senior Counsel
Center for Biological Diversity

Signature:  Date: March 25, 2025

Elizabeth Reid-Wainscoat, Campaigner
Center for Biological Diversity

Signature:  Date: March 25, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Notice of Petition i

Executive Summary 1

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. NATURAL HISTORY 3

2.1 Description 3

2.2 Taxonomy 4

2.3 Habitat 5

2.4 Home Range and Spatial Distribution 6

2.5 Diet 7

2.6 Reproductive Biology 7

2.7 Behavior 8

2.8 Survivorship 9

2.9 Genetics 9

3. RANGE AND DISTRIBUTION 10

Los Angeles County (Historic) 11

Orange County (Historic, Extant) 11

San Diego County (Historic, Extant) 11

3.2 Current Distribution 12

Dana Point Preserve, Orange County 12

U.S. Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton 14

San Mateo Creek South, San Diego County 14

Santa Margarita (Oscar One / Edson Range Population) 15

3.3 Captive Breeding and Release Locations 16

4. ABUNDANCE AND POPULATION TREND 16

4.1 Dana Point Preserve 17

4.2 Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton 20

4.2.2 South San Mateo 21

4.2.3 Santa Margarita 21
Oscar One 22
Edson Range 23
5. FACTORS AFFECTING SUCCESSFUL REPRODUCTION AND SURVIVAL 23
5.1 Habitat Availability 24
5.1.1 Habitat Modification and Destruction 24
5.1.2 Non-native Vegetation and Habitat Succession 26
5.1.3 Habitat Management 27
5.1.4 Land Use and Activities 28
5.2 Small Population 39
5.3 Climate Change 40
5.4 Disease, Predation, Competition 41
5.6 Captive Propagation, Reintroduction, and Translocation 42
6. INADEQUACY OF EXISTING REGULATORY MECHANISMS 43
6.1 Federal Regulatory Mechanisms 43
6.1.1 Federal Endangered Species Act 43
6.1.3 The Department of the Navy 45
6.1.4 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 46
6.1.5 Federal Highways Administration 46
6.2 State Regulatory Mechanisms 46
6.2.1 Species of Special Concern 47
6.2.2 State Wildlife Action Plan 47
6.2.3 California Coastal Act 47
6.2.4 California Environmental Quality Act 48
6.3 Regional and Local Regulatory Mechanisms 49
6.3.1 Natural Community Conservation Plan 49
6.3 Non-Regulatory Federal and State-level Actions 50
6.4.1 USFWS Recovery Plan for the Pacific Pocket Mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) 50

6.4.3 USFWS Species Status Assessment 53
6.4.4 USFWS Recovery Implementation Strategy 53
6.5 Regional and Local Plans and Policies 54
6.5.1 Marine Corps Pendelton Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan 54
6.5.2 MCBCP Pacific pocket mouse Management Plan 54
6.5.3 Dana Point Preserve Draft Habitat Management Plan 54
6.5 Non-Regulatory Planning 55
6.6.1 Pacific Pocket Mouse Working Group. This is a group of entities that have some direct interest in or responsibility for PPM and is variously represented by individuals from those entities in working group meetings (approximately once per year). 55
6.6.2 Reintroduction Program. As noted above, a captive breeding program has been undertaken but largely unsuccessful to date. 55
7. CESA PROTECTION IS WARRANTED FOR PACIFIC POCKET MOUSE 55
Recommendations 55
REFERENCES 57
(all references submitted with petition except those book chapters and manuscripts indicated with a * which are not provided,) 57

TABLES

Table 1. Results from all live-trap Pacific pocket mouse monitoring events since CNLM acquisition, 2008-2020 18
Table 2. Pacific pocket mouse track-tube monitoring data from the Dana Point Preserve, 2017-2024 18
Table 3. Visitation Data at the Dana Point Preserve, 2011-2024 20
Table 4. Estimated area occupied (ha) and population area occupied (PAO) for each population with Santa Margarita also broken out into the individual sampling areas 21

FIGURES

Figure 1. Current range of the Pacific pocket mouse 3
Figure 2. Total area in hectares (ha) estimated to be occupied by PPM for each population from 2012 to 2023 17
Figure 3. USFWS (2024) Results from preliminary population viability assessment (PVA) 22
Figure 4. Zones of varying distance (13 meters, 50 meters, 100 meters) from the trail at the Dana Point Preserve. 36

Executive Summary

The Center for Biological Diversity submits this petition to list the Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*; PPM) as either Threatened or Endangered pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act (California Fish and Game Code §§ 2050 *et seq*., "CESA"). This petition demonstrates that the Pacific pocket mouse is eligible for and warrants listing under CESA based on the factors specified in the statute and implementing regulations. Under CESA, a "threatened species" is "a native species or subspecies…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…" California Fish and Game Code § 2067. An endangered species is "a native species or subspecies…which 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." California Fish and Game Code § 2062.

In response to the dramatic loss of habitat experienced by PPM, it was listed as Endangered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in 1998. All but three of the ten known historic locales are considered extirpated, one as recently as 2003, and the subspecies now exists at only 3 locations. Occupied habitat is now estimated to be less than 300 hectares (740 acres), far short of the 1998 USFWS Recovery goal of 2,000 hectares, and no critical habitat has been designated.

Given the small number and sizes of Pacific pocket mouse populations, its limited historic and current range, the continuous habitat loss, fragmentation, and degradation, and mounting threats of disease and predation, climate change, and human land use activities, the subspecies requires all protections available to ensure its persistence. Federal protection of the Endangered Species Act has been inadequate to protect PPM from known and escalating threats. CESA listing will: provide further protection to the current population, particularly on non-federal lands in the Dana Point Preserve that represents one-third of extant populations, and to future populations (established through translocation or release of captive-bred mice) per the Recovery Plan goals.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) is a subspecies of heteromyid rodent endemic to coastal southern California that is endangered, or at a minimum, threatened, in California. It faces numerous threats to its continued existence including habitat loss and fragmentation, predation, climate change, and military and recreation

impacts, among others. Listing the Pacific pocket mouse under CESA would provide necessary protection against many of these direct and indirect threats. CESA protection would aid in ensuring the continued survival and eventual recovery of the species in California. As this petition documents below, Pacific pocket mouse in California meets the criteria for protection as an endangered, or at a minimum, threatened species under CESA, and would benefit greatly from such protection. This petition reviews the natural history and status of Pacific pocket mouse in California, focusing on trends and threats to the three extant populations located within the state. The petition describes the importance of protecting these populations, and future reintroductions, under CESA and explains why this is crucial for the survival and recovery of this species in California.

The Pacific pocket mouse historically occurred along the coast of southern California, from Marina del Rey and El Segundo in Los Angeles County, south to the vicinity of the Mexican border in San Diego County (summarized in Erickson 1993) on fine-grain, sandy substrates in open coastal sage scrub, coastal strand, coastal dune, and river alluvium habitats. The majority of records are within 1 mi (1.6 km) of the coast, at less than 600 ft (180 m) in elevation. PPM was considered extinct for several decades until rediscovered at the Dana Point Headlands in Orange County in 1993 and was emergency listed as endangered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in 1994 due to immediate threats to the remnant population (USFWS 1998). Subsequently, three additional population sites were discovered on Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, San Diego County (Ogden 1997, MBA 1997). Despite more than 150 surveys within their historic range, no additional PPM populations have been discovered since 1995 and one rediscovered population has since become extirpated (Brehme and Fisher 2008, USFWS 1998; 2024). The most recent USFWS 5-year Review of PPM (USFWS 2020) concluded that the principal threats identified at the time of listing remain, including habitat destruction and fragmentation due to development, habitat degradation from human disturbance, high fire frequencies and invasion of nonnative plants (especially grasses), small population size, and reduction of habitat quality in extant PPM populations due to vegetation succession and loss of bare ground and openings within senescent sage scrub. In spite of the protections currently in place, habitat degradation from human disturbance continues and seems to be increasing – particularly that from foot traffic and impacts from recreation and trespass.

The Pacific pocket mouse now occurs in the wild at only three sites within the increasingly rare open coastal sage scrub habitats: the Dana Point Headlands in Orange County, and two locations within the Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton (MCCBP) in San Diego County (Figure 1). Urbanization and land conversion have led to habitat loss and have fragmented the historical range of PPM, isolating the extant populations from one another. Due to the demand

for further coastal development within its range, habitat loss and degradation can be expected to continue indefinitely. Given the small number of extant populations, the small area known to be currently occupied, continued loss and degradation of habitat, and the requirement for intensive and perpetual management required to sustain existing populations, the Pacific pocket mouse remains highly endangered and vulnerable to extinction.



Figure 1a. Historic Range of PPM; Figure 1b. Current Range of the Pacific Pocket Mouse in San Diego and Orange Counties. Credit: Godfrey (2018)

2. NATURAL HISTORY

2.1 Description

The Pacific pocket mouse is a nocturnal, aggressively solitary, and semi-fossorial rodent in the family Heteromyid that is physiologically adapted to warm and dry climates. PPM is one of the

smallest rodents in North America (USFWS 1998) with an adult body mass generally ranging between 7-9 grams (USFWS 1998). Body length from nose to tip of tail for PPM ranges up to 131 millimeters (5.2 inches) in length from nose to tip of tail (Hall 1981) with the ratio of length of tail to head and body usually ranging between 1.03-1.40 (Williams et al. 1993). The length of the tail, hind foot, and skull, and the small size of the skull sutures, distinguish this subspecies from other subspecies of the little pocket mouse, including the Los Angeles pocket mouse (*P. l. brevinasus*)—the only other little pocket mouse subspecies to occur in cismontane southern California (Hall 1981). They have fur-lined external cheek pouches used to store seed while foraging and transport to cache sites. The body pelage of the PPM is spineless and bristle free and predominately brown, pinkish buff or ochraceous buff above and light brown, pale tawny, buff, or whitish below (Hall 1981, USFWS 2010). Typically, there are two small patches of light-colored hairs at the base of the ear (Ingles 1965). The tail can be either distinctly or indistinctly bicolored (Hall 1981).

Average life expectancy in the wild is approximately one year, with survival for as long as 3–5 years not uncommon (French et al. 1967, 1974). In winter, if environmental factors are unfavorable, the Pacific pocket mouse may hibernate underground until spring brings better conditions. However, if adequate food supplies are available, the mouse will remain active during winter.

2.2 Taxonomy

The Pacific pocket mouse is one of 16 currently recognized subspecies of the little pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris*, USFWS 2010). This subspecies is the smallest member of the family Heteromyidae, which consists of spiny pocket mice (*Heteromys* and *Liomys*), pocket mice (*Perognathus* and *Chaetodipus*), kangaroo rats (*Dipodomys*), and kangaroo mice (*Microdipodops*). PPM was originally described by Mearns (1898) under the name *Peragnathus pacificus*, based on the type specimen from the Tijuana River Valley at the U.S./Mexico in San Diego County, California. Von Bloeker (1932) subsequently concluded *P. pacificus* represented two subspecies of the little pocket mouse, *P. longimembris pacificus* and *P. longimembris cantwelli.* Subsequent to a biometric analysis of 331 specimens of the little pocket mouse, Huey (1939) synonymized *P. l. pacificus* with *P. l. cantwelli*, assigning the name of the earlier described subspecies, *P. l. pacificus*. Huey's treatment continues to be recognized by recent authors (Hall 1981, Williams et al. 1993).
Most recently, Patton and Fisher (2023) suggested animals from the type locality described by Mearns (1898) at the U.S./Mexico border are morphologically distinct from the extant populations and that extant populations all belong to the previously described *P. l. cantwelli*.

Because all existing populations are still considered a single subspecies, this subspecies is currently referred to as the Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*).

Photo credit: Joanna Gilkeson/USFWS

2.3 Habitat

PPM are associated with fine grain, sandy or gravelly substrates in coastal strand, coastal dunes, river alluvium and coastal sage scrub habitats within approximately 4 kilometers (2.5 miles) of the Pacific Ocean (Mearns 1898; von Bloeker 1932; Grinnell 1933; Bailey 1939, USFWS 2010). Historic records report Pacific pocket mouse populations in coastal dunes and river alluvium; however, these habitats were described as rare to virtually eliminated in coastal southern California in the 1990s (USFWS 1998) and have only become rarer and more impacted in recent decades.

The presence of loose or friable soils appears to be the most important factor in determining distribution (USFWS 1998). PPM are typically not found in areas covered by dense nonnative grasses and thatch, or shrub cover, as they require open ground to forage efficiently for diverse seeds and use openings for dust bathing to remove ectoparasites, absorb oil, and communicate with conspecifics (USFWS 1998, Brehme et al. 2023b). Modeling by Brehme et al. using data largely collected from the two extant populations at Camp Pendleton (2019, 2023b) found that increased nonnative grass cover was a strong predictor of decreased colonization and increased extirpation probability in those areas. This study also found that the likelihood of PPM occupancy increased with moderate to high forb cover (40-80%) and open ground (20-70%), but decreased with even moderate nonnative grass cover (>30%) (Brehme et al. 2023b).

The population within the Dana Point Preserve occurs in coastal sage scrub vegetation of various densities growing within loamy sand soils on a coastal terrace. The Dana Point Preserve site is a remnant coastal bluff top habitat fragment that is bounded by Dana Point Harbor, the Pacific Ocean and urban development. The San Mateo North population, now extirpated, occurred on a south-facing slope in the northwest corner of MCBCP within habitat described as predominately mature coastal sage scrub growing within loamy coarse sands and sandy loams (MBA and LSA 1997). The remaining San Mateo Creek population, San Mateo South, is located near the San Margarita River, and is found in small patches of coastal sage scrub, bare ground, and in low-density non-native grassland within a larger matrix of dense non-native grassland, chiefly in fine sandy loam and loamy coarse sand soils (Ogden 1997, USFWS 1998, Spencer et al. 2000). This site is located within a military training area on MCBCP approximately 3.2 km (2 mi) from the coastline. The third extant population, Santa Margarita, is the southernmost site and the largest of the PPM sites, consisting of both the Oscar One and Edson Range training areas within MCBCP. This site has the greatest range of habitat conditions including areas predominated by coastal sage scrub to sage scrub-grassland ecotonal areas, mixed native and nonnative grassland and forblands, and dense nonnative grasslands (USFWS 2010).

2.4 Home Range and Spatial Distribution

Pacific pocket mouse populations are dynamic and fluctuate considerably from year to year both in numbers and areas of occupied habitat (Brylski 1993, USFWS 1998). PPM exhibit substantial individual variability in movement with some individuals appearing to remain relatively sedentary and others making long distance excursions of 150 meters or more; sometimes coinciding with a shift in use area (USFWS 2010). The average PPM core home range size is estimated to be 0.017 hectares, or ~13 meters in diameter (Shier 2009) but individuals have been recorded traveling 181 meters in a single night, with average movement distances reported of 10 meters to 30 meters between successive captures (Dodd et al. 1998, 1999, USFWS 2008). Mark-and-release studies indicate limited adult movement and juvenile dispersal distances (Swei et al. 2003). Males consistently are observed to have larger home ranges than females, with additional variability in movement over time and space possibly relating to breeding status, the age composition of the population, population density and/or site conditions. According to USFWS (2020, p. 4), mean observed range length (ORL) is significantly different between male and female PPM. Over a 4-year monitoring period, mean ORL was 29.3 and 17.9 meters (96.1 and 58.7 feet) for males and females, respectively. Some PPM were observed to go on longer distance excursions and relocate to different areas within the monitoring grids (USFWS 2020).

2.5 Diet

PPM is largely granivorous, specializing forb and grass seeds (USFWS 1998), and may occasionally include insects and green vegetation in its diet (Reichman and Price 1993, Meserve 1976a). PPM obtain both metabolic water and energy from seeds and are highly efficient at minimizing evaporative water loss (French 1993). Diet studies have shown that PPM primarily select forbs (Iwanowicz et al. 2016), and prefer forbs, perennial herbs, and native bunch grasses over perennial shrubs and grasses for food resources (Vandergast et al. 2023), particularly in the early spring months to support their energetic needs for reproduction (Brehme et al. 2019b, 2020. A positive relationship was found between forb cover and PPM occupancy at Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton (MCBCP; Brehme et al. 2014) and at the Dana Point Preserve (Brehme et al. 2020) and years with low forb growth and early forb die-offs have been associated with PPM declines (Brehme et al. 2019).

2.6 Reproductive Biology

Generally, the PPM breeding season begins in early spring and lasts through July but varies with temperatures, food supply, and plant growth (USFWS 1998). The time period during which a female PPM is in peak estrus can be extremely limited, however, lasting as little as one hour per cycle (D. Shier pers. comm.) This is one of several features that reflect vulnerability of the subspecies—i.e., if this period is affected or interrupted by environmental factors. Females typically produce one litter with two to eight young per litter, but may have up to two litters in high resource years (USFWS 2008). The gestation period is approximately 3 weeks, young are born in a nest in an underground burrow and are weaned after 30 days (Shier et al. 2016). The Pacific pocket mouse reaches sexual maturity in two to five months and is capable of reproduction in their natal year during favorable conditions (USFWS 2008). Reproduction is influenced by food availability and in years of poor resource availability (e.g., drought) PPM may delay breeding or forego breeding altogether, resulting in little to no recruitment to the population (Beatley 1969, French et al. 1967, Kenagy and Bartholomew 1985, USFWS 2008, Brehme et al. 2019). As such, PPM may be particularly vulnerable to the impacts of rapid climate change. In high resource years, adult females may have up to two litters with their female offspring mating and reproducing in a single season (USFWS 2008). Because of this, PPM abundance can be highly variable within and among years.

2.7 Behavior

PPM create and live much of the time in burrows beneath the soil surface, and cache seeds below ground and within burrow systems for sustenance throughout the year (e.g., Randall 1993, Merrill et al. 2023). More recent research has provided evidence that both pit caches and larders may be used (Chock et al. 2019). In sand dunes in Oceanside, CA, burrows were found approximately one foot below the surface under vegetation edges and ended in a single nest chamber (Bailey 1939). Burrows and tunnels can sometimes be even closer to the surface—as little as 1 to 4 inches below ground (D. Shier pers. comm.). As such, sounds and vibrations from above-ground disturbances—such as foot traffic and human voices—could affect PPM below ground. In sandy habitats, burrows are particularly vulnerable to compaction by foot traffic. Brehme et al. (2014) reported a strong negative effect of human foot traffic on PPM occupancy. Although much remains to be studied regarding burrow architecture, recent observations have indicated that the height of the burrows themselves may be very shallow (e.g., 1 inch)—further indicating their vulnerability to collapse.

PPM use seasonal heterothermy (winter torpor and facultative summer aestivation) in response to environmental stresses of food shortage and/or low temperatures (Chew et al. 1965, Bartholomew and Cade 1957). The onset of torpor is marked by a large drop-off in activity that can occur from June to November and is highly spatially variable within and among years (Meserve 1976a, Shier 2009, Brehme et al. 2014, 2020). During torpor, the mice alternate between periods of dormancy and feeding on cached seeds. Periods of dormancy have neither a daily nor strictly seasonal pattern (Brehme et al. 2014). In captivity, dormant individuals may show some activity each day within their burrows. Emergence typically occurs in late winter to early spring (February-March) and is thought to coincide with seed availability (Meserve 1976b). It has been suggested that the trigger for emergence may be changes in soil temperature (French 1977). As the beneficial aspect of torpor or aestivation is to reduce energy expenditure, any disturbance that disrupts these states can have a negative effect. Again, such disturbances could include human-caused sounds or vibrations—especially if burrows are shallow and/or close to the surface. Further, because Heteromyids have expanded middle ears, they are especially sensitive to low frequency sound (D. Shier pers. comm.).

PPM are solitary and nonsocial. In captive breeding setting, PPM, particularly females, display aggression towards male conspecifics (King et al. 2018). PPM is the smallest, least dominant species in the community, and appear to actively avoid larger rodent species (Chock et al. 2018), as evidenced by lower probabilities of detecting PPM with the presence of other larger rodent species (except western harvest mouse) (Brehme et al. 2019). Like other Heteromyids,

PPM use sandbathing to clean their fur, and as a form of chemical communication (Eisenberg 1963, USFWS 2020) such as communication between sexes during estrus and the breeding period (Shier et al. 2016).

2.8 Survivorship

PPM has a short lifespan in the wild, with an average of one year, although survival for as long as three to five years is sometimes observed (French et al. 1967, 1974). In captivity, PPM have lived up to 10 years (GSRC and SDZWA 2022). A demographic study estimated distinct monthly survivorship rates during summer and winter months, which generally corresponded to periods of above ground activity and inactivity associated with these seasons, where mean monthly survivorship was lower in summer than in winter (USFWS 2008). An exception to this was lower winter and spring survival associated with near record rainfall during that winter and spring. Overall, these seasonal survivorship rates estimated in this study indicate that PPM has a mean annual survivorship rate of around 17%, which is consistent with monitoring results (USFWS 2008). Generally short but variable individual lifespans, coupled with much variation in annual reproductive success, contribute to much annual variability in population size and generally more vulnerability in persistence.

2.9 Genetics

Genetic diversity is the basis for populations to change in response to environmental conditions—i.e., adaptation. As such, genetic diversity is one metric for consideration of a population's (and, by extension, a species') ability to persist. Analyses of genetic variation suggest that effective population sizes within the extant PPM populations are universally low and cause for concern (USFWS 2020; 2024, Wilder et al. 2020, Shier et al. 2022). The estimated effective population sizes are: Ne=14.9 at Dana Point, Ne= 20.5 at South San Mateo, and Ne=36.5 at Santa Margarita (Wilder et al., in prep.) Further, genomic and karyotypic analysis indicates there are fixed chromosomal differences among the PPM populations, with the Santa Margarita and South San Mateo populations having a diploid (2n) chromosome number of 56 and Dana Point having 2n=58 (Wilder et al. in prep). These chromosomal differences are important considerations for any genetic intervention (e.g., introducing individuals from other populations with a goal of increasing genetic diversity) as this not only significantly undermines any likelihood of successful reproduction between these two types in the wild but, if successful, may lead to outbreeding depression. As such, an ex-situ cross-breeding program has been planned and is in progress, discussed further below. However, results are uncertain and may require many attempts and considerable time to produce backcrossed hybrids that may be suitable for introduction.

3. RANGE AND DISTRIBUTION

Historically, the Pacific pocket mouse occurred along coastal southern California, from Marina del Rey and El Segundo in Los Angeles County, south to the vicinity of the Mexican border in San Diego County (Hall 1981, Williams et al. 1986, Erickson 1993). The majority of records are within 1.6 km (1 mi) of the coast and there are no reliable reports of occurrences more than 4 km (2.5 mi) from the ocean. Pacific pocket mice have been recorded in elevations as high as 180 meters (600 feet) in the San Joaquin Hills, but most localities are found at considerably lower elevations, at less than 600 ft (180 m) (Erickson 1993). Available data indicate that the historical distribution of the Pacific pocket mouse was much more extensive prior to the large-scale development of the coastal lowlands of southern California.

Pacific pocket mice were thought to be extinct when the last known population of PPM (Newport Beach, CA) was extirpated in the early 1970s. PPM was then rediscovered in 1993 at what is now the Dana Point Preserve in Orange County (Brylski 1993, USFWS 1994). In 1995, PPM were found in three additional locations on Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton in San Diego County (North San Mateo, South San Mateo, and North Santa Margarita). Despite 166 surveys within their historic range, no additional PPM populations have been discovered since 1995 (USFWS Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office Survey Report Database, 2023), and the North San Mateo population on USMCBCP is presumed extirpated since 2003 (Brehme and Fisher 2008, USFWS 2010; 2015). Currently, PPM exists in three recognized extant populations: Dana Point Headlands Preserve, owned and managed by the Center for Natural Lands Management (CNLM), and San Mateo South and Santa Margarita, located on MCBCP lands. All other historical locations are believed extirpated (USFWS 2012). These remaining locations are isolated and are therefore each are assumed to represent a distinct population. This lack of connectivity means that natural dispersals and exchanges of genetic diversity are not feasible; thus, substantial and unproven interventions would be needed to provide this historically occurring influx of genetic diversity.

Occupied habitat for the Pacific pocket mouse in 1998 was estimated to total less than 400 hectares (1,000 acres) at all known localities combined (USFWS 1998). Current (2022) estimated occupied habitat is now less than 200 hectares (500 acres) (Brehme et al. 2023a, CNLM 2024). The range has contracted since 1998 when the USFWS declared that "…Loss or degradation of any of the populations at the three known extant locales could irretrievably diminish the likelihood of the subspecies' survival", because one population has already been extirpated and potential habitat has been further degraded and lost. Currently, the Pacific pocket mouse

population persist only in three distinct locations where their viability is threatened by land use activities and their persistence relies on intensive, perpetual management.

3.1 Historic Range

Between 1894 and 1972, the Pacific pocket mouse was recorded from 9 general locales and 30 specific localities from Los Angeles County south to the Mexican border in San Diego County (Erickson 1998); approximately 80 percent of all records were from 1931 or 1932 (Erickson 1993). Since the 1930's, the majority of suitable and historic habitat for the Pacific pocket mouse has been destroyed, fragmented, and significantly reduced by urbanization and agricultural conversion. By 1998, only one percent of potential habitat for the PPM remained undeveloped in Los Angeles County, less than twenty percent in Orange County, and a comparable amount of natural habitat remains in coastal San Diego County (USFWS 1998). Populations at six of the historic localities are considered extirpated and numerous recent surveys within the historic range of the subspecies have failed to detect additional extant populations (USFWS 1998).

Los Angeles County (Historic)
In Los Angeles County, the Pacific pocket mouse has been observed in the vicinity of Marina del Rey/El Segundo, Clifton, and Wilmington (Erickson 1993). These sites, none of which are currently occupied by Pacific pocket mouse populations, are now urbanized, as is most of the Los Angeles Basin. Little suitable habitat remains in Los Angeles County, and what does remain is isolated and fragmented. There have been no records of Pacific pocket mice from Los Angeles County since 1938 (Erickson 1993, Brylski 1993, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1998a).

Orange County (Historic, Extant)
The Pacific pocket mouse has been observed in two areas of coastal Orange County: the vicinity of Signal Peak ("Spyglass Hill") in the northern San Joaquin Hills, and the Dana Point Headlands in Dana Point. Pacific pocket mice were detected at the Spyglass Hill locale in the course of several rodent surveys conducted at the University of California, Irvine, from 1968 to 1971 (Meserve 1972, 1976). Spyglass Hill has since been urbanized and only remnant habitat patched remain. The Dana Point Headlands population was first recorded in 1932, and was re-discovered after presumed extirpation in July 1993 (Brylski 1993). This location, now the Dana Point Preserve owned by CNLM, supports one of three known extant populations.

San Diego County (Historic, Extant)
PPM have been recorded from four localities in San Diego County: San Onofre, the Santa

Margarita River mouth, Los Penasquitos Lagoon, and the lower Tijuana River (Erickson 1993, Erickson 1998, USFWS 1998). In 1995, two additional populations were discovered on Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton. The "Oscar One" population was located on in the vicinity of the Santa Margarita River and another two were located on the gentle slopes and hillsides on either side of San Mateo River, near the historic San Onofre population. The "Edson Range" extension of the Oscar One population was discovered in 1998.

The now-extirpated San Mateo Creek North population formerly occupied approximately 6.5 hectares (16 acres) across the river from the San Mateo South population. PPM were last observed at San Mateo North in 2003 (Natural Resources Assessment 2003, Montgomery 2005, Brehme and Fisher 2009, USFWS 2010), and multiple comprehensive surveys performed that site since then have not detected PPM (Brehme et al. 2015, Brehme et al. 2019). This is likely due to a combination of a small population that is geographically restricted, habitat degradation due to increased human activity on site as well as nonnative plants, invasive Argentine ants and maturation of existing habitat. North San Mateo is in close proximity to a residential community that increases access by domestic cats and dogs, as well as creation of unauthorized trails, dumping and other human activities (Montgomery 2003, Brehme et al. 2009). Additionally, the part north of San Mateo Creek exists immediately adjacent to the proposed alignment of a six lane toll road, the Foothill Transportation Corridor South, the construction of which would adversely impact the likelihood of dispersal amongst north and south parts of the locales.

3.2 Current Distribution

PPM currently exists in three recognized extant populations: Dana Point Headlands Preserve, owned and managed by CNLM, and two locations on MCBCP lands: San Mateo South and Santa Margarita. These three locales are isolated and considered distinct populations. Only one locale (Dana Point Preserve) is permanently protected through a legal instrument (Conservation Easement), and all locales have been impacted by habitat destruction or fragmentation, land use activities, human-caused fire, and other disturbances.

Dana Point Preserve, Orange County

The Pacific pocket mouse has persisted on the Dana Point Headlands in southern, coastal Orange County. At the time it was rediscovered, this PPM population was located on land under consideration for development (e.g., City of Dana Point 1994, EDAW 1994). On April 28, 1998, the Dana Point City Council supported a development proposal and in 2004 adopted the Headlands Development and Conservation Plan (HDCP), approving commercial development of

a 49 hectare (122 acre) site with 27.7 hectares (68.5 acres) of the site designated as open space (City of Dana Point 2004). The open space areas include the Dana Point Preserve and several City parks, including Hilltop Park, Harbor Point Park, and Strand Vista Park, as well as the County Strand Beach. The Dana Point Headlands PPM population is within the 29.4-acre Dana Point Preserve (Preserve), and is the only known existing population of PPM off MCBCP.

The Dana Point Preserve is owned and managed by the Center for Natural Lands Management, which acquired the property in 2005 for the purpose of protecting the rare coastal sage scrub community and habitat for the endangered PPM as well as the threatened coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*, CAGN). CNLM's management of the Preserve is overseen by the USFWS and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) through, in part, the Orange County Central and Coastal Subregions Natural Communities Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP). The City of Dana Point holds a Conservation Easement over the Preserve and USFWS and CDFW are third-party beneficiaries. PPM occupancy has fluctuated greatly at Dana Point in recent years (CNLM 2024). Active habitat management for PPM on the property has included thinning of duff and dead shrubs, removal of invasive species, detection and treatment of non-native Argentine ants, and other intensive activities (Merrill 2023). Habitat at the Dana Point Preserve is also managed for the federal-threatened coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*, CAGN), a species which has habitat requirements that are not fully aligned with those of PPM. The requirement to manage the preserve for CAGN populations limits the extent of habitat management on the Preserve that can be focused solely on PPM.

The Preserve has distinct and hard edges on most boundaries: it is bounded by the Pacific Ocean on the west and by hardscaped city streets and residential development on most of the rest of its perimeter. As a portion of Preserve is comprised of steep coastal bluff, the effective potential habitat of the Preserve approximates 0.4 hectares (22 acres).

While the Preserve is designated as conservation open space under local zoning and the local coastal program, the City parks are designated as recreational open space. The intensity of use allowed in recreational open space is higher than in conservation open space and these parks are designed to facilitate recreation and views. Adjacent to the Preserve, the City of Dana Point (City) owns and manages the Hilltop, South Strand, and Harbor Point parks totaling 8 ha (20 ac) of coastal sage scrub habitat. Hilltop Park also has some areas designated as environmentally sensitive habitat areas under the Coastal Act, which the City is required to conserve. PPM has been intermittently observed in the City of Dana Point-owned Hilltop Area, but trapping data has not indicated this habitat is occupied (Brehme et al 2020).

In accordance with the Local Coastal Plan and Headlands Development and Conservation Plan, a trail was designed and created on the Preserve, and initially opened for public access in December 2009. Since the opening of the trail to the public, public visitation has increased substantially, essentially doubling from 2011 to 2017 (CNLM 2023), and appears to be continuing to increase.

U.S. Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton

Two extant populations were discovered (or rediscovered) in 1995 on the U.S. Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton in the vicinity of two historic locales: San Mateo Creek and Santa Margarita. Each location is surrounded by land uses (e.g., roads, military training activities, agriculture, residential development) that act as barriers to dispersal and genetic exchange among the populations. In 1995, the rediscovered San Mateo Creek location consisted of two separate small pockets of animals detected immediately north and south of San Mateo Creek. The northerly site, which has been designated by Camp Pendleton as the San Mateo-North Site and is now extirpated, is approximately 1.4 kilometers (0.9 mile) from the coast. The southerly site, which has been designated as the San Mateo-South Site is approximately 2.1 kilometers (1.3 miles) from the coast. The second, separate Camp Pendleton locale with an extant population occurs on a marine terrace north of the Santa Margarita River in an area that is designated by Camp Pendleton as training area Oscar One The extent of occupied habitat in the Oscar-I training area ranged from approximately 2.5 to 4 kilometers (1.6 to 2.5 miles) from the coast in 1996 (USFWS 1998).

San Mateo Creek South, San Diego County

The San Mateo Creek South population, located on the southern side of San Mateo Creek in northern San Diego County. Trapping data from San Mateo Creek South indicates that this population has occupied an average of 34 hectares (84.26 acres) across 2012-2022 (Brehme et al. 2024) or about 32% of the 105 ha (259 ac) area that is monitored as potential habitat (Brehme et al. 2023a). It is likely that the San Mateo wash was dominated by sandy alluvium prior to agricultural development and that it may have supported a significant population of PPM. The north and south parts of the San Mateo Creek population may at one time have been part of a more extensive population. The locations are adjacent to urban development and transportation facilities, but are connected to extensive natural open space. Many of the areas occupied by PPM at South San Mateo is covered with mature shrub vegetation with little open

ground, which monitoring suggests is of lower habitat quality for PPM relative to more open vegetation communities with higher amounts of bare ground and forb cover.

Santa Margarita (Oscar One / Edson Range Population)

The largest PPM population is located north of the Santa Margarita River within Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base and spans two troop training areas. The Oscar One target range supports the largest portion of this population (USFWS 1998a, Spencer et al. 2000). An apparent extension of this population was discovered in 1998 on the Edson Range (Spencer et al. 2000). The combined area of the Oscar One / Edson population suggests a total of about 900 hectares (2,250 acres) of habitat, although much of this habitat may be lacking appropriate soils (Spencer et al. 2000). The Oscar One / Edson Range population is less vulnerable to development, habitat fragmentation, and isolation than the other extant populations due to its location on the Marine base. However, Pacific pocket mouse habitat on the site is impacted and continues to be threatened by military activities such training exercises and the development of training facilities. The Edson Range and Oscar One each have different training regimes and operational restrictions and because of this, PPM monitoring for the Santa Margarita population is split between the two training areas, although these two areas adjoin one another and are connected demographically, thereby acting as a single population.

<u>Oscar One</u>

Within the 411-ha (1,016 ac) area delineated for PPM monitoring within Oscar One, estimated habitat use between 2012 and 2022 has averaged 41 ha (101 ac), approximately 10 percent of the monitored area (Brehme et al. 2023a). Oscar One has had relatively high PPM numbers historically, but these numbers declined following a wet winter in 2004 to 2005, that also appeared to be exacerbated by a dramatic expansion of troop training activities in 2006 (USFWS 2012). Beginning in 2012, the Marine Corps started implementation of a comprehensive monitoring program that uses Percent Are Occupied (PAO) statistical methods to track the status each of the extant populations on Base. Since these monitoring efforts began, PPM occupancy at Oscar One has remained low across the training area (Brehme et al. 2023a) except for some observed increase along Powerline Road where core grids are located within more suitable PPM habitat (diverse forbs with open ground). The presence of non-native grasses has been found to negatively impact PPM occupancy at Oscar One, and native fire ants may negatively affect PPM populations in these areas of suitable habitat (Brehme et al. 2023a).

Edson

Within the 474-hectare (1,171 acre) area delineated as potentially occupied by PPM within the Edson Range, estimated habitat use between 2012 and 2022 has averaged 139 ha (343 ac), which is about 29% of the monitored area (Brehme et al. 2023). The estimated occupancy at Edson has seen a relatively steady and rapid decline (Brehme et al. 2023a); in 2016, estimated PAO at Edson was 282 ha but as of 2021 PAO was only 28 ha (Brehme et al. 2023a). Within this training area, there has been a documented strong positive relationship between PPM populations and prescribed burns (Brehme et al. 2023b). Burns occurred at Edson in 2011 (prescribed burn), 2012 and 2014 (wildfires). In 2020, a prescribed burn was conducted at Edson in the hopes of an increase in PAO but which resulted in lower than expected improvements, possibly due to existing low PPM populations on site in 2020 combined with a 2021 drought

3.3 Captive Breeding and Release Locations

The establishment of new PPM populations through translocation and/or the release of captive-bred individuals is identified as a primary recovery strategy in the USFWS 1998 Recovery plan. Between 2007 and 2011 it was concluded that there were insufficient numbers of mice in the source populations to safely conduct translocations without harm to the source populations. As an alternative, a conservation breeding program was initiated in 2012. The Pocket Mouse Conservation Breeding Facility Animals was established at the San Diego Zoo Safari Park with an explicit goal of providing sufficient animals to establish three new PPM populations. Individuals from the extant populations have been brought into captivity and are being bred to provide a source of animals for population creation. Animals from the conservation breeding facility have been released at one site in Orange County since 2016 but the population is not currently considered established or self-sustaining.

4. ABUNDANCE AND POPULATION TREND

Pacific pocket mouse populations are small, dynamic, and fluctuate considerably from year to year both in both of numbers and areas of occupied habitat (Brylski 1993, USFWS 1998). Such small sizes predispose these populations to extirpation by stochastic events, catastrophes, inbreeding depression, or other factors (Noss and Csuti 1997). Information on population demographics and trends is informed by monitoring efforts on Dana Point and at MCBCP. Population monitoring in these locales focuses on the total Population Area Occupied (PAO), which is determined using track tube surveys and live trapping surveys on sample plots and provide the number of hectares estimated to be occupied by year (Brehme et al. 2023a).



Figure 2. Total area in hectares (ha) estimated to be occupied by PPM for each population from 2012 to 2022. Data sourced from Brehme et al. 2023a and CNLM 2024.

4.1 Dana Point Preserve

Since the establishment of the Preserve, CNLM has conducted annual PPM surveys either through live-trapping, track-tube monitoring, or a combination of both (see review Merrill 2019, 2020, 2021). Prior to CNLM acquiring the Preserve, a comprehensive trapping effort performed in 2001 only detected 4 individual mice onsite (USFWS 2002). This was followed by an expansion in habitat use and abundance that occurred after CNLM acquired the Preserve and commenced active habitat management in 2005. In 2009, the Dana Point PPM population reached its peak, as indicated by 82 PPM detections within the 7.24 ha (17.9 ac) of monitored suitable habitat (Brylski et al. 2010; Table 2) and an estimated habitat use around 81% (Carranza 2014). This was followed by a population crash with only 6 individuals detected in 2017 (Miller 2017), and then only 2 individuals detected in 2019. This population experienced a rebound in 2020, with 77 individuals detected and an estimated habitat use around 46% (Merrill et al. 2023). This rebound coincided with increased habitat management and the COVID-related closure of the popular public trail that traverses the site, which has since reopened. Overall, these fluctuations indicate this population is highly vulnerable to extirpation from isolation and small population size. As USFWS and CDFW have noted, “[r]egardless of the cause of the observed fluctuations in the PPM population, the monitoring results clearly illustrate that this population remains vulnerable to extirpation due to its isolation and small

population size." (USFWS and CDFW 2022).

Table 1. Results from all live-trap Pacific pocket mouse monitoring events since CNLM acquisition, 2008-2020. Source: Merrill et al. 2023.

Month(s) and Year of Trapping Events	Level of Effort (trap nights)	Trapping Results (unique PPM)
May – June 2008	3280	30
May 2009[1]	3770	82
May 2012	3330	57
May 2017	2286	6
June 2019	792	2
June 2020[2]	1254	77

[1] The trail was opened to public access in December 2009.

[2] The trail was closed to public access in March 2020.

Track-tube monitoring provides information on presence/absence of mice and the areas of the Preserve where they are active above-ground. This can reflect general population size and trends when data are available across years. The Proportion of Area Occupied (PAO) is an estimate of amount of area where PPM are likely to occur based on track-tube detections. Similar to the trends from the live-trapping data, the population appeared low around 2017, with a notable increase starting in 2020, to a peak in 2021—that period corresponding to a reduction in public visitation due to COVID-related restrictions and later, reduced, trail hours. See Table 3 below. Thereafter, the PAO has declined since the trail hours were increased to 7 am to sunset daily, due to a court order sought by the City of Dana Point in ongoing litigation against CNLM. A decline in the proportion of area occupied indicates a decline in total population.

Table 2: Pacific pocket mouse track-tube monitoring data from the Dana Point Preserve 2017-2024

Track-Tube Monitoring Year	Estimated Proportion of Area Occupied
2017	0.08
2018	0.24
2019	0.14
2020	0.46
2021	0.95
2022	0.81
2023	0.78
2024	0.56

The high and increasing level of public use of the Preserve is hypothesized to be detrimentally impacting habitat suitability for PPM and there is a strong scientific basis in principle and case studies, as well as evidence from the Preserve, of negative direct (i.e., mouse fatality) and indirect impacts (CNLM 2023).

The high degree of public access to the Dana Point Preserve has consequences for the PPM population that include impacts from both permitted trail use and non-permitted activities. Impacts from permitted pedestrian use alone are myriad and include direct mortality (CNLM 2023) as well as potential behavior alterations, displacement, and effective habitat loss due to the sight, sounds, smells and vibrations of trail users (reviewed in Merrill et al. 2023). Non-permitted activities that occur on the Preserve include trail users bringing dogs on- and off-leash, which exacerbate impacts of human-only trail use (Banks and Bryant 2007, Steven et al. 2011, Hennings 2016, Reilly et al. 2017), leaving food or trash onsite (may attract predators), and off trail trespass which can crush PPM burrows and food-source plants.

Any disruption of a PPM's above- and below-ground activities can negatively impact that individual's health, longevity, and likelihood of successful reproduction. PPM, while remaining below-ground for substantial amounts of time, need to conduct life-sustaining activities at the surface including feeding and food collection, selecting mates and mating, territory exploration and expansion, and hygiene (i.e., sand baths). Above-ground activities are typically conducted at night or during low-light levels. Low-light times of day include early morning, cloudy or foggy conditions, early evening and night. Presence of humans (including the sight of humans, their scents and sounds) can shorten or discourage these essential activities, or directly impact mice (e.g., a dead PPM was found on the trail in June 2023; a necropsy revealed it had traumatic injuries resulting from being crushed, likely by a pedestrian on the trail during open hours). Sounds and vibrations from trail use can also affect mice while below ground, interrupting their energy-saving state (torpor or aestivation) and depleting their energy reserves. In addition, these effects can disrupt the female's reproductive cycle, which can have devastating impacts on the population. Cumulative over the entire population, a decline in survivorship and lower number of offspring can cause a downward spiral for the population that could result in local extirpation (extinction of this population), bringing the species closer to the brink of extinction.

Data have been collected on public use of the trail at the Dana Point Preserve since 2011 – the trail opened in 2009. These data are derived from trail counters at both entrances to the trail, which count the number of times a person passes the counter to enter the trail. There are two primary conclusions that can be drawn from these data (Table 1):

- The estimated average number of daily visitors has increased over time, doubling between 2011 and 2017, and currently is an average of approximately 654 per day (= 238,710 per year).
- When the trail was open three days per week, 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (modified schedule June/2021 – Nov/2022), the estimated daily visitation rates decreased, but there were still higher numbers than in 2011 when the trail counters were first installed.

Table 3. Visitation Data at the Dana Point Preserve, 2011-2024

Year (period)	Estimated No. of visitors (daily average)	Estimated Yearly number (extrapolated)
2011	345 (7 am to sunset, daily)	125,740
2017	673 (7 am to sunset, daily)	245,740
2020 (Jan – March)	713 (immediately pre-COVID) (7 am to sunset, daily)	260,245
2021-2022	481 (modified schedule)	175,565
2023	620 (7 am to sunset, daily)	226,300
2024 (January – August)	654 (7 am to sunset, daily)	238,710

The Dana Point PPM population may also incur some risk from domestic and feral cats (USFWS 1998). The Dana Point Preserve itself is isolated by an increasing amount of urban development and is subject to associated edge effects from the surrounding residential and commercial development that continues to occur. A large hotel being developed adjacent to the Preserve, on what was formerly open space, will further exacerbate edge effects, including artificial night lighting and noise pollution, Argentine ants, and PPM predators.

4.2 Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton

The total area occupied within defined population areas at MCBCP (Santa Margarita and South San Mateo) was estimated to be 164.5 ha (17% PAO) in 2022, a 29% increase since 2021 (Brehme et al. 2023a). This occupancy is currently 51% below its peak estimate of 335 ha in 2016 (Figure 2). Additional data analysis of PPM abundance at MCBCP corroborates that the Edson population experienced a substantial decline between 2016 and 2019 (Table 4).

Table 4. Estimated area occupied (ha) and population area occupied (PAO) for each population with Santa Margarita also broken out into the individual sampling areas (Oscar One and Edson). Source: (Brehme et al. 2023a, CNLM 2024)

	Oscar One (411 ha)		Edson (474 ha)		Santa Margarita (885 ha)		S. San Mateo (105 ha)		Dana Point (12 ha)	
Year	Area Occupied	PAO	Area Occupied	PAO	Area Occupied	PAO	Area Occupied	PAO	Area Occupied	PAO
2012	39.3	0.10	130.1	0.27	169.4	0.19	20.2	0.19	4.0	0.54
2013	45.0	0.11	167.4	0.35	212.4	0.24	20.6	0.20	3.7	0.51
2014	67.8	0.16	189.1	0.40	256.9	0.29	27.7	0.26	5.8	0.81
2015	28.0	0.07	253.1	0.53	281.1	0.32	38.2	0.36		
2016	9.7	0.02	281.6	0.59	291.3	0.33	43.8	0.42	5.3	0.71
2017	22.2	0.05	145.0	0.31	167.2	0.19	41.1	0.39	0.6	0.08
2018	37.4	0.09	142.2	0.30	179.6	0.20	43.6	0.41	1.8	0.24
2019	22.6	0.05	70.2	0.15	92.8	0.10	24.9	0.24	1.1	0.14
2020	68.6	0.17	69.2	0.15	137.8	0.16	40.1	0.38	3.7	0.46
2021	48.5	0.12	28.4	0.06	76.9	0.09	33.9	0.32	7.4	0.95
2022	65.5	0.16	57.4	0.12	122.9	0.14	41.8	0.40	6.4	0.81

4.2.2 South San Mateo

The estimated amount of habitat used by PPM between 2012 and 2022 at South San Mateo has averaged 34 ha (84 ac), or about 32% of the 105 ha (259 ac) area that is monitored as potential habitat (Brehme et al. 2023a). South San Mateo has a higher percent occupancy due to its smaller size, although the occupied area is similar to Oscar One. This population experienced a PAO decline in 2019 associated with an early forb die of in 2018 then followed by a population increase after targeted vegetation management (Brehme et al. 2022). PPM declined slightly from a PAO of 40 ha in 2020 to 33 ha in 2021, likely due to little documented reproductive activity within the core plots and no recruitment (Brehme et al. 2022).

4.2.3 Santa Margarita

The Santa Margarita population spans two troop training areas, Edson Range and Oscar One and is the largest of the three PPM populations with a monitoring footprint of 885 ha (2,187 ac) and an average of 181 ha (447 ac) occupied in the last 10 years. The two areas have different training regimes and operational restrictions and because of this, PPM monitoring for the Santa Margarita population is split between the two training areas, although these two areas adjoin one another and are connected demographically, thereby acting as a single population.

The Santa Margarita population experienced a significant population increase in 2012-2016,

reaching a population high of more than 23,000 individual PPM, followed by a dramatic decrease in 2017-2019 (Table 4; Brehme et al 2023a). A recent preliminary population viability assessment (PVA) for this population determined that the population has a 100% chance of extirpation within 100 years, running 100 iterations and starting population sizes of both 3,101 and 1,550 (Figure 3; GSRC and SDZWA 2022).



Figure 3. Results from preliminary population viability assessment (PVA) (GSRC and SDZWA 2022, p. 57) running 100 iterations with 2 starting population sizes of 3,101 (blue) and 1,550 (red).

Oscar One

Within the 411-ha (1,016 ac) area delineated for PPM monitoring within Oscar One, estimated habitat use between 2012 and 2023 has averaged 41.9 ha (104 ac) representing about 10 percent of the monitored area (Table 1; Brehme et al. 2024). Oscar One contains a land navigation training area, sandy soils, and extensive areas of non-native grass. Oscar One has had relatively high PPM numbers historically, but these numbers declined following a wet winter in 2004 to 2005, that also appeared to be exacerbated by a dramatic expansion of troop training activities in 2006 (USFWS 2012). Beginning in 2012, the Marine Corps started implementation of a comprehensive monitoring program that uses PAO statistical methods to track the status each of the extant populations on Base. Since these monitoring efforts began, PPM occupancy at Oscar One has remained low across the training area (Table 4). PAO and

PPM captures have increased in recent years along Powerline Road where some monitoring grids are located; this area differs from other monitoring areas in that it experiences a lower concentration of military training activities and contains sandy soils that allow for good drainage. The presence of non-native grasses has been found to negatively impact PPM occupancy at Oscar One, and it is hypothesized that native fire ants may negatively affect PPM populations in these areas of otherwise suitable habitat (Brehme et al. 2023b).

Edson Range

Within the 474-ha (1,171 ac) area delineated as potentially occupied by PPM within the Edson Range, estimated habitat use between 2012 and 2023 has averaged 135 ha (334 ac), which represents about 28% of the monitored area (Brehme et al. 2023a). The estimated occupancy (PAO) at Edson has seen a relatively steady and rapid decline (Table 1), dropping from 282 ha in 2016 to only 28 ha in 2021 (Brehme et al. 2023a). PPM populations have responded positively to burns at Edson (Brehme et al. 2023b) and prescribed burns have been conducted in the hopes of an increase in PAO. However existing low PPM populations on site in 2020 combined with a drought year in 2021 that limited forb growth likely resulted in lower than expected improvements (Brehme et al. 2023b).

5. FACTORS AFFECTING SUCCESSFUL REPRODUCTION AND SURVIVAL

The principal threats identified in the 1998 Recovery Plan for the Pacific pocket mouse as contributing to the decline of the subspecies remain unabated in 2024. These threats include a small number of populations (which is even smaller now than in 1998), small population sizes, habitat destruction and fragmentation due to development, habitat degradation from human disturbance, invasion of nonnative plants (especially grasses), and reduction of habitat quality due to vegetation succession.

In addition to these threats, PPM populations are known to be imminently threatened by land use activities at and surrounding the extant locales, including impacts of heavy pedestrian and military use (soil compaction and associated vegetative loss), predation risks (fire ants, Argentine ants, domestic cats, native predators), competition for seed resources (co-occurring rodent species, harvester ants, Argentine ants); negative impacts from vibrations, noise, and artificial lighting (USFWS 1998, 2010, Brehme et al. 2013, 2014, Shier pers. comm.), and the uncertain impacts from rapid climate change.

While vegetation is manageable to some extent (influencing the amount of ground cover and species composition with trimming and removal, possibly some planting), it is still a function of natural processes and affected by weather conditions and climate change—largely unmanageable factors. Some of the growing threats to the PPM cannot be directly managed or controlled, such as climate change, loss of habitat through coastal erosion, or the spread of certain diseases and viruses.

5.1 Habitat Availability

Land uses and habitat management practices in the range of the PPM are the main influences that determine the availability of PPM habitat. Urbanization and land conversion have led to habitat loss and have fragmented the historical range of PPM, and extant populations are now isolated from one another (Gilpin 1987). Fragmentation increases barriers to dispersal and makes remaining populations smaller and more vulnerable to catastrophes, deleterious effects of inbreeding, and environmental and demographic stochasticity. The quality of fragmented habitat may also decline as a result of edge effects, which increases vulnerability of habitat to disturbance, invasion by nonnative species, and exposure to artificial night-time lighting which may cause problems for nocturnal rodents by increasing their vulnerability to visually aided predators (Clarke 1983, Dice 1945) or result in direct habitat avoidance (Brown et al. 1988, Kotler 1984, Price et al. 1984). These edge effects also increase the likelihood of local extirpation of populations. Bolger et al. (1997) studied the effects of habitat fragmentation on rodents in southern California and found that species with highly stochastic populations were more frequently extirpated from small habitat fragments. This suggests that a restricted and fragmented distribution (coupled with small population sizes; see Section 4.2) continues to be a factor that threatens the viability of PPM.

5.1.1 Habitat Modification and Destruction

The large majority of remnant, suitable habitat within the historic range of the Pacific pocket mouse in coastal Los Angeles, Orange, and San Diego counties has been converted to urban, suburban, and agricultural uses (USFWS 1993, 1998). By 1998, at the time USFWS Recovery Plan was published, less than 400 hectares (1,000 acres) or 1% of approximately 11,340 hectares (28,000 acres) within 3.2 kilometers (2 miles) of the coast in Los Angeles County remained undeveloped (i.e., potential PPM habitat). In Orange County, about 17,600 hectares (43,500 acres), or 81% of approximately 21,600 hectares (53,500 acres) within 3.2 kilometers (2 miles) of the coast, have been developed (USFWS 1998). Land uses in coastal

San Diego County are reportedly similar. Oberbauer and Vanderwier (1991) reported that 72% of the original coastal sage scrub, 94% of native grasslands, 88% of coastal mixed chaparral, 88% of coastal salt marsh, 100% of coastal strand, and 92% of maritime sage scrub habitats in San Diego County had been converted to urban and agricultural uses by 1988. Although the historic distribution of the coastal sage scrub element of PPM habitat was undoubtedly patchy to some degree, this condition evidently has been greatly exacerbated by urban and agricultural development. All of the published literature on the status of coastal sage scrub vegetation in California supports the conclusion that this plant community is one of the most depleted habitat types in the United States (USFWS 1993). The available information further suggests that the quantity of potential PPM habitat associated with river alluvium substrate has significantly declined since the subspecies was last recorded in numbers in the 1930's. With few exceptions (such as the Santa Margarita River), essentially all of the rivers and creeks within the historic range of the Pacific pocket mouse are now partially or completely channelized. In many cases (e.g., Los Angeles River, San Gabriel River, Santa Ana River), stream and sediment flows are regulated or inhibited by dams, reservoirs or other water conservation or impoundment facilities (Erickson 1993).

During the 1930s, when Pacific pocket mice were detected at the mouth of the Santa Margarita River, the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton did not exist. The southern half of the Santa Margarita River Estuary was destroyed in the early 1940's during the establishment of Camp Pendleton and the related construction of a boat basin and harbor facilities. In addition, the adjacent Oceanside area has been extensively developed since the Pacific pocket mouse was last recorded there in the 1930s. Within Orange County, the Pacific pocket mouse has been confirmed at two locales: the San Joaquin Hills and Dana Point. Development of the "Spyglass Hill" area in the San Joaquin Hills began in 1972 and has resulted in the destruction of the site where the Pacific pocket mouse inhabited.

Within Los Angeles County, the Pacific pocket mouse historically was detected in three areas: Marina del Rey/El Segundo/Hyperion, Wilmington, and Clifton. Two of the three historic locales for the Pacific pocket mouse (Clifton and Wilmington) in Los Angeles County have been developed and are no longer potential habitat (Erickson 1993). The third historic locale (Marina del Rey/El Segundo/Hyperion) apparently has been substantially altered since the subspecies was last detected there (Erickson 1993). The Hyperion area, which formerly contained relatively large expanses of coastal strand and wetland habitats, has been extensively developed.

In addition to habitat loss, fragmentation is a major threat to PMM populations. Habitat fragmentation reduces habitat quality and increases local extirpation of native wildlife (e.g., Torborgh and Winter 1980; Wilcox 1980; Ehrlich and Ehrlich 1981; Wilson 1992; Bolger et al. in press; Soulé et al. 1992). Bolger et al. (1997) concluded that habitat fragments supported fewer species of native rodents than equivalently sized plots in large plots of unfragmented chaparral indicating that local extinctions have occurred following fragmentation and insularization. When the distribution of native rodents in 25 urban habitat fragments was assessed by live-trapping, over half of the fragments surveyed (13 of 25) did not support populations of native rodents. Fragments supported fewer species than equivalently sized plots in large expanses of unfragmented habitat, and older fragments (fragments that had been isolated for a longer period of time) supported fewer species (Bolger et al. 1997). Both results implied that local extinctions occurred in the fragments following insularization. Soulé et al. (1992) further noted that "...urban barriers including highways, streets, and structures, impose a very high degree of isolation."

The Dana Point Preserve, which harbors one third of the world's PPM populations, has been reduced to a habitat fragment, surrounded by an increasing amount of urban development. Ongoing development adjacent to the Preserve includes a significant housing subdivision and a hotel that is currently being built on what was previously natural open space. The threats to PPM associated with fragmentation and urban development include the number of domestic cats and other non-native and native predators that generally accompany human development (crows, ravens, raccoons, red foxes, opossums), as well as negative impacts from vibrations, noise, artificial lighting (USFWS 1998, 2010, Brehme et al. 2013-2020, D. Shier pers. comm.), and increased recreation on the Preserve (Merrill et al. 2023).

An additional threat to habitat availability is the loss of land due to erosion. This is currently an issue at the Dana Point Preserve, and potentially to any coastal bluff locations that may support PPM as future translocation sites. Indeed, a property immediately adjacent to the Dana Point Preserve experienced considerable erosion resulting in an impactful landslide in February 2024.

5.1.2 Non-native Vegetation and Habitat Succession

For PPM, the introduction and dominance of nonnative grasses and other weeds is an ongoing threat to habitat quality. Historically, PPM habitats were largely open and dominated by native bunch grass and forbs but the invasion of European annual grasses in the mid-1800s, alongside intensified agriculture and livestock grazing, led to these nonnatives dominating many of these

habitats (Barry et al. 2006, Brehme et al. 2023b). Non-native grass cover is a strong negative predictor of PPM occupancy and colonization and a positive predictor of localized extirpation, especially as the amount of nonnative grasses increases above 20 percent (DOD 2019, Brehme et al. 2023b). Non-native grasses were found to make up approximately 5 to 40 percent of the total cover within PPM sites in MCBCP during surveys from 2012 to 2017 (Brehme et al. 2023b). Because non-native grasses grow more thickly than the native bunchgrasses they replace, they likely hinder PPM movements and foraging success (Rieder et al. 2010) and studies across MCBCP in 2016 and 2017 found that non-native grass seed do not appear to be a favored food resource and make up only a trace amount of PPM diet (DOD 2019, Brehme et al. 2023b).

Habitat succession---changes in the amount and composition of vegetation and associated soil conditions—occurs over time in the absence of disturbance or intense management. With fire having largely been eliminated as a natural disturbance within PPM habitat, and the options for PPM dispersal to more favorable areas having been curtailed by development, prescriptive intensive management has become essential in providing suitable habitat conditions. Even management, though, is restricted to certain stewardship tools, limited in its implementation and efficacy by weather and appropriate financial resources, and cannot control all influences on PPM habitat. For example, weather conditions and soil seedbank can lead to growth of shrubs and annuals and decrease the bare ground component that is an important component of PPM's preferred microhabitat (Loda et al. 1999, p. 8; Spencer et al. 2000, pp. 12-15; Montgomery 2005, pp. 7-8). Management efforts can include trimming perennial vegetation and removing some annual vegetation cover, but appropriate seed plants must be available as a food source for PPM, and adequate perennial vegetation must be present to provide protective cover, conserve soil moisture, help prevent erosion, and provide soil stability for under-ground burrows. Several years of increasing cover of shrubs, woody debris, and duff with associated decreases in forb cover led to reduced habitat suitability for PPM on Dana Point. This vegetation succession corresponded with relatively low recorded occupancy of PPM at Dana Point from 2017–2019 (Merrill 2019, 2020, 2021) as well as increasing numbers of visiting public.

5.1.3 Habitat Management

Loss of historical habitat through PPMs range combined with alterations to disturbance regimes that historically created and maintained suitable habitat for PPM, has resulted in the confinement of PPM to its three extant and isolated locations. Without adjacent areas available to disperse to, habitat where the three populations occur must be continuously and intensively managed to prevent extirpation.

5.1.3.1 Prescribed Fire

The seasonality, size, intensity, and frequency of fire in coastal southern California has likely changed drastically over the last century in association with human settlement. As a result of fire suppression activities, many of coastal southern California's natural areas may be subject to less frequent fire than occurred historically (USFWS 2010, p. 46). Not allowing habitat to burn reduces habitat quality for PPM by increasing the continuity of shrub cover and eliminating habitat openings that are thought to be an important component of PPM's preferred microhabitat (Loda et al. 1999, p. 8; Spencer et al. 2000, pp. 12-15; Montgomery 2005, pp. 7-8). Too frequent burning, however, can result in long term vegetation composition change; coastal sage scrub may decline and convert to grasslands when the fire frequency becomes extremely high (Syphard et al. 2006, p. 1754). Prescribed fire is considered an important management tool for PPM habitat at MCBCP for reducing non-native grasses and banked seeds, as well as thatch build up (e.g., Brehme et al. 2023b). However, the long-term impacts of prescribed fire on PPM habitat have not been studied (Brehme et al. 2023b, p. 8), a potential risk given that this is frequent and primary management activity at MCBCP.

Prescribed fire cannot be used at Dana Point due to the proximity of the Preserve to residential development and mowing is impractical because of the terrain. Thus, the only management options at Dana Point for maintaining good habitat for the PPM population are resource-intensive activities such as native plant seeding; hand removal of nonnative grasses, brush, and thatch; and selective, targeted use of appropriate pesticides.

5.1.4 Land Use and Activities

There are several land uses and human activities that affect habitat availability within the range of the PPM by contributing to direct loss, degradation, and fragmentation of habitat, and/or reducing effective habitat size and quality.

5.1.4.1 Development/Project Construction

Development and construction are ongoing threats to the extant PPM population and to the potential locales for reintroduction. Development and projects have had a large historical impact on the PPM and have been major drivers of habitat lost and degradation.

Development and construction significantly affected the Dana Point population historically, and

currently. In February of 2005, the City of Dana Point approved the Dana Point Headlands Development and Conservation Plan, which involves residential and commercial development on about 29-ha (71-ac) of the 48.0-ha (121-ac.) Dana Point Headlands site (USFWS 2020). Habitat permanently conserved in association with the development includes the 11.9-ha (29.4 ac) Dana Point Preserve. The hiking trail within the Dana Point Preserve was constructed in 2007 with access to the trail during daylight hours provided to the public beginning in December of 2009 (see Merrill et al. 2023). Since being listed under the USFWS Endangered Species Act, the quantity of habitat available to PPM has decreased, impacts from edge effects have increased from new residential and commercial development (e.g. increased ambient light levels, irrigation runoff, intrusion from pets), and human intrusion into PPM habitat has and continues to increase, despite a conservation easement on the property (USFWS 2010, USFWS 2020).

Impacts to the PPM habitat in the area of MCBCP began in the early 1940s when the Santa Margarita River Estuary was destroyed during the establishment of Camp Pendleton and the related construction of a boat basin and harbor facilities. Progressive impacts to habitat occurred in the subsequent decades until PPM was rediscovered on MCBCP and received regulatory protection under the USFWS Endangered Species Act. In 1996, the USFWS completed consultation with the Marine Corps on the Crucible Challenge Course, which was built within the Oscar One training area (USFWS 1996, USFWS 2010)—a project that resulted in the loss of an additional 3.2 ha (8 ac) of occupied or suitable PPM habitat (USFWS 2020). Maintenance, adjustments, and modifications of the Crucible Course, continues to accrete habitat impacts. The use of the Crucible Course was contemplated to result in the take of one PPM per company of recruits using the Crucible Course, and one PPM per year due to road maintenance activities USFWS 1996, USFWS 2010). The Marine Corps recently proposed moving the Land Navigation Course portion of the Crucible Challenge Course from Oscar One to Oscar Two; with certain activities to remain at a 10.9 ha (27 ac) section of Oscar One. The proposed Oscar Two course would cover 218.1 ha (539 ac) and include the construction of a fence along the northern perimeter of the training area, and the installation of 65 additional land navigation points, as well as regular road and site maintenance at the new site (MCBCP 2021). Another project, the 51 Area Reservoir Repair Project, included repairing and restoring damage caused to facilities and the environment from the accidental release of water from the Reservoir in 2012; cumulatively, impacts from this project are estimated to have impacted 0.72 ha (1.79 ac) of PPM habitat, including the permanent loss of 0.17 ha (0.43 ac) of habitat (USFWS 2020).

5.1.4.2 Military Training Activities

Two of the extant populations—those on Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton—are vulnerable to impacts from military training activities. Military training is currently a primary threat to PPM at the Santa Margarita population. Training activities are frequent, with 17,000 troops training annually on approximately 134.8 ha (333 ac) of potential PPM habitat. A proposed shift and expansion of existing training activities in PPM-occupied habitat further north could result in additional impacts to PPM at Santa Margarita. At present, the South San Mateo area is subject to occasional on-road military vehicle use and on and off-road foot traffic training but is not regularly used by the Marine Corps for training (USFWS 2010).

In addition to the direct impacts to PPM habitat from military activities (i.e., loss, degradation), there are numerous indirect impacts to habitat quality related to these activities, including artificial lighting, anthropogenic noise, vibrations and trampling, rodenticide use, predator attractant, areas of avoidance due to human presence, and an increase in non-native plants in the area (Chock and Shier 2021, pp. 8-9).

Military training at Santa Margarita consists of approximately 17,000 recruits completing the training annually at the Crucible Course, across 36 to 40 weeks per year with 250 to 550 Marines present weekly. Training activities are impactful, and include land navigation, troop movement, live firing ranges, bivouac sites, dirt roads and trails and associated facilities (USFWS 2010, MCBCP 2021). Training activities were expanded in 2006 (USFWS 2007b) and impacts from this expansion were observed within undeveloped areas include removal or reduction of vegetation, soil compaction, addition of new training elements, and increased foot and off-road vehicle traffic over a large portion of the Lower Mesa within Oscar One. One of the primary new training activities includes land navigation training across 134.8 ha (333 ac) of suitable PPM habitat. These activities involve the movement of large numbers of troops on foot through habitat areas (MCBCP 2021). This has resulted in a reduction of vegetative cover, creation of trails, and compaction of soils throughout portions of the Lower Mesa documented to be historically occupied by PPM. In addition to the potential for direct impacts to mice from crushing of burrows, these impacts have degraded habitat quality for PPM by reducing vegetative cover and availability of seed resources, reducing the quality of soils for constructing burrows, and facilitating extensive proliferation of non-native invasive plant species (e.g. Sahara mustard, *Brassica tournefortii*). Given the pre-existence of nonnative annual grasses and weeds in this area, the movement of troops throughout this area is also likely to degrade habitat quality for PPM by facilitating their continued invasion and spread (D'Antonio and Vitousek 1992, USFWS 2010).

Following the documentation of the 2006 expanded training activities, the Marine Corps modified the location of some of these training areas to minimize impacts but land navigation and other training practices continue to degrade PPM habitat south of Macs road, where PPM were once densely concentrated (USFWS 2008) but are now are absent or only detectable in trace numbers (Brehme et al. 2019, Brehme et al. 2020, USFWS 2020). In 2012, about 0.61 ha (1.5 ac) of PPM-occupied habitat within Santa Margarita were disturbed due to the establishment of a temporary training/bivouac site (USFWS 2020), which ultimately resulted in consultation with USFWS and consequent restoration (USFWS 2020). In 2022, MCPCP proposed a new project for improvements and maintenance of 52 targets at Edson Range 501 at Santa Margarita, covering 25 ha (61.8 ac), which would be used to train approximately 15,000 recruits annually (USFWS 2023). This work would require ground disturbing berm work in the near and long-term. Potential and expected impacts to PPM from these activities could include direct mortality from vehicles and foot traffic, as well as habitat degradation and soil compaction.

Artificial night-time lighting: PPM above-ground activities are typically conducted at night or during low-light levels. As such, artificial night-time lighting may disrupt nocturnal rodents such as the Pacific pocket mouse, through potential modification of predation rates, obscuring of lunar cycles, and/or causing direct habitat avoidance (USFWS 1998, Shier et al. 2020). A study of the effect of different levels and orientation of (artificial) night lighting on PPM at Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton indicated that anthropogenic light negatively affected foraging of PPM (Wang and Shier 2017).

Noise: Increased anthropogenic noise can interfere with avian acoustic communication (Slabbekoorn and Ripmeester 2008, Barber et al. 2010). Impaired communication resulting from anthropogenic noise has been linked to altered predator avoidance behaviors (Anze and Koper 2018), lower lek attendance in greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) (Blickley et al. 2012), reduced pairing success in ovenbirds (*Seiurus aurocapilla*) (Habib et al. 2007), and impaired nestling development in house sparrows (*Passer domesticus*) (Schroeder et al. 2012), indicating that the impacts of noise on communication have the potential to interfere with reproductive processes. Anthropogenic noise may function as a deceptive signal to wildlife, causing animals to engage in false responses that may be energetically and biologically costly. Evidence of this is provided by a study of endangered Stephens' kangaroo rat, in which traffic noise not only masked but also mimicked foot-drumming signals (Shier et al. 2012). For vulnerable species such as PPM, the combined effects of communication disruption and signal deception may further tax already endangered populations.

Reproductive behavior: Above ground disturbances can affect PPM reproductive behavior as the time period during which a female PPM is in peak estrus can be extremely limited (i.e., as brief as one hour per cycle, D. Shier pers. comm.) and reproductive behavior may potentially be dissuaded by disturbances or perceived threats during this time.

Burrow destruction: Burrows and tunnels can sometimes be as little as 1 to 4 inches below ground (D. Shier pers. comm.) and are vulnerable to trampling. As such, sounds and vibrations from above-ground disturbances could affect PPM below ground. In sandy habitats, burrows are particularly vulnerable to compaction by foot or off-road vehicle traffic. Brehme et al. (2014) reported a strong negative effect of human foot traffic on PPM occupancy.

Impact on Torpor: As the beneficial aspect of torpor or aestivation is to reduce energy expenditure, any disturbance that disrupts these states can have a negative effect. Again, such disturbances could include human-caused sounds or vibrations—especially if burrows are shallow and/or close to the surface. Further, because Heteromyids have expanded middle ears, they are especially sensitive to low frequency sound (D. Shier pers. comm.).

5.1.5.3 Fire and Fire Management Practices

Current fire prevention measures and unnaturally high fire frequencies resulting from anthropogenic ignitions, particularly training activities at MCBCP, may directly or indirectly impact the PPM (USFWS 1998). Furthermore, PPM colonization of cleared habitat following creation of firebreaks, combined with firebreak maintenance practices at South San Mateo, is likely resulting in some ongoing incremental impacts to PPM habitat and direct harm to individual PPM on a periodic basis.

Occasional wildfire may be beneficial to PPM if fire frequency and intensity remains low enough. While fire is generally considered to be beneficial to PPM and prescribed fire is used as a habitat management tool (see Habitat Management, above), if fire occurs too frequently or at the wrong time of year, displacement of native forbs and shrubs by the invasion of nonnative grasses and forbs can result in habitat type conversion (O'Leary and Westman 1988, D'Antonio and Vitousek 1992, Minnich and Dezzani 1998, Keeley et al. 2005) resulting in a long term loss of habitat suitability for PPM from the accumulation of nonnative grasses and thatch. Further, prescribed fire as a beneficial tool for PPM habitat depends heavily on the nature of the fire not affecting under-ground PPM and the availability of nearby habitat refugia as food sources while the fire-affected area recovers.

PPM residing within habitat where there is a fire have potential to succumb to the fire from burning, asphyxiation or heat prostration, or may survive either by fleeing or by sheltering in place. Studies that have been performed to understand the potential for fire to result in direct harm to small mammals suggest many small mammals are able to shelter in place within crevices in rock outcroppings, burrows, and unburnt or protected areas within the burn perimeter that provide insulation from direct heat and fresh air (Howard et al. 1959, Tevis 1956, Gashwiler 1959, Lawrence 1966, Quinn 1979, Price et al. 1995). Due to its burrowing habit, PPM are likely to be predisposed to be able to survive and withstand fire by sheltering in place within burrows, where there is adequate insulation from heat (USFWS 2020).

The Marine Corps and California State Parks maintain fire breaks in the vicinity of South San Mateo and the historical North San Mateo population, respectively (USFWS 2010). Fire breaks are maintained by disking or blading soil, which may crush PPM burrows and/or harm individuals through direct injury or displacement. Following the discovery of PPM at South San Mateo in 1995, the Marine Corps abandoned maintenance of some of the fire break segments, or portions thereof, in the vicinity of this population to minimize and avoid impacts to PPM, but fire breaks occupied by PPM are still occasionally disked or created by facilities maintenance staff on site (USFWS 2014, USFWS 2019).In 2012, about 0.13 ha (0.32 ac) of occupied PPM habitat was impacted within a former east-west trending ridgeline firebreak at South San Mateo. MCBCP restored this habitat for PPM (USFWS 2019), and monitoring indicates this area was recolonized by PPM in 2017, approximately 5 years after the disking incident.

In 2014, PPM habitat was disked when a new fire break was created near Base housing off of Basilone Road at South San Mateo. This activity likely crushed burrows and harmed individual PPM residing within the footprint of the fire break. To monitor the response of PPM to this habitat disturbance, the MCBCP PPM monitoring program placed an “Impact” monitoring grid within the disked area that detected PPM in the cleared and adjoining area the following season (Brehme et al. 2018). Following recolonization of this area by PPM, this area was disked again in June of 2017 (USFWS 2019). However, continued monitoring of the impact grid indicates that this firebreak has again been recolonized by PPM following the second disking incident (Brehme et al. 2019).

Prior to extirpation of the North San Mateo PPM population, State Parks would periodically spread plant mulch over the fire break adjoining this population to suppress new plant growth and reduce maintenance needs. This layer of mulch created moist soil conditions favoring the proliferation of invasive Argentine ants, which colonized the adjoining habitat and are believed to have contributed to degradation of habitat quality for PPM at this locale (Suarez et al. 1998,

Brehme et al. 2009).

5.1.5.4 Road and Utility Maintenance

Dirt roads on MCBCP are maintained either by the Base, or by utility companies [San Diego Gas and Electric (SDGE), Southern California Edison (SCE)] (USFWS 2020). For routine road maintenance, SDGE and SCE are allowed small scale ongoing take of 1-3 PPM annually (USFWS 2017, USFWS 2022) and thus routine road maintenance potentially results in some individual PPM injured or killed on an annual basis.

During 2014, the Marine Corps started surfacing the dirt roads that intersect the distribution of the PPM population within the Oscar One training area with pea gravel and/or crushed stone (USFWS 2020). Based on alteration of the road surface from dirt to a composite rock substrate, and the observation of decreasing road permeability to movements of another pocket mouse across a change of road type from low-use dirt, low-use secondary paved, to rural 2-lane highway (Brehme et al. 2014), it is possible that this road surfacing could contribute to the fragmentation of PPM habitat within the Santa Margarita population from road avoidance behavior (USFWS 2020).

In 2012, an emergency access road was created through PPM habitat while performing repairs in response to damage to drainage ditches from the accidental release of water from the San Onofre Reservoirs (USFWS 2020, p. 14). This resulted in the grading of an estimated 0.34 ha (0.83 ac) of PPM habitat within the South San Mateo population, and likely resulted in the death or injury of at least seven PPM (Snyder 2012, p. 2). Monitoring of the PPM population indicates that the emergency access roadbed was recolonized by PPM following this grading incident but was subsequently disked in 2017 in association with the creation of an adjoining fire break (see Fire and Fire Management Practices, above; Brehme et al. 2019, p. 18). The Marine Corps has consulted to place a composite surface on this road and establish it as a permanent access road for maintenance of the San Onofre reservoir facilities (USFWS 2019, USFWS 2020, p. 14).

5.1.5.6 Recreation Activities and Unauthorized Habitat Disturbances

Residential communities fall within close proximity to the Dana Point Preserve and South San Mateo PPM populations, and a pedestrian trail is located on the Dana Point Preserve (Figure 4). Public use of these areas has potential to degrade PPM habitat through creation of

unauthorized trails and other habitat disturbances from human activities.

Negative effects related to recreational disturbance have been documented across a wide variety of species and taxa including, mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, and even invertebrates (e.g., Steven et al. 2011, Bennett et al. 2013, Larson et al. 2019). Human disturbance on wildlife from non-consumptive recreation can result in altered spatiotemporal habitat use (Kangas et al. 2010), extirpate wildlife from otherwise suitable habitat, or cause animals to shift geographically into areas of lower quality habitat to avoid areas with human activity (Taylor and Knight 2003, Ficetola et al. 2007, Finney et al. 2005, Kangas et al. 2010, Mallord et al. 2007, Dertien et al. 2021). Thus, recreational disturbances can both reduce habitat suitability and ultimately result in functional habitat loss (Gutzwiller et al. 1994, Frid and Dill 2002, Tost et al. 2020). Fragmented habitats may present unique stressors if there is no adjacent habitat for animals to relocate to, forcing individuals to remain in proximity to disturbance that they would otherwise avoid (Frid and Dill 2002). Indirect effects of increased human presence can occur when humans create an environment of higher predator pressure or cause animals to temporally shift their activities to avoid human activity. In an urban park, white-footed mice (*Peromyscus leucopus*)—primarily a crepuscular-nocturnal forager—spent less time foraging in areas of high human use even though people were not allowed in this park after dusk, possibly due to increased predator presence along trails (Persons and Eason 2017). Temporal shifts to avoid human activity can cause some species to become more nocturnal; such "diel shifts" can bring predator-prey species into greater overlap, with increase predation risks (Patton et al. 2019), or lead to suboptimal foraging conditions (Wheat and Wilmers 2016). The cumulative, compounding adverse effects of predator-avoidance behaviors can have impacts on fecundity and every component of offspring survival, with long-term implications for population growth (Allen et al. 2021). For PPM, impacts from public access may include trampling the burrows; damaging plants that serve as food sources, nesting locations, and shelter; changes in predator dynamics; and impacts on reproduction. For example, the time period during which a female PPM is in peak estrus can be extremely limited (i.e., as brief as one hour per cycle, D. Shier pers. comm.) and reproductive behavior may potentially be dissuaded by disturbances during this time.

The effects of trail use are not limited to the trail itself, and impacts can be further-reaching. This has particular implications for a small site like the Dana Point Preserve. For example, the sights, sounds, vibrations, and smells (and the latter can linger for quite some time) of human presence radiate out from the trail for some distance and some time. Based on a study of impacts of public access to trails by Dertien and Larson (2018), in which "threshold buffers" (distances from the trail within which effects might be expected to occur for various taxonomic

groups) were assessed, CNLM examined three threshold buffers (13, 50, and 100 meters) for the Dana Point Preserve trails (Figure 4). Given the meandering nature of the trail, even the shortest (potential) impact zone (13 meters) covers a significant portion of the Preserve (16%). That distance was selected on the basis that this may be the average diameter for PPM core home range (Shier 2009). The other two distance zones, 50 and 100 meters, reflect some literature that found that smaller rodent species avoided areas within 50-100 meters of trails or people (Dertien et al. 2021). At 100 meters, almost 90% of the Preserve is included in the potential impact zone, which does not include impacts from the adjacent parking lot and roads. If those (latter) impacts are included in the threshold buffer for the Preserve, the entire Preserve would be potentially impacted.



Figure 4. Zones of varying distance (13 meters, 50 meters, 100 meters) from the trail at the Dana Point Preserve. Values show proportion (%) and area (acres) of the Preserve covered by each zone. Source: Merrill et al. (2023).

Prior to CNLM acquisition of the Dana Point Preserve, the area was fenced and closed to the

public, but was subject to unauthorized trespass and other unlawful activities including dumping, growing marijuana, and as location for habitation by the unhoused (Miller, 2008, pers. obs.). In December of 2009, the public was granted access during daylight hours to a formal trail that was constructed within the Dana Point Preserve in 2007. This led to a dramatic increase in the amount of human presence within the Dana Point Preserve during daytime due to the popularity of the trail with the public (Miller, 2010, pers. obs.; Merrill et al. 2023). The trail was closed in 2020, at the start of the Covid pandemic, and reopened later that year with limited hours, opening later and closing earlier to limit public access in low-light times of day when PPM are most likely to be active aboveground (Merrill et al. 2023). In November 2022, the trail was opened for increased daily hours of 7 am to sunset, due to a court order sought by the City of Dana Point in ongoing litigation against CNLM. Public use of the Preserve has been increasing every year, as reflected in trail use counter data. Average per-day use doubled over a seven-year period (2011-2017), and recent data indicates the upward trend in visitation is continuing. In 2023, the average number of visitors per day (during open days) was 648.3 (± 21.9 SE), which is an increase of approximately 28% from 2022 (497.4 ± 33.4 [SE]), and an increase of approximately 46% from the 2011-2017 average (444.4 ± 53.6 SE) (Merrill 2024). Further, plans for a hotel adjacent to the Preserve could result in additional visitation, and associated impacts related to development (e.g., the use of rodenticide, artificial lighting, noise, vibration, and disease/virus transmission).

Due to the small population size of PPM on the Preserve, its cryptic nature and imperiled status, as well as the size and trail configuration on the Preserve, conducting experimental studies to determine the full impact of increased human presence and recreation is impracticable. However, likely impacts to the PPM population can be inferred from studies elsewhere including those focused on small rodents (Baharudin et al. 2022). Such impacts include altered behaviors and activity patterns, which could result in decreased time spent in essential activities such as foraging or reduced time spent in torpor, degraded habitat quality due to increased disturbance adjoining the trail, and increased presence of nonnative species such as domestic dogs (*Canis familiaris*), house mice (*Mus musculus*), rats (*Rattus rattus, Rattus norvegicus*) and Argentine ants (literature review in CNLM 2023). Although the public is prohibited from venturing off trail, there are instances of off trail recreation (such as hiking and mountain biking), as well as dogs off leash (Merrill and Rogers 2019). In addition to trampling vegetation, and compacting soils, ongoing off-trail trespass increases the potential to crush PPM burrows. From June 2017 to February 2023, despite numerous signs, fencing, and CNLM staff presence, 220 incidents of people going off-trail were reported. In that same time period, there were 81 recorded instances of pet dogs or cats on the trail (Merrill et al. 2023, p. 13). On June 5, 2023, a dead PPM was found on a trail that appeared to have been stepped on by a

pedestrian, as trauma was confirmed to be cause of death via necropsy (Merrill 2023, Shier 2023, pers. comm).

After a long decline trend since 2012, as indicated by trapping data, PPM occupancy increased at Dana Point following the temporary closure of the public trail in 2020 and subsequent modified hours, and then decreased again once the trail hours were increased, which suggests the hours of trail use is a contributing factor to the observed increase and then decrease in population and area occupied (Merrill 2023), CNLM 2024 (Table 2). The impact of public use in this small and fragmented preserve can be considered a permanent threat to the PPM population that will likely suppress viability and occupation of PPM on the site in perpetuity. However, while some limited public access is a legal requirement associated with the Preserve's establishment, the hours that the trail is open and the numbers of visitors are controllable. More limited hours of public use are likely more protective of the PPM population at Dana Point and will likely increase that population's viability.

Because South San Mateo falls entirely within a military installation, it receives the least impact from trail creation and public trespass. However, nearby base residents occasionally use the existing road network for mountain biking, hiking, and dog walking (USFWS 2020). These recreational activities, especially the presence of domestic dogs, are known to degrade habitat quality through disturbances associated with noise, smells, vibrations, and anti-predator responses (reviewed in Larson et al. 2016)

Of the MCBCP locales, the now extirpated North San Mateo, which has both trails and residential areas within close proximity, has experienced the greatest habitat impacts from recreational use and habitat disturbances from the public (USFWS 2010). While it is unknown if recreational use and unauthorized habitat impacts led to the presumed extirpation of this population, it is likely that these impacts contributed to the decline of this population. Overall, recreation activities and unauthorized habitat disturbances at the two extant northern PPM populations create a low level of continual disturbance. While any of these activities may affect only a small portion of the habitat within a site at any one time, their cumulative impact may exacerbate the extirpation risks of these populations by degrading habitat quality and depressing what are likely already small PPM populations.

5.2 Small Population

Urbanization and land conversion have fragmented the historical range of PPM such that extant populations now operate as independent units rather than parts of a stable metapopulation that is maintained by immigration/emigration dynamics. Isolated populations are more susceptible to long-term/permanent extirpation by accidental or natural catastrophes because the likelihood of recolonization following such events is negatively correlated with the extent of isolation (Gilpin 1987, p. 136). Small populations have higher probabilities of extinction than larger populations because their low abundance renders them susceptible to inbreeding, loss of genetic variation, high variability in age and sex ratios, and other random naturally occurring events such as droughts or disease epidemics. Owing to the probabilistic nature of extinction, some small populations will survive in the short term when faced with these demographic, environmental, and genetic stochastic risks, but they are likely to eventually become extirpated.

Analysis of genetic samples collected during population monitoring suggest that effective population sizes within the extant populations are universally low and cause for concern (USFWS 2020). The estimated effective population sizes at Dana Point, South San Mateo and Santa Margarita are (respectively) Ne=14.9, Ne= 20.5, and Ne=36.5 (Wilder et al., in prep.). These results suggest that all three populations are vulnerable to loss of genetic variation and adaptive potential over time and below the threshold at which reduced fitness from mating of closely related individuals is expected (Frankham et al. 2014). Poor reproductive performance of Dana Point animals in captivity, and loss of Dana Point genetic representation within the captive colony over time, further suggests that this population is already suffering from reduced fitness relative to the other PPM populations (Wilder et al. 2020). Finally, a comparison of contemporary genetic variation with variation measured from tissue collected prior to 2003 indicates that all populations have suffered recent population declines and a significant loss of genetic variation, with the Dana Point population exhibiting the greatest and most concerning loss (Swei et al. 2003, pp. 511–512; Wilder et al. 2020, unpaginated; USFWS 2020, pp. 16-17). By maintaining genetic diversity and increasing the number of PPM populations, current captive breeding and reintroduction efforts may help to ameliorate the threat of small population size in the future. However, this threat is currently high in overall magnitude, and is exacerbated by other threats to PPM from habitat disturbance, degradation, human use, and fragmentation.

Given the small sizes of the populations at the three known extant locales, its dispersal habits , and the severe fragmentation and loss of the subspecies' habitat, the Pacific pocket mouse is highly susceptible to extinction as a result of environmental or demographic factors alone (see Mace and Lande 1991).

5.3 Climate Change

Since the listing of the PPM, the potential impacts of ongoing, accelerated climate change have become a recognized threat to the flora and fauna of the United States (IPCC 2007, PRBO 2011). Current models suggest that southern California will likely be adversely affected by global climate change through prolonged seasonal droughts and rainfall coming at unusual periods and different amounts (Pierce 2004, Cayan et al. 2005, CEPA 2006, Jennings et al. 2018). Mean annual temperatures are also predicted to increase. Climate change models indicate a 4 to 9 degrees Fahrenheit (2 to 4 degrees Celsius) increase in average temperature for the San Diego Area of southern California by the end of the century (Jennings et al. 2018). Coastal sage scrub habitats, of which PPM is associated, are also likely to be impacted by climate change. Altered precipitation timing, soil moisture, and drought severity may affect species composition, distribution, and survival of this community and many native sage scrub associated species are projected to experience a >50% decline in suitable habitat in southern California by mid-century (EcoAdapt 2017).

Information is not available to make accurate predictions regarding its effects to PPM (USFWS 2020) and predicting impacts to PPM due to climate change are further complicated by the timing, frequency, and amount of increased or decreased rainfall, which can impact soil moisture, fire regimes, vegetation cover, and seed availability for PPM (Brehme et al. 2023b). Excessive seasonal precipitation and/or extreme weather events can impact PPM survivorship in a number of ways. In years of poor resource availability (e.g., drought) PPM may delay breeding or forego breeding altogether, resulting in little to no recruitment to the population (Beatley 1969, French et al. 1967, Kenagy and Bartholomew 1985, USFWS 2008). Yet prolonged drought 5-year was associated with an increase in the area occupied by PPM within MCBCP (USWS 2024). While high rainfall may result in increased seed resources, high rainfall may negatively impact PPM by reducing open ground to unsuitably low levels needed for them to forage, by spoiling seed caches, or by reducing survivorship by negatively affecting the ability of PPM to retain body heat during their winter torpor (Valone et al. 1995, Brehme et al. 2023b). In 2017, rainfall was above average, and over one-third of the PPM population was lost in a single year. However, rainfall was not a strong direct predictor of PPM occupancy dynamics (Brehme et al. 2023b).

The impacts of predicted future climate change to PPM remain unclear, though any significant changes from historic patterns will undoubtedly have consequences, and climate change has potential drastic effects to the PPM and its habitats. Given the timeframe presented in climate

change studies, while major climate impacts to the region are unlikely to occur in the next 20 to 30 years, there may be short-term climate impacts, such as increased periods of drought, increased fire frequency and/or severity, or periods of heavy rainfall, which are likely to affect PPM population fluctuations. Therefore, the magnitude of this threat is unknown at this time but is unlikely to have major, novel impacts in the next decade or two.

5.4 Disease, Predation, Competition

Predation by the non-native red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*) and feral/domestic cats (*Felis catus*) were recognized as threats to PPM at the time of listing (59 FR 49762) and since that time numerous other potential native and non-native predators of PPM have been revealed by camera surveys at the Dana Point Headlands which detected at least seven potential predators (USFWS 2010, USFWS 2020, K. Merrill pers comm.).

Domestic pet activity has been documented at North San Mateo and at South San Mateo, and domestic cats have been directly observed entering occupied PPM habitat (Montgomery 2003). Predation from cats is an ongoing threat to PPM at Dana Point Headlands, South San Mateo, and potential habitat at North San Mateo. Feral and domestic cats are known to be efficient predators of rodents (e.g., George 1974). A study by Pearson (1964) concluded that the removal of 4,200 mice from a 14-hectare (35-acre) test plot was accomplished largely by 6 cats over 8 months. Compounding the threat of predation from cats is the explosive proliferation of non-native populations of red foxes in coastal southern California (e.g., Lewis et al. 1993). Given the relative abundance of the red fox in coastal southern California (Lewis et al. 1993) and the fact that the diet of red foxes invariably include mice (e.g., Ingles 1965, Lewis et al. 1993), red foxes could substantially impact populations of Pacific pocket mice where they are sympatric.

The invasive, nonnative Argentine ant (*Linepithema humile*) is an ant species that is known to prey on hatchling birds and is present at each of the extant PPM populations. Brehme et al. (2019) hypothesized that native fire ants (*Solenopsis xyloni*) and invasive Argentine ants may be predators of PPM that could be responsible for PPM population declines at some locations. PPM mortality due to native fire ants has been observed three times since the mid-1990s. Mortality occurred when PPM confined in Sherman live-traps (placed for population monitoring) were attacked and killed by ants. An instance of mortality due to ants was first recorded during monitoring in 1995 or 1996, and also occurred in 2004 (Miller 2004, pers. comm., unpaginated) and 2014 (Brehme 2018). Native fire ants are the more likely threat to the Santa Margarita population, and Argentine ants a potential threat to the Dana Point and South San Mateo populations. Argentine ants were found during trapping events at MCBCP in traps

with and on PPM and were also noted scavenging on two dead PPM, which were casualties associated with a live trapping event in 2020 (Merrill et al. 2023). A study by USGS suggested that, of the two ant species, native fire ants are more likely to forage below ground and prey upon PPM when they are in their burrows (Matsuda 2020). It is possible that Argentine ants directly also impact PPM through predation in their burrows (Brehme et al. 2019) by foraging on young, and indirectly through harvesting seed caches.

Argentine ants are present throughout the Dana Point Preserve (Merrill 2019) and appear to be present at higher densities than when the first CNLM Argentine ant survey was conducted in 2014. At that time, the Argentine ant naïve occupancy estimate (the number of points with ants detected out of the number of points monitored) was 65.6% (82/125 grids) while in 2018 the naïve occupancy estimate was 94.6% (123/130) with more grids (87/130) having a "high number" of Argentine ants present on bait (i.e., >250 individuals) than in 2014 (32/125) (see Merrill 2014 and 2019). Trash left by the many visitors on the Dana Point Preserve (i.e., food and beverages) exacerbates the threat by providing additional resources (sugary drinks in particular) to Argentine ants along the trail, in the adjacent parking lot, and within PPM habitat (K. Merrill pers. comm.)

Extent of and impact of disease or parasites are affecting PPM is not well understood (USFWS 2020), however, the introduction of an exotic pathogen is increased in areas where there is frequent human visitation or foot traffic, as is the condition at the Dana Point Preserve. During a 2023 trapping effort at the South San Mateo site, three of three PPM captured were found to be infected with coccidia, an intracellular parasite that infects the intestinal tracts of animals. Coccidiosis in mice can cause fever, vomiting, diarrhea, muscle pain, and nervous system effects and changes to behavior, and may lead to death (Haberkorn et al 1983). Healthy animals may recover without medication—but immunocompromised or young individuals are particularly vulnerable to more severe infection that can be fatal.

In summary, predation remains a threat to PPM across the subspecies range. Increasing residential development near Dana Point Preserve could increase native and non-native predators generally associated with human development (cats, crows, ravens, raccoons, red foxes, opossums, Argentine ants) that could have an impact on PPM populations (Merrill et al. 2023). The impact of disease and parasitic infection is unknown, but recent evidence indicates that PPM does at least experience coccidiosis in wild populations (Pacific Pocket Mouse Working Group Meeting, February 13, 2024).

5.6 Captive Propagation, Reintroduction, and Translocation

A PPM captive breeding program was initiated in 2011 with the San Diego Zoo Institute for Conservation Research to create additional populations as called for in the PPM Recovery Plan (USFWS 1998, USFWS 2020). After seven years of failed efforts to establish a new population through this program, it is uncertain whether a self-sustaining population can be established at this location at all.

6. INADEQUACY OF EXISTING REGULATORY MECHANISMS

The vulnerability of the subspecies is caused by persistent and escalating threats discussed above and inadequate conservation discussed below.

6.1 Federal Regulatory Mechanisms

The USFWS has conducted valuable research and implemented certain efforts to address PPM population declines, which are discussed above. However, effective federal-level conservation efforts for the Pacific pocket mouse are still inadequate as discussed below.

Federal protections have not and can not adequately protect habitat. As of 1998 when the Recovery Plan was published, the current occupied habitat for the Pacific pocket mouse was estimated to total less than 400 hectares (1,000 acres) at all sites combined, and is now less than 200 hectares (Brehme et al 2023a, CNLM 2024). Of the nine historic locales (Erickson 1994, Erickson 1998) only Dana Point is permanently protected and all have been damaged or are threatened by habitat destruction or fragmentation, human-caused fire, or other disturbances. Populations at six of the historic localities have been extirpated.

As documented above, human land use modifications have greatly reduced the extent, quality, and functionality of PPM historical habitat. Listing PPM as federally Endangered in 1994 and implementation of the Recovery Plan (1998) have done little to stop the loss, fragmentation, and degradation of habitat and associated populations.

Although two PPM populations occur on federal (MCBCP) land, training activities that conflict with PPM conservation are considered higher priority thus limiting the protection of PPM in those locations.

6.1.1 Federal Endangered Species Act

The USFWS emergency listed the Pacific pocket mouse in February 1994 (59 FR 5306) following the rediscovery of a single population at the Dana Point Headlands in 1993. Upon expiration of the emergency rule, PPM was federally listed the subspecies as endangered on September 29, 1994, in accordance with the Endangered Species Act (59 FR 49752). The subspecies was given a recovery priority number of 3C which means it is facing a high degree of threat, including conflicts with development projects, yet has a high recovery potential. However, in the 30 years since its ESA listing, no benchmarks defined as Recovery Criteria, for either down-listing (to threatened status) or delisting, have been realized (as described in 6.4.1 USFWS Recovery Plan for the Pacific Pocket Mouse)

6.1.2.1 Critical Habitat Designation

No Critical Habitat has been designated for the Pacific pocket mouse. When the Service listed the Pacific pocket mouse as an endangered species in 1994, it declined to designate critical habitat, determining that to do so would not be "prudent." Specifically, the Service concluded that designating critical habitat for the Pacific pocket mouse (1) would lead to an increased threat to the species through the publication of maps identifying the location of the sole Pacific pocket mouse population then known to exist; and (2) would not provide any conservation benefit to the species because the only population then known was located on private property that lacked a "federal nexus" subjecting it to the critical habitat provisions of the ESA. These conclusions can no longer be justified. In September 2000, the Center for Biological Diversity and Natural Resources Defense Council petitioned USFWS to revise its critical habitat determination for the Pacific pocket mouse and designate Pacific pocket mouse critical habitat pursuant to the federal Endangered Species Act ("ESA or Act"). The USFWS again declined to designate Critical Habitat.

6.1.2.2 ESA Section 7 Consultation and Biological Opinions

- Biological Opinion on the Proposed Crucible Challenge Course, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, San Diego County, California (1-6-96-F-35) addressed impacts that the proposed construction, operation and maintenance of the Crucible Challenge Course (project) in the Oscar-I and Edson Range areas of Marine Corps Base (MCB), Camp Pendleton may have on the endangered least Bell's vireo *(Vireo bellii pusillus)* (LBV), Pacific pocket mouse *(Perognathus longimembris pacificus)* (PPM), and threatened coastal California gnatcatcher *(Polioptila californica californica)* (CAGN).

- Intra-Service Formal Section 7 Consultation on the Amendment of a Section 10(a)(1)(A) Permit for Captive Breeding and Reintroduction/ Population Augmentation of the Pacific Pocket Mouse. FWS-OR/MCBCP-11B0255-12F0091.

  This biological opinion addresses the effects of the proposal entitled *Captive Breeding, Anti-Predator Behavior and Reintroduction of the Pacific Pocket Mouse (Perognathus longimembris pacificus)*" (Shier and Swaisgood 2010) and is based on the following information: (1) the above referenced captive breeding proposal; (2) a 2011 Traditional Section 6 Grant Project Statement (Proposal) submitted to the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG); (3) the "*Genetic Management Plan for Captive Propagation of the Pacific Pocket Mouse* (Perognathus longimembris pacificus)" (Miller and Shier 2011); (4) the "*Population Modeling Report: Establishing a Captive Population of the Pacific Pocket Mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*)*" (Ivy 2011); and (5) other correspondence and information compiled during discussions with the principal investigator, Dr. Debra M. Shier, regarding the proposal.

- Oct 09 2015. Unauthorized Impacts to Pacific Pocket Mouse, Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, San Diego County, California, addressed unauthorized impacts to the federally endangered Pacific pocket mouse *(Perognathus longimembris pacificus,* PPM) associated with disking of habitat in the 51 Area of Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton. The affected population of PPM is referred to as the South San Mateo population.

6.1.2.3 Habitat Conservation Plan

(See 6.3 Regional and Local Regulatory Mechanisms)

6.1.3 The Department of the Navy

(from 1998 Recovery Plan) The Department of the Navy (Navy) is charged with protecting trust resources on multiple areas of land containing potential Pacific pocket mouse habitat. Biologists with the Navy's Environmental Planning and Natural Resource Management Division (Southwest Division) have coordinated and conducted five focused surveys for the Pacific pocket mouse on Federal lands. Because no Pacific pocket mice have been detected during the course of these surveys.

6.1.4 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

(from 1998 Recovery Plan) U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) regulates and permits the discharge of fill into wetlands and waters of the United States in accordance with various provisions of section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Because the Pacific pocket mouse could occur in areas that are designated as wetlands or waters of the United States, the Corps may regulate some projects that could affect the subspecies. For the International Wastewater Treatment Plant Project in the Tijuana River Valley, the Corps funded surveys for the Pacific pocket mouse within the action area of the project. Like any Federal agency, the Corps is required to consult with us in accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act if their discretionary authority to issue permits "may affect" federally listed species, including the Pacific pocket mouse. Avoidance or compensation measures are generally integrated into projects that may affect listed species.

6.1.5 Federal Highways Administration

(from 1998 Recovery Plan) The Federal Highways Administration has required and authorized focused surveys for Pacific pocket mice in conjunction with the proposed Foothill (South) Transportation Corridor project. It is expected that the Federal Highways Administration will continue with informal consultation (ongoing as of April 1998) and will initiate formal consultation with us in accordance with the regulations at 50 CFR 402 if the project may adversely affect the Pacific pocket mouse population(s) near San Mateo Creek. At the present time, the project applicant, the Transportation Corridor Agencies, apparently is redesigning the proposed project to avoid direct impacts to the local Pacific pocket mouse occupied habitat as it was defined in the last survey effort. The applicant's proposed preferred alternative currently parallels San Mateo Creek. One alternative alignment for the proposed project avoids San Mateo Creek drainage altogether by connecting with Interstate-S farther to the north. We are evaluating a number of alternatives in coordination with the Federal Highways Administration.

6.2 State Regulatory Mechanisms

To date, California has limited state-level protections in place for the conservation of the Pacific pocket mouse, despite its being limited to only three extant population, and ongoing translocations that have failed to establish, and drastic and continuing loss of potential suitable habitat to development. Conservation of the Pacific pocket mouse requires enforceable, coordinated state action to mitigate the numerous, multifaceted threats that this species faces. Below is a comprehensive list of existing protections for Pacific pocket mouse in California

and the reasons why each of these is insufficient to conserve the Pacific pocket mouse in the state.

6.2.1 Species of Special Concern

The Pacific Pocket mouse is designated as a Species of Special Concern (SSC) by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CNDDB 2024). While this designation provides that impacts to the species must be considered in decision making and other circumstances, SSC designation has not provided significant protection for the PPM.

6.2.2 State Wildlife Action Plan

To date, there is no State Wildlife Action Plan for Pacific pocket mouse which is only included generally as a SSC.

In 2000, Congress enacted the State Wildlife Grant (SWG) program to support state government projects that broadly benefit wildlife and habitats, but particularly species of greatest conservation need (SGCN). As a trustee agency focused on safeguarding natural resources in California, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) manages funding from the Federal SWG program. To receive funding from this program, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) requires each state government to develop a comprehensive wildlife conservation strategy outlined in a State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP).

A major component of the State Wildlife Action Plan is the identification of SGCNs in the State. The 2015 update to SWAP defined SGCNs to include all SSC in addition to listed species and those species particularly vulnerable to climate change. SGCNs (including SSCs) listed in the SWAP are eligible for conservation funding via State Wildlife Grant funds. SWAP 2015 includes threat assessments for habitats that support SGCNs and provide conservation goals and actions for these habitats.

6.2.3 California Coastal Act

The California Coastal Act guides how land along the California coast is developed and protected, and emphasizes the importance of preservation of coastal biodiversity, including environmentally sensitive habitat areas. In Dana Point, the City's Local Coastal Program guides the application of Coastal Act policies to certain coastal areas, including the Dana Point Preserve.

6.2.4 California Environmental Quality Act

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), enacted in 1970, provides for the disclosure and mitigation of project impacts to State-designated rare animals and plants in accordance with the CEQA environmental review process conducted by the Department. The rediscovery of the Pacific pocket mouse in 1993 was a result of the Department's formal request for a focused survey for this subspecies on the Dana Point Headlands. The Department is also responsible for enforcing various codes established to protect native California plants and animals. In this capacity, the Department could issue citations for the unauthorized capture of Pacific pocket mice. As such, authorization to trap and collect the Pacific pocket mouse is excluded from standard collecting and trapping permits.

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 SSC as defined above. CDFW further provides that SSC "should be considered during the environmental review process." (*Id*.; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15380.) Thus, a potentially substantial impact on a SSC, 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. 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 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 California's sage-grouse, in practice they have not provided sufficient protection. Sage-grouse are listed as a SSC, such that a project that has the potential to significantly impact one of these populations may qualify as having 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 may be triggered.

However, 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", an agency could interpret CEQA as still allowing approval of the project. CEQA therefore cannot be relied on to consistently protect the greater sage-grouse populations in California.

6.3 Regional and Local Regulatory Mechanisms

6.3.1 Natural Community Conservation Plan

The Department's Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) program is an effort by the State of California, and numerous private and public partners, to take a broad-based ecosystem approach to plan for the protection and perpetuation of biological diversity. The NCCP program began in 1991 as a cooperative effort to protect habitats and species. It is broader in its orientation and objectives than the California and Federal Endangered Species Acts, as these laws are designed to identify and protect individual species that have already declined in number significantly.

An NCCP identifies and provides for the regional protection of plants, animals, and their habitats, while allowing compatible and appropriate economic activity. Working with landowners, environmental organizations, and other interested parties, a local agency oversees the numerous activities that create the development of an NCCP. CDFW and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service provide the necessary support, direction, and guidance to NCCP participants. Currently 17 approved NCCPs (includes 6 subarea plans) have been approved

and implemented. More than nine NCCPs are in various stages of planning (includes two subarea plans). Together these NCCPs will cover more than 8 million acres provide conservation for nearly 400 special status species and a wide diversity of natural community types throughout California.

Orange County Central and Coastal Subregions Natural Communities Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP)

- under the NCCP/HCP, "Participating landowners" are required to address impacts to and conservation of PPM, gnatcatcher, and other species on certain property, including the Preserve. The City of Dana Point is also a Participating Landowner.
- While at least one developer was required to provide funds to the NCCP Orange County due to impacts to PPM, we do not know of any funds being designated for PPM in in NCCP implementation.

6.3 Non-Regulatory Federal and State-level Actions

6.4.1 USFWS Recovery Plan for the Pacific Pocket Mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*)

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) calls for preparation of recovery plans for those listed species that are likely to benefit from the effort. A recovery plan must establish, if practicable, recovery goals and objectives, describe site-specific management actions recommended to achieve those goals, and estimate the time and costs required for recovery. A recovery plan presents a set of recommendations, but it is not a regulatory document. Since the 1998, when the PPM Recovery was published, USFW has revised its approach to recovery planning and implementation to include the recovery plan within a three-part framework; which now includes the Species Status Assessment and Recovery Implementation Strategy. PPM has had neither a Species Status Assessment or Recovery Implementation Strategy although a SSA is currently in review. Furthermore, the Recovery plan is now more than a quarter century old, and in the 26 years since it was drafted, PPM have become more endangered because of the loss of one of the populations, the increasing threats on the others, and the failure, to date, to establish any new populations.

The Recovery Plan (USFWS 1998) stated Reclassification to threatened status may occur by the year 2023, assuming full implementation of this plan. Unfortunately, none of the benchmarks identified in the plan for delisting or downlisting to threatened have been met:

Recovery Criteria for reclassifying the Pacific pocket mouse to threatened status according the USFWS (1998) is if and when:

1. Ten populations are independently viable and stable or increasing, and their habitats are secure (free of risk of loss) and fully protected through fee ownership by a resource agency or conservation program, conservation easement, or other means of permanent protection. Populations of Pacific pocket mice shall be considered viable if the appropriate analysis of measured population parameters indicate that each of the 10 populations has a 95 percent or greater chance of surviving for 100 years.
2. Occupied habitat consists of a minimum of 2,000 hectares (4,940 acres) that are secure and fully protected through fee ownership by a resource agency or conservation program, conservation easement, or other means of permanent protection.
3. All Pacific pocket mouse populations are managed through a program to maintain genetic diversity for future generations.
4. All Pacific pocket mouse populations and essential habitat are managed so that current and potential threats (e.g., predation and disease) are eliminated or minimized to the extent that each population is not at risk of extirpation. Essential habitat is defined to mean both suitable and potential habitat that is necessary for the full recovery of the subspecies.

We may consider delisting the Pacific pocket mouse if and when:
1. All actions necessary for reclassification to threatened have been implemented.
2. Any necessary protection, restoration and enhancement activities (on all sites that have been determined to be essential to the recovery of the subspecies) are successfully completed.
3. Populations of the Pacific pocket mouse should be representative of the full (existing) genetic variability and historical geographical range of the subspecies and occur in habitats that collectively represent the full range of parameters observed and described in the past or during prescribed, future research and monitoring efforts. In order to delist the subspecies, we must also determine that the following five factors no longer continue to adversely affect the survival and recovery of the subspecies: (1) the present or threatened modification, or curtailment, of the subspecies' habitat or range; (2) overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes; (3) disease and predation; (4) inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms; and (5) other human-made or natural factors affecting the continued existence of the subspecies (50 CER 424.11). A final decision relating to the delisting of the subspecies would be made only after a thorough review of all relevant information, including prescribed research

The recovery strategy for the Pacific pocket mouse consists of two components.
The first is to stabilize the existing populations by protecting currently occupied habitat. In addition to providing adequate protection to the known populations. The second component involves establishing additional populations through: 1) natural colonization/recolonization into nearby and adjacent habitats, coupled with habitat management in these areas, and 2) translocation and/or the release of captive-bred individuals.

- Address whether these strategy efforts have been successful, and to what extent.
- A captive breeding and reintroduction program was initiated in 2012 (USFWS 2020) and still there are no self-sustaining introduced populations in the wild (Pacific Pocket Mouse Working Group Meeting, February 13, 2024).
- According to the USFWS 1998 recovery plan, "Loss or degradation of any of the populations at the three known extant locales could irretrievably diminish the likelihood of the subspecies' survival."….since this plan was published, one population has been extirpated.
- The 1998 recovery plan "Recovery of the Pacific pocket mouse will likely take approximately 25 years (until the year 2023)." None(?) of the criteria for downlisting the species, as outlined in the 1998 Recovery plan has been met at the 25 year mark
    - 10 populations
    - 4,940 acres occupied habitat
    - All Pacific pocket mouse populations are managed through a program to maintain genetic diversity for future generations
    - All Pacific pocket mouse populations and essential habitat are managed so that current and potential threats (e.g., predation and disease) are eliminated or minimized to the extent that each population is not at risk of extirpation. Essential habitat is defined to mean that habitat necessary for the full recovery of the subspecies.

  Additional strategies for recovery that are provided in the Recovery Plan include
  1) Enhance and expand Pacific pocket mouse habitat.
  2) Prepare and implement habitat management plans
  3) Conduct research on the life history, ecology, and population biology of the Pacific pocket mouse.
  4) Identify and implement measures to create additional populations.
  5) Enhance public awareness of, and appreciation for, the Pacific pocket mouse recovery program through educational and interpretive programs.

Few of these strategies have been implemented other than research and largely unsuccessful efforts to create additional populations.

6.4.3 USFWS Species Status Assessment

A Species Status Assessment was recently drafted (USFWS 2024) and is currently under review. Funding for the SSA is being provided by MCBCP.

A Species Status Assessment (SSA) provides foundational information for implementing recovery actions. An SSA includes much of the information and analyses that may also be found in the "background" section of a recovery plan, but it also assesses this information in a more explicit and deliberative manner. Similar to the "background" in traditional recovery plans, an SSA includes analysis of the species' historic and current conditions, and also includes further analyses such as future projections of population trends under varying threat conditions, and potential management regimes. An SSA is structured around the conservation biology principles of the 3Rs – Resiliency, Representation and Redundancy.

6.4.4 USFWS Recovery Implementation Strategy

A recovery implementation strategy helps prioritize and guide recovery actions for listed species. PPM does not have a Recovery Implementation Strategy.

6.5 Regional and Local Plans and Policies

6.5.1 Marine Corps Pendelton Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan

MCI-WEST MCB Camp Pendleton (Camp Pendleton, Base) is a premier amphibious training Base which is home to 19 federally listed species. Integral to the success of military mission aboard Camp Pendleton is maintaining and protecting natural resources. The Base has successfully implemented the installation's Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan by close coordination and collaboration with Base operators, federal and California state agencies, and the regional scientific community. Camp Pendleton's Wildlife Management Section oversees management of 12 federally protected species of mammal, bird, amphibian and fish on Base, as well as many other sensitive species of various taxa. These species are distributed widely over approximately 125,000 acres of largely undeveloped training land in Southern California, including 17 miles of shoreline, three major watersheds and coastal foothills with elevations up to 3,000 feet above sea level. MCIWEST-MCB Camp Pendleton and MCAS Camp Pendleton developed the INRMP Revision in coordination with the US Fish and Wildlife Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Services, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the California Department of Parks and Recreation, Orange County District.

6.5.2 MCBCP Pacific pocket mouse Management Plan

The Crucible Challenge Course Biological Opinion (USFWS 1996) committed the Marine Corps to development of a Pacific pocket mouse management plan. The plan provides a framework of various habitat management activities to occur on the Base. Actions related to the implementation of the management plan are preceded by consultation with USFWS (MCBCP Staff, PPM Working Group Meeting 12/13/2024). The implementation of the plan is dependent on receipt of congressionally approval federal funds. The receipt of funding is inconsistent in both timing and quantity, which can constrain management planning and efforts.

6.5.3 Dana Point Preserve Draft Habitat Management Plan

In 2005, a habitat management plan was drafted by a consultant for Headlands Reserve, LLC, the developer of the Headlands area, for the Dana Point Preserve and adjacent City parks. This plan was never finalized and approved as required under Headlands Reserve, LLC's coastal development permit. CNLM has followed the general goals of the draft plan and has prepared annual work plans and annual reports for USFWS and CDFW review and approval. In 2023, CNLM prepared a draft Habitat Management Plan for Public Access for the Dana Point Preserve

(cite) and prepared an update to that draft plan in 2024 (cite). The protections in the plan have not been able to be fully implemented due to legal action taken by the City of Dana Point.

6.5 Non-Regulatory Planning

Plans have been created by stakeholders in specific areas to benefit PPM. While the plans are voluntary and non-binding, they identify some of the threats to PPM and goals to improve habitat.

6.6.1 Pacific Pocket Mouse Working Group. This is a group of entities that have some direct interest in or responsibility for PPM and is variously represented by individuals from those entities in working group meetings (approximately once per year).

6.6.2 Reintroduction Program. As noted above, a captive breeding program has been undertaken but largely unsuccessful to date.

7. CESA PROTECTION IS WARRANTED FOR PACIFIC POCKET MOUSE

The threats to California Pacific pocket mouse are numerous, multi-faceted, and require enforceable measures specific to each threat with a cohesive and legally mandated strategy on how to avoid, minimize and if necessary, mitigate such threats. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the State of California to provide protections under the CESA for the dwindling populations of PPM that persist in California. Listing will further efforts to stabilize populations and move towards recovery. Once listed, the following recommendations need to be implemented:

Recommendations

In this context, recommendations for the management and recovery of the Pacific pocket mouse are as follows:

1. CDFW prepare a recovery plan for Pacific pocket mouse pursuant to Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2079.1.
2. The California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) develop and implement management plans (including fire management plans) focused on PPM for any state park units within the species' range.

3. The CDPR seek to acquire habitat to establish new parks/natural reserves for protection and restoration of PPM habitat and opportunities to expand and connect existing state parks and natural reserves for protection and restoration of PPM habitat as part of California's 30x30 conservation goals.
4. CDFW expand its cooperative work with relevant federal agencies (DOD, USFWS) to protect Pacific pocket mouse and its habitat on federal land.
5. CDFW and USFWS work with other state and federal agencies (DOD) and public entities more aggressively to implement agreements for PPM introductions.
6. CDFW make recommendations to the City of Dana Point regarding sustainable public access at the Dana Point Preserve -- one of the three extant PPM populations.
7. CDFW make recommendations to the City of Dana Point regarding improvements in its management and monitoring for PPM on its property that lies adjacent to the Dana Point Preserve.
8. CDFW seek a transfer of the Conservation Easement for the Dana Point Preserve, currently held by the City of Dana Point, for long-term management to benefit the PPM.

REFERENCES

(all references submitted with petition except those book chapters and manuscripts indicated with a * which are not provided,)

Allen, M.C., M. Clinchy, and L.Y. Zanette. 2021. Fear of predators in free-living wildlife reduces population growth over generations. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 119(7) e2112404119.

Antze, B. and N. Koper. 2018. Noisy anthropogenic infrastructure interferes with alarm responses in Savannah sparrows (*Passerculus sandwiche*nsis). Royal Society Open Science 5:172168.

Baharudin, N.S., M. Mohd, M. Faris, R. Subari, N.S.A. Subiyri, T. Rinalfi, and P.T. Azizan. 2022. Updated assessment of ground-dwelling mammals in Ayer Hitam Forest Reserve, Selangor. Journal of Sustainability Science and Management 17:313-333.

Bailey, V. 1939. The solitary lives of two little pocket mice. Journal of Mammalogy 20:325-328.

Banks, P.B. and J.V. Bryant. 2007. Four-legged friend or foe? Dog walking displaces native birds from natural areas. Biology Letters 3:611-613.

Barry, S., S. Larson, and M. George. 2006. California native grasslands: a historical perspective a guide for developing realistic restoration objectives. Journal of Environmental Management. 91: 7-11.

Bartholomew, G. and T. Cade. 1957. Temperature regulation, hibernation, and aestivation in the little pocket mouse, *Perognathus longimembris*. Journal of Mammalogy 38:60- 72.

Beatley, J.C. 1969. Dependence of desert rodents on winter annuals and precipitation. Ecology 50:721-724.

Bennett, V.J., V.S. Quinn, and P.A. Zollner. 2013. Exploring the implications of recreational disturbance on an endangered butterfly using a novel modelling approach. Biodiversity Conservation 22:1783-1798.

Blickley, J.L., D. Blackwood, and G.L. Patricelli. 2012. Experimental evidence for the effects of chronic anthropogenic noise on abundance of greater sage-grouse at lek. Conservation Biology. 26:461-471

Bolger, D.T., A.C. Alberts, R.M. Sauvajot, P. Potenza, C. McCalvin, D. Tran, S. Mazzoni, and M.E. Soulé. 1997. Response of rodents to habitat fragmentation in coastal southern California. Ecological Applications 7:552-563.

Brehme, C.S. and R.N. Fisher. 2009. 2008 Survey Results for the Pacific Pocket Mouse: North

and South San Mateo, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton; with additional analyses to inform long-term monitoring design. Prepared for AC/S Environmental Security, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton. 40 pp.

Brehme, C.S. and R.N. Fisher in collaboration with Burnham, K., P. Meserve, W. Spencer, W. Miller, M. Pavelka, and D. Deutschman. 2009. Pacific Pocket Mouse Monitoring Plan for Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton: Short Term Studies and Long Term Goals. 2009. Prepared for Wildlife Management Branch, AC/S Environmental Security, Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton. 88 pp.

Brehme, C.S., J.A. Tracey, L.R. McClenaghan, and R.N. Fisher. 2013. Permeability of roads to movement of scrubland lizards and small mammals. Conservation Biology 27:710–720.

Brehme, C.S., J. Sebes, T. Matsuda, D. Clark, and R.N. Fisher. 2014. MCBCP Pacific Pocket Mouse Monitoring Results for 2013 and Multi-year Trend Analysis from 2012 to 2013. Prepared for AC/S Environmental Security, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton. 70 pp.

Brehme, C.S., J. Sebes, T. Matsuda, D. Clark, and R.N. Fisher. 2015. Pacific Pocket Mouse Monitoring 2014, MCB, Camp Pendleton. Prepared for AC/S Environmental Security, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton. 48 pp.

Brehme, C.S., D.T. Adsit-Morris, T.K. Edgarian and R.N. Fisher. 2018. Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton Pacific Pocket Mouse Monitoring Results and Trend Analysis for 2017. Prepared for Environmental Security Department, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton. 71 pp.

Brehme, C.S., D.T. Adsit-Morris, T.K. Edgarian and R.N. Fisher. 2019. Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton Pacific Pocket Mouse Monitoring Results for 2018 with Trend Analysis from 2012 to 2018. Prepared for AC/S Environmental Security, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton. 56 pp

Brehme, C.S., K. Merrill, D.T. Adsit-Morris, T.K. Edgarian and R.N. Fisher. 2020. Dana Point Headlands (CNLM, City of Dana Point) Pacific Pocket Mouse Monitoring Results for 2020. USGS Cooperator Report to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Carlsbad, CA, USA. Interagency Agreement 4500139540

Brehme, C.S., D.T. Adsit-Morris, T.K. Edgarian and R.N. Fisher. 2022. Permit Report: Pacific Pocket Mouse Monitoring Results for 2021 on Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton. Draft Final. Prepared for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton. 29 pp.

Brehme, C.S., D.T. Adsit-Morris, T.K. Edgarian and R.N. Fisher. 2023a. Permit Report: Pacific Pocket Mouse Monitoring Results for 2022 on Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton. Draft Final. Prepared for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and

Wildlife, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton. 22 pp.

Brehme, C.S., S.K. Thomsen, D. Adsit-Morris, and R.N. Fisher. 2023b. Interactions among rainfall, fire, forbs and non-native grasses predict occupancy dynamics for the endangered Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) in a Mediterranean-type ecosystem. Global Ecology and Conservation 47. 11 pp.

Brehme, C.S., D.T. Adsit-Morris, T.K. Edgarian and R.N. Fisher. 2024. Permit Report: Pacific Pocket Mouse Monitoring Results for 2023 on MCBCP Base, Camp Pendleton. Draft Final. Prepared for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, MCBCP Base, Camp Pendleton. 29 pp.

Brown, J.S., B.P. Kotler, R.J. Smith, and W.O. Wirtz. 1988. The effects of owl predation on the foraging behavior of heteromyid rodents. Oecologia 76:408-415.

Brylski, P. 1993. A focused survey for the Pacific pocket mouse on the Dana Point Headlands, Orange County, CA. Prepared for EDAW, Inc. by the Planning Center, Newport Beach, CA. August 1993.

Brylski, P., W.B. Miller, S. Dodd, and S. Montgomery. 2010. Draft addendum to the pilot monitoring project for the Pacific pocket mouse, 2009, CNLM Dana Point Preserve, Orange County, California. Prepared for the Center for Natural Lands Management. 36 pp.

Carranza, L.A. 2014. CNLM annual report of management activities for the 2013–2014 fiscal year on the Dana Point Preserve, owned and managed by CNLM (CNLM No. S033). Prepared for: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (10-B-0615), California Department of Fish and Wildlife, City of Dana Point. Center for Natural Lands Management. 55 pp.

[CBD] Center for Biological Diversity. 2000. A Petition to Revise The Critical Habitat Determination for the Pacific Pocket Mouse (*Paragnathus Longimembris Pacificus*) Under the Federal Endangered Species Act September 18, 2000.

*[CDFW] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2015. State Wildlife Action Plan 2015, A Conservation Legacy for Californians. Accessed from https://wildlife.ca.gov/SWAP/Final

Chew, R.M, R.G. Lindberg, and P. Hayden. 1965. Circadian rhythm of metabolic rate in pocket mice. Journal of Mammalogy 46:477-494.

Chock, R.Y., D.M. Shier, and G.F. Grether. 2018. Body size, not phylogenetic relationship or residency, drives interspecific dominance in a little pocket mouse community. Animal Behaviour 137:197-204.

Chock, R.Y., G.F. Grether, and D.M. Shier. 2019. Cache pilfering in a granivore guild: implications

for reintroduction management. The Journal of Wildlife Management 83:1607-1616.

Chock, R.Y., Miller, W.B., King, S.N., Brehme, C.S., Fisher, R.N., Sin, H., Wilcox, P., Terp, J., Tremor, S., Major, M.R. and Merrill, K., 2022. Quantitative SWOT analysis: A structured and collaborative approach to reintroduction site selection for the endangered Pacific pocket mouse. Journal for Nature Conservation, 70, p.126268. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2022.126268.

City of Dana Point. 2004. The Headlands Development and Conservation Plan. September 22, 2004.

City of Dana Point. 2005. Master Coastal Development Permit CDP 04-23. Issued January 19, 2005

Clarke, J.A. 1983. Moonlight's influence on predator/prey interactions between short-eared owls (*Asio flammeus*) and deermice (*Peromyscus maniculatus*). Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology. 13:205-209.

[CNDDB] California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). 2024. Special Animals List. California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Sacramento, CA. October 2024.

[CNLM] Center for Natural Lands Management. 2024. Update to Draft 2023 Habitat Management Plan for Public Access for the Dana Point Preserve (Draft 2023 HMP) (March 14, 2023). September 2024.

D'Antonio, C.M. and P.M. Vitousek. 1992. Biological invasions by exotic grasses, the grass/ fire cycle, and global change. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 23:63-87.

Dertien, J.S., C.L. Larson, and S.E. Reed. 2018. Adaptive management strategy for science-based stewardship of recreation to maintain wildlife habitat connectivity. Wildlife Conservation Society, Americas Program, Bronx, NY, USA.

Dertien, J.S., C.L. Larson, and S.E. Reed. 2021. Recreation effects on wildlife: a review of potential quantitative thresholds. Nature Conservation 44:51-68.

Dice, L.R. 1945. Minimum intensities of illumination under which owls can find dead prey by sight. American Naturalist 79:385-416.

[DOD] Department of Defense Environmental Security. 2019. Pacific Pocket Mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) Management Plan Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, California. 34 pp.

Dodd, S., Brylski, P., Montgomery, S., and W. Spencer. 1998. Draft Report, 1997 Pacific pocket

mouse surveys on the Dana Point Headlands. Prepared for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game.

Dodd, S., Laabs, D., and J. Greene. 1999. Final Report, 1998 Pacific pocket mouse surveys on the Dana Point Headlands, Orange County, CA. Prepared for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, and the Nature Reserve of Orange County.

EcoAdapt. 2017. Southern California Sage Scrub Habitats – Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment Synthesis.

*Eisenberg, J.F. 1963. The behavior of heteromyid rodents. University of California Publications in Zoology 69:1-100.

Erickson, R.A. 1993. Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*). Draft manuscript to be included in Endangered Rodents of the World, to be published by the Species Survival Commission of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and
Natural Resources (IUCN).

Ficetola, G.F., R. Sacchi, S. Scali, A. Gentilli, F. De Bernardi, and P. Galeotti. 2007. Vertebrates respond differently to human disturbance: Implications for the use of a focal species approach. Acta Oecologica 31:109-118.

Finney, S.K., J.W. Pearce-Higgins, and D.W. Yalden. 2005. The effect of recreational disturbance on an upland breeding bird, the golden plover *Pluvialis apricaria*. Biological Conservation 121:53-63.

Frankham R., C.J.A. Bradshaw and B.W. Brook. 2014. Genetics in conservation management: revised recommendations for the 50/500 rules, Red List criteria and population viability analyses. Biological Conservation 170:56–63.

French, N., B. Maza, and A. Aschwanden. 1967. Life spans of Dipodomys and Perognathus in the Mojave Desert. Journal of Mammalogy 48:537-548.

French, N., B. Maza, H.O. Hill, A.P. Aschwanden, and H.W. Kaaz. 1974. A population study of irradiated desert rodents. Ecological Monographs 44:45-72.

French, A.R. 1977. Circannual rhythmicity and entrainment of surface activity in the hibernator, *Perognathus longimembris*. *Journal of Mammalogy* 58:37-43.

Frid, A. and L. Dill. 2002. Human-caused disturbance stimuli as a form of predation risk. Conservation Ecology 6:11-26.

Gashwiler, J.S. 1959. Small mammal study in west-central Oregon. Journal of Mammalogy 40:128–139.

George, W.G. 1974. Domestic cats as predators and factors in winter shortages of raptor prey. The Wilson Bulletin 86:384-396.

Gillespie, I.G. and E.B. Allen. 2004. Fire and competition in a southern California grassland: impacts on the rare forb *Erodium macrophyllum*. Journal of Applied Ecology 41:643–652.

*Gilpin, M.E. 1987. Spatial structure and population vulnerability. In M. E. Soule (ed) Viable Populations for Conservation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Great Britain. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511623400.008

Godfrey, S. 2018. Spatial Distribution of the Endangered Pacific Pocket Mouse (*Perognathus longimembrus* ssp. *pacificus*) Within Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat at Dana Point Headlands Conservation Area. Thesis, University of Southern California. August 2018.

Greenberg, B. 2022. Dana Point Suing Nature Center over Blufftop Trail. Article, Dana Point Times. https://www.danapointtimes.com/dana-point-suing-nature-center-over-blufftop-trail/ <Accessed October 31, 2023>

*Grinnell, J. 1933. Review of the recent mammal fauna of California. University of California Publications in Zoology 40:71-234.

[GSRC and SDZWA] Gulf South Research Corporation and San Diego Zoo Wildlife Alliance. 2022. Pacific Pocket Mouse Translocation Feasibility Study, Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, California. Prepared for Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, Environmental Security Department. Draft Report. 103 pp.

Gutzwiller, K.J., R.T. Wiedenmann, K.L. Clements, and S.H. Anderson. 1994. Effects of human intrusion on song occurrence and in subalpine birds. Auk 111:28-37

Haberkorn A, Friis CW, Schulz HP, Meister G, Feller W. Control of an outbreak of mouse coccidiosis in a closed colony. Lab Anim. 1983 Jan;17(1):59-64. doi: 10.1258/002367783781070803. PMID: 6865312.

Habib, L., E.M. Bayne, and S. Boutin. 2007. Chronic industrial noise affects pairing success and age structure of ovenbirds *Seiurus aurocapilla*. Journal of Applied Ecology 44:176-184.

*Hall, E. 1981. The Mammals of North America. Second edition. John Wiley and Sons, New York.

Hennings, L. 2016. The impacts of dogs on wildlife and water quality: a literature review. Metro Parks and Nature, Portland, OR, USA. Included in Hennings 2017 as Appendix 1.

Howard, W.E., R.L. Fenner, and H.E. Childs. 1959. Wildlife survival in brush burns. Journal of Range Management 12:230-234.

Huey, L.M. 1939. The silky pocket mice of Southern California and northern Lower California, Mexico, with the description of a new race. Transactions of the San Diego Society of Natural History IX (11):47-54.

*Ingles, L.G., 1965. Mammals of the Pacific states: California, Oregon, and Washington. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.

[IPCC] Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2023 Summary for Policymakers. In: Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Core Writing Team, H. Lee and J. Romero (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, pp. 1-34, doi: 10.59327/IPCC/AR6-9789291691647.001

Ivy, J.A. 2014. Population Modeling Report—2014 Update, Establishing a Captive Population of the Pacific Pocket Mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*). Unpublished Report. 6 pp.

Iwanowicz, D.D., A.G. Vandergast, R.S. Cornman, C.R. Adams, J.R. Kohn, R.N. Fisher, and C.S. Brehme. 2016. Metabarcoding of Fecal Samples to Determine Herbivore Diets: A Case Study of the Endangered Pacific Pocket Mouse. PloS One 11:e0165366.

Jackson, L.E., Strauss, R.B., Firestone, M.K., Bartolome, J.W., 1988. Plant and soil N dynamics in California annual grassland. Plant Soil 110:9-17.

Jennings, Megan K., Dan Cayan, Julie Kalansky, Amber D. Pairis, Dawn M. Lawson, Alexandra D. Syphard, Udara Abeysekera, Rachel E.S. Clemesha, Alexander Gershunov, Kristen Guirguis, John M. Randall, Eric D. Stein, and Sula Vanderplank. (San Diego State University). 2018. San Diego County ecosystems: ecological impacts of climate change on a biodiversity hotspot. California's Fourth Climate Change Assessment, California Energy Commission. Publication number: CCCA4-EXT-2018-010

Kangas, K., M. Luoto, A. Ihantola, E. Tomppo, and P. Siikamäki. 2010. Recreation-induced changes in boreal bird communities in protected areas. Ecological Applications 20:1775-1786.

Keeley, J E., M. Baer-Keeley, and C.J. Fotheringham. 2005. Alien plant dynamics following fire in Mediterranean-climate California shrublands. Ecological Applications 15:2109- 2125.

Kenagy, G. and G. Bartholomew. 1985. Seasonal reproductive patterns in five coexisting California desert species. Ecological Monographs 55:371-397.

King, S., A. Navarro, J.P. Montagne, T. Wang, S. Leivers, and D.M. Shier. 2018. Conservation breeding and reintroduction of the Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*). San Diego Zoo Institute for Conservation Research. 50 pp. Unpublished report.

Kotler, B.P. 1984. Risk of predation and the structure of desert rodent communities. Ecology 65:689-701.

Larson, C.L., S.E. Reed, A.M. Merenlender, and K.R. Crooks. 2016. Effects of recreation on animals revealed as widespread through a global systematic review. PLoS ONE 11(12):e0167259.

Larson, C.L., S.E. Reed, A.M. Merenlender, and K.R. Crooks. 2019. A meta-analysis of recreation effects on vertebrate species richness and abundance. Conservation Science and Practice. 1:e93. https://doi.org/10.1111/csp2.93

Lawrence, G.E. 1966. Ecology of vertebrate animals in relation to chaparral fire in the Sierra Nevada foothills. Ecology 47:278-291.

Lewis, J.C., K.L. Sallee, and R.T. Golightly. 1993. Introduced red fox in California. State of California, the Resources Agency. Department of Fish and Game Nongame Bird and Mammal Section Report 93-10. 70 pp.

Loda, J., C. Winchell, M. Pavelka, and E. King. 1999. The role of vegetation in determining suitable habitats for the Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*). Unpublished report prepared by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service for the Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, Environmental Security, October 1999. 18 pp. plus Appendices

Lucero, J. E. and R.M. Callaway. 2018. Native granivores reduce the establishment of native grasses but not invasive Bromus tectorum. Biological Invasions, 20:3491–3497.

Mace, G.M. and R. Lande. 1991. Assessing extinction threats: toward a reevaluation ofIUCN threatened species categories. Conservation Biology 5:148-157.

Mallord, J.W., P.M. Dolman, A.F. Brown, and W.J. Sutherland. 2007. Linking recreational disturbance to population size in a ground-nesting passerine. Journal of Applied Ecology 44:185-195.

[MBA and LSA] Michael Brandman Associates and LSA Associates. 1997. Results of focused surveys for the Pacific pocket mouse Foothill Transportation Corridor-South. Unpublished report prepared for Foothill/Eastern Transportation Corridor Agency, Santa Ana, California, February 1997. 26 pp. + Appendices.

[MCBCP] Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton. 2021. Marine Corps Western Recruiting Region Land Navigation Course: Biological Assessment. Draft Report. 50 pp.

Mearns, E.A. 1898. Description of three new forms of pocket-mice from the Mexican border of the United States. Bulletin American Museum of Natural History. Article XV. Vol. X: 299-302.

Merrill, K.C. 2014. CNLM Annual Report of Management Activities for the 2013-2014 Fiscal Year. Dana Point Preserve (S033).

Merrill, K.C. 2019. CNLM Annual Report of Management Activities for the 2017–2018 fiscal year (October 1, 2017–September 30, 2018), Dana Point Preserve (S033). Center for Natural Lands Management, 35 pp.

Merrill, K.C. 2021. CNLM Annual Report of Management Activities for the 2019-2020 Fiscal Year (October 1, 2019 – September 30, 2020) Dana Point Preserve (S033). 25 pp

Merrill, K.C. 2022. CNLM Annual Report of Management Activities for the 2021 Fiscal Year (October 1, 2020 – September 30, 2021) Dana Point Preserve (S033). 22 pp

Merrill, K.C. 2023a. Report for Permit TE-221411-6.1 & SCP-013986. Memorandum. 2 pp.

Merrill, K.C. 2023b. CNLM's Dana Point Preserve (S033) Annual Report of Management Activities for the 2022 Fiscal Year (October 1, 2021 – September 30, 2022). 28 pp.

Merrill, K.C., M.A. Labbe, and D.L. Rogers. 2023. Draft 2023 Habitat Management Plan for Public Access for the Dana Point Preserve. 106 pp.

Merrill, K.C. 2024a. CNLM Dana Point Preserve Pacific Pocket Mouse Enhancement Management Plan Fiscal Year 2023 Summary Report (October 01, 2022 – September 30, 2023). 16 pp.

Merrill, K.C. 2024b. CNLM's Dana Point Preserve (S033) Annual Report of Management Activities for the 2023 Fiscal Year (October 1, 2022 – September 30, 2023). 33 pp.

Meserve, P. 1976a. Food relationships of a rodent fauna in a California coastal sage scrub community. Journal of Mammalogy 57:300-319.

Meserve, P. 1976b. Habitat and resource utilization by rodents of a California coastal sage scrub community. Journal of Animal Ecology 46:647-666.

Miller, W.B. and D.M. Shier. 2011. Genetic Management Plan for Captive Propagation of the Pacific Pocket Mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*): December 2011. 6 pp

Minnich, R.A. and R.J. Dezzani. 1998. Historical decline of coastal sage scrub in the Riverside-Perris plain, California. Western Birds 29:366-391.

Montgomery, S.J. 2003. 1998-1999 Pacific Pocket Mouse Surveys, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton. Prepared for Environmental Security, MCBCP under contract M00681-97-C-0036. Final Report.

Montgomery, S.J. 2005. Results of monitoring surveys for the federally endangered Pacific

pocket mouse, other rodents, and vegetation at the management ignited fire location, at the San Mateo North Pacific pocket mouse population site, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California. Unpublished report prepared by S. J. Montgomery for the Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, Wildlife Management Branch, Environmental Security under contract N 68711-00-LT-00036.

Natural Resources Assessment, Inc. 2003. Presence/absence trapping studies for the Pacific pocket mouse on the Foothill/Eastern Transportation Corridor South. Unpublished report prepared for P and D Consultants, San Diego, California. November 7, 2003. 13 pp. + appendix.

*Noss R.F. and Csuti B. 1997. Habitat fragmentation. In: Meffe G.K. and Carroll C.R. (eds) Principles of Conservation Biology. 2nd ed. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts, pp. 269–304.

*Oberbauer, T.A. and J.M. Vanderwier. 1991. The vegetation and geologic substrate association and its effect on development in southern California. Pp. 203-212 in: Environmental Perils, San Diego Region (P.L. Abbott and W.J. Elliott, eds.). San Diego Association of Geologists.

O'Leary, J.F and W.E. Westman, 1988. Regional disturbance effects on herb succession patterns in coastal sage scrub. Journal of Biogeography 15:775-786.

Parker, S.S. and J.P. Schimel. 2010. Invasive grasses increase nitrogen availability in California grassland soils. Invasive Plant Science Management 3:40-47

Persons, W. E. and P. Eason. 2017. Human activity and habitat type affect perceived predation risk in urban white-footed mice. Ethology 123:348–356

Ogden Environmental and Energy Services (Ogden). 1997. Pacific Pocket Mouse survey, Phase III, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton. Unpublished report. Prepared for Assistant Chief of Staff, Environmental Security. 46 pp.

Patton, J. L., and Fisher, R. N. 2023. Taxonomic reassessment of the Little pocket mouse, Perognathus longimembris (Rodentia, Heteromyidae) of southern California and northern Baja California. THERYA 14:131-160

Pearson, O.P. 1964. Carnivore-mouse predation: an example of its intensity and bioenergetics. J. Mammal. 45:177-188.

Pierce, D.W. 2004. Effects of North Pacific oscillation and ENSO on seasonally averaged temperatures in California. Climate Research Division, Scripps Inst. Of Oceanography. Cal. Energy Comm., PIER Energy-related Env. Res. CEC-500-2005-002.

Price, M.V., N.M. Waser, and T.A. Bass. 1984. Effects of moonlight on microhabitat use by desert rodents. Journal of Mammology 65:353-356.

*Price, M.V., N.M. Waser, K.E. Taylor, and K.L. Pluff. 1995. Fire as a management tool for Stephens' Kangaroo rat and other small mammal species. Pages 51–61 *in* Brushfires in California Wildlands: Ecology and Resource Management, J.E. Keeley and T. Scott (Eds.). International Association of Wildland Fire. Fairfield, Washington, USA.

PRBO. 2011. Projected effects of climate change in California: Ecoregional summaries emphasizing consequences for wildlife. PRBO Conservation Science, Petaluma, CA.

Quinn, R.D. 1979. Effects of fire on small mammals in the chaparral. California-Nevada Wildlife Transactions: 125–133.

Randall, J.A., 1993. Behavioural adaptations of desert rodents (Heteromyidae). Animal Behaviour, 45:263-287.

*Reichman, O.J. and M.V. Price. 1993. Ecological aspects of heteromyid foraging. In: H. Genoways and J. Brown, eds. Biology of the Heteromyidae. Special Publication No. 10. The American Society of Mammalogists. Pp. 539-574.

Reilly, M.L., M.W. Tobler, D.L. Sonderegger, and P. Beier. 2017. Spatial and temporal response of wildlife to recreational activities in the San Francisco Bay ecoregion. Biological Conservation 207:117-126.

Rieder, J.P., T.A.S. Newbold, and S.M. Ostoja. 2010. Structural changes in vegetation coincident with annual grass invasion negatively impacts sprint velocity of small vertebrates. Biological Invasions 12:2429–2439.

*[SDGE] San Diego Gas and Electric Habitat Conservation Plan. 1995. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/report/conservation-plan?plan_id=53

Schroeder, J., S. Nakagawa, I.R. Cleasby, and T. Burke T. 2012. Passerine birds breeding under chronic noise experience reduced fitness. PLoS ONE 7, e39200.

Shier, D. 2009. Behavioral ecology and translocation of the endangered Pacific little pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) for the period January 2008 to December 2008. Unpublished report prepared for an Interagency Agreement between U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and CRES, Zoological Society of San Diego. Conservation and Research for Endangered Species, Division of Applied Animal Ecology, Zoological Society of San Diego, Escondido, California. 56 pp.

Shier, D.M., S. Leiversw, S. King, R. Chock, A. Navarro, and J.P. Montagne. 2016. Captive breeding, anti-predator behavior and reintroduction of the Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) 2014–2016. Division of Applied Animal Ecology,

San Diego Zoo Institute for Conservation Research. 146 pp. Unpublished report.

Shier, D.M., A. Wilder, W.B. Miller, C. Curry, S.N.D. King, R.Y. Chock, A. Greggor, and M.L. Houck, M.L. 2022. Draft Genetic Management Plan for the Pacific Pocket Mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*), Escondido, CA. 77 pp.

Slabbekoorn, H. and E.A. Ripmeester. 2008. Birdsong and anthropogenic noise: implications and applications for conservation. Molecular Ecology 17:72-83.

Snyder, J.D. 2012. Acting Assistant Field Supervisor, Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office, USFWS. Email correspondence to Mr. Jeffery Paull, Deputy Director, Environmental Security Department, MCIWEST-Marine Corps Base. Dated December 4, 2012. Subject: Activities resulting in unauthorized impacts to Pacific pocket mouse on Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, San Diego County, California.

Soulé, M.E., A. Alberts and D. Bolger, 1992. The effects of habitat fragmentation on chaparral plants and vertebrates. Oikos 63:39-47.

Spencer, W.D., C. Schaefer, S. Dodd, S.J. Montgomery, and C. Holland. 2000. Pacific pocket mouse studies program, Phase II report, Final. Unpublished report prepared for Foothill/Eastern Transportation Corridor Agency and U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. May 2000. 44 pp. + appendices.

Steven R, Pickering C, Castley JG. 2011. A review of the impacts of nature based recreation on birds. Journal of Environmental Management 92:2287-2294.

Suarez, A.V., Bolger, D.T. and Case, T.J. (1998), Effects of Fragmentation and Invasion on Native Ant Communities in Coastal Southern California. Ecology, 79: 2041-2056. https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(1998)079[2041:EOFAIO]2.0.CO;2

Swei, A., P. Brylski, W. Spencer, S. Dodd, and J. Patton. 2003. Hierarchical genetic structure in fragmented populations of the Little Pocket Mouse (*Perognathus longimembris*) in southern California. Conservation Genetics 4:501-514.

Taylor, A.R. and R.I. Knight. 2003. Wildlife responses to recreation and associated visitor perceptions. Ecological Applications 13:951-963

Tevis, L. 1956. Effect of a slash burn on forest mice. The Journal of Wildlife Management 20:405–409.

*Terborgh, J. and B. Winter. 1980. Some causes of extinction. Pp. 119-133 in Conservation Biology. an Evolutionary-Ecological Perspective, M.E. Soule and B. Wilcox, eds. Sinauer Associates, Inc., Sunderland, Mass.

Tost, D., E. Straub, K. Jung, and U. Siebert. 2020. Impact of tourism on habitat use of black grouse (*Tetrao tetrix*) in an isolated population in northern Germany. PLoS ONE 15(9): e0238660. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0238660.

[USFWS and CDFW] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2022. Response to Update to the Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan for Dana Point Headlands. Biological Open Space, City of Dana Point, California. FWS/CDFW-OR-2022-0016223. March 23, 2022.

[USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1993. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; determination of threatened status for the coastal California gnatcatcher. Final rule. 58 Federal Register 16742-16757. Washington, D.C., March 30, 1993.

[USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1996. Biological Opinion on the Proposed Crucible Challenge Course, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, San Diego County, California (1-6-96-F-35). Biological Opinion. 21 pp.

[USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998. Pacific Pocket Mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) Recovery Plan. Portland, OR. 112 pp.

[USFWS] U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2007b. Habitat Disturbance at the Crucible Course and Status of the Pacific Pocket Mouse within the Oscar One Training Area, Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, San Diego County, California. Email Correspondence. 3 pp.

[USFWS] U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2008. Monitoring of the Pacific Pocket Mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) Population in the Oscar One Training Area on Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton: 2003-2006. Unpublished report prepared by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service for the Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, AC/S Environmental Security under contract M-33200-04-MP-00054. 94 pp.

[USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2010. Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) 5-year review: summary and evaluation. Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office, Department of the Interior. 86 pp.

[USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2012. Intra-Service Formal Section 7 Consultation on the Amendment of a Section 10(a)(1)(A) Permit for Captive Breeding and Reintroduction/Population Augmentation of the Pacific Pocket Mouse. Memorandum. 42 pp.

[USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2014. Unauthorized Impacts to Pacific Pocket Mouse, Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, San Diego County, California. Email Correspondence. 8 pp.

[USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2019. Reinitiation of section 7 consultation for the 51 Area Reservoir repair at Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, San Diego County,

California. Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office, Department of the Interior. 43 pp.

[USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2020. Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) 5-year review: summary and evaluation. Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office, Department of the Interior. 34 pp.

[USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2023. Biological Opinion for Range 501 Maintenance Actions on Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, San Diego County, California. Biological Opinion. 36 pp.

*[USMC] Draft Final Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan for Marine Corps Base Pendelton, California. U.S. Marine Corps. https://www.pendleton.marines.mil/Main-Menu/Staff-Agencies/Environmental-Security/Natural-Resources/.

Valone, T.J., Brown, J.H., Jacobi, C.L., 1995. Catastrophic decline of a desert rodent, Dipodomys spectabilis: insights from a long-term study. Journal of Mammalogy 76:428–436.

Vandergast, A.G., Brehme, C.S., Iwanowicz, D., Cornman, R.S., Adsit-Morris, D. and Fisher, R.N., 2023. Fecal metabarcoding of the endangered Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) reveals a diverse and forb rich diet that reflects local habitat availability. Ecology and Evolution, 13(9), p.e10460. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2023.e02640

Von Bloeker, Jr., J.C. 1932. A new race of *Perognathus longimembris* from southern California. Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington 45: 127-129.

Wang T., and D.M. Shier. 2017. Effects of anthropogenic lighting on Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) foraging behavior, persistence and fitness; Prepared for Wildlife Management Branch, Environmental Security Department, Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton. pp. 1-45. San Diego Zoo Institute for Conservation Research, Escondido, CA.

Wheat, R.E. and C.C. Wilmers. 2016. Habituation reverses fear-based ecological effects in brown bears (*Ursus arctos*). Ecosphere 7:e01408.

*Wilcox, B. A. 1980. Insular Ecology and Conservation. Pp. 95-117 in: Conservation Biology. An Evolutionary-Ecological Perspective, M.E. Soule and B. Wilcox, eds. Sinauer Associates, Inc., Sunderland, Mass. 395 pp.

Wilder, A.P. and C. Curry. 2020. Characterizing functional genomic diversity in Pacific pocket mice captively bred for reintroduction. Prepared for California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Final report. 31 pp.

Wilder, A.P., A.Y. Navarro, S.N. King, W.B. Miller, S.M. Thomas, C.C. Steiner, O.A. Ryder, and D .M. Shier. 2020. Fitness costs associated with ancestry to isolated populations of an endangered species. Conservation Genetics. 21:589-601.

*Wilder, A.P., D.M. Shier, S.N.D. King, O. Dudchenko, E.R. Funk, A. Misuraca, M. Houck, W.B. Miller, C.J. Curry, H. Fronczek, R. Khan, R.N. Fisher, E.A. Lieberman, O.A. Ryder, C.C. Steiner. *In Prep*. Costs of inbreeding versus outbreeding depression favor genetic rescue in the endangered Pacific pocket mouse. Unpublished manuscript. 17 pp.

Williams, D.F. 1986. Mammalian species of special concern in California. Wildlife Management Division Administrative Report 86-1. California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento. 112 pp.

*Williams, D.F., H.H. Genoways and J.K. Braun. 1993. Taxonomy and systematic. In: H.H. Genoways and J.H. Brown, eds. Biology of the Heteromyidae. Special Publication No. 10. The American Society of Mammalogists. Pp. 38-196.

State of California
Department of Fish and Wildlife

Signed original on file,
received July 10, 2025

Memorandum

Date: July 02, 2025

To: Melissa Miller-Henson
Executive Director
Fish and Game Commission

From: Charlton H. Bonham
Director

Subject: **Initial Evaluation of the Petition to List Pacific Pocket Mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) as Threatened or Endangered under the California Endangered Species Act**

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) has completed its initial evaluation of the petition to list Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) as a threatened or endangered species under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), Fish and Game Code section 2050 et seq. The Fish and Game Commission (Commission) received the petition from the Center for Biological Diversity on March 25, 2025. Pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2073, the Commission referred the petition to the Department on April 4, 2025.

The Department completed the attached petition evaluation report as required by Fish and Game Code section 2073.5. The Department's petition evaluation report delineates the categories of information required in a petition, evaluates the sufficiency of the available scientific information, and incorporates additional relevant information that the Department possessed or received during the review period. Based upon the information contained in the petition, and other relevant information in the Department's possession, the Department has determined that there is sufficient scientific information to indicate that the petitioned action may be warranted. The Department recommends that the Commission accept the petition for further consideration pursuant to CESA.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Scott Gardner, Branch Chief, Wildlife Branch at (916) 801-6257 or by email at Scott.Gardner@wildlife.ca.gov.

Attachment

ec: *California Department of Fish and Wildlife*

Chad Dibble
Deputy Director
Wildlife and Fisheries Division

Scott Gardner
Branch Chief

Wildlife Branch

Pete Figura
Environmental Program Manager
Wildlife Branch

Austin Roy
CESA Recovery Coordinator
Wildlife Branch

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

California Endangered Species Act

Petition Evaluation for Pacific Pocket Mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*)

Report to the Fish and Game Commission
July 2025

Cover page photo credit: Joana Gilkeson (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service).

Suggested citation: California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2025. Report to the Fish and Game Commission, petition evaluation for Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*). California Department of Fish and Wildlife, P.O. Box 944209, Sacramento CA 94244-2090. 24 pp.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures iv
List of Tables iv
List of Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Terms v
Executive Summary vi
1 Introduction 1
1.1 Petition Evaluation Overview 1
1.2 CESA Petition History 2
1.3 Federal Status 2
1.4 Additional Species Status Designations 2
1.4.1 California Species of Special Concern 2
1.4.2 NatureServe Conservation Status Ranks 2
2 Species Description and Taxonomy 3
2.1 Species Description 3
2.2 Species Taxonomy 3
2.3 Population Structure and Genetics 3
2.3.1 Population structure 3
2.3.2 Genetics 4
2.4 Similar Taxa 4
3 Summary of Petition Components 4
3.1 Life History 5
3.2 Range and Distribution 6
3.3 Habitat 10
3.4 Abundance and Population Trend 10
3.4.1 Dana Point Preserve 10
3.4.2 South San Mateo 13
3.4.3 Santa Margarita 13
3.5 Threats 14
3.5.1 Habitat availability 14
3.5.2 Small Population Size 18
3.5.3 Climate Change 18

3.5.4 Disease, Predation, and Competition 18
3.6 Existing Management 19
3.7 Future Management 20
3.8 Availability and Sources of Information 21
4 Other Relevant Information Available to the Department 21
5 Sufficiency of Scientific Information and Recommendation to the Commission 22
Acknowledgements 22
Literature Cited 23
Personal Communications 24

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Map depicting the historical range and distribution of the Pacific pocket mouse (1a); Map depicting the contemporary range and distribution of the Pacific pocket mouse (1b).. 9
Figure 2. Image of track-tube monitoring method (a) and example Pacific pocket mouse tracks from a track-tube (b).. 11
Figure 3. Total area in hectares (ha) estimated to be occupied by Pacific pocket mouse for each population from 2012 to 2022 12
Figure 4. Zones of varying distance (13 m, 50 m, 100 m) from the trail at the Dana Point Preserve. Values show proportion (%) and area (acres) of the Preserve covered by each zone 17

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Estimated area occupied (ha) and proportion of area occupied (PAO) for each population with Santa Margarita also broken out into the individual sampling areas (Oscar One and Edson). Source: Brehme et al. 2022; CNLM 2024. This table was provided in the Petition as Table 4. 8
Table 2. Results from all live-trap Pacific pocket mouse monitoring events since CNLM acquisition, 2008–2020. Source: Merrill et al. 2023. This table was provided in the Petition as Table 1. 12
Table 3. Pacific pocket mouse track-tube monitoring data from the Data Point Preserve, 2017–2024. This table was provided in the Petition as Table 2. 13

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS, ACRONYMS, AND TERMS

CDFW – California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CDPR – California Department of Parks and Recreation
CESA – California Endangered Species Act
CNDDB – California Natural Diversity Database
CNLM – Center for Natural Lands Management
Commission – California Fish and Game Commission
Department – California Department of Fish and Wildlife
ESA – Federal Endangered Species Act
HCP – Habitat Conservation Plan
MCBCP – Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton
NCCP – Natural Community Conservation Plan
PAO – Proportion of Area Occupied
SSC – Species of Special Concern
spp. – Species (plural)
ssp. – Subspecies
USFWS – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This petition evaluation for Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) has been prepared by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) in response to the petition to list Pacific pocket mouse as threatened or endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (petition). The purpose of this petition evaluation is to provide a recommendation to the Fish and Game Commission (Commission) on whether the petition provides sufficient information to indicate the petitioned action may be warranted.

The Pacific pocket mouse is a small rodent that occurs in coastal sage scrub habitats within 1.6 km (1 mi) of the coast and below 180 m (600 ft) in elevation in Orange County and San Diego County. The species historically ranged from Los Angeles County to the U.S.-Mexico border, but now only occurs at three isolated, disjunct localities in the city of Dana Point and on Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton. Population abundance varies between localities and through time and seems to be related to environmental conditions and impacts from human development and land use.

The Department has determined that the petition addresses each of the required petition components listed in Fish and Game Code section 2072.3 and California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 670.1, subdivision (d)(1):

- Life history
- Range
- Distribution
- Detailed distribution map
- Kind of habitat necessary for survival
- Abundance
- Population trend
- Factors affecting the ability to survive and reproduce
- Degree and immediacy of threat
- Impact of existing management efforts
- Suggestions for future management
- Availability and sources of information

In completing its petition evaluation, the Department considered the information in the petition and other information the Department possesses. The Department has determined that there is sufficient scientific information to indicate that the petitioned action to list Pacific pocket mouse as threatened or endangered under CESA may be warranted. Therefore, the Department recommends that the Commission accept the petition for further consideration pursuant to CESA.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Petition Evaluation Overview

This petition evaluation serves as the basis for the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's (Department) recommendation to the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) on whether the petition to list Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) as threatened or endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) should be accepted and considered. The recommendation is based on the sufficiency of scientific information in the petition, as well as other relevant information possessed or received by the Department during the evaluation period.

A petition to list a species under CESA must include "information regarding the population trend, range, distribution, abundance, and life history of a species, the factors affecting the ability of the population to survive and reproduce, the degree and immediacy of the threat, the impact of existing management efforts, suggestions for future management, and the availability and sources of information. The petition shall also include information regarding the kind of habitat necessary for species survival, a detailed distribution map, and any other factors that the petitioner deems relevant" (Fish & G. Code, § 2072.3; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (d)(1)).

Once a petition is submitted to the Commission, the Department has 90 days (120 days with extension) to prepare a petition evaluation that evaluates each of the petition components and makes a recommendation to the Commission as to whether there is sufficient scientific information to indicate that the petitioned action to list the species under CESA may be warranted (Fish & G. Code, § 2073.5, subds. (a)-(b)). Once completed by the Department, the petition evaluation is delivered to the Commission and placed on the agenda for receipt at the next available meeting of the Commission. At that time, the petition evaluation will be made available to the public for a 30-day public comment period prior to the Commission taking any action on the petition. The Commission then considers the petition, the Department's petition evaluation, written comments received, and oral testimony to make a finding at the next available meeting of the Commission as to whether the petition provides "sufficient information to indicate that the petitioned action may be warranted" (Fish & G. Code, § 2074.2, subd. (e)(2)). The standard for accepting a petition for consideration and assessing sufficiency of information is addressed in *Center for Biological Diversity v. California Fish and Game Commission* (2008) 166 Cal.App.4th 597.

If the Commission determines that the petitioned action may be warranted, the species becomes a candidate for CESA listing and proceeds to the status review stage of the CESA listing process. The Department then prepares a peer-reviewed report that advises the Commission on whether the petitioned action is warranted, based upon the best

scientific information available (Fish & G. Code, § 2074.6). Finally, the Commission determines whether the petitioned action to list the species as threatened or endangered is warranted, based on the Department's status review and other information in the administrative record (Fish & G. Code, § 2075.5).

1.2 CESA Petition History

On March 25, 2025, the Center for Biological Diversity submitted a petition to the Commission to list Pacific pocket mouse as threatened or endangered under CESA. On April 4, 2025, the Commission referred the petition to the Department for evaluation. At its meeting on April 16–17, 2025, the Commission officially acknowledged receipt of the petition.

1.3 Federal Status

The Pacific pocket mouse was emergency listed under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) in February 1994 (USFWS 1994a). Upon expiration of the emergency rule, the species was listed as endangered under the ESA on September 29, 1994. In 1998, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) published a recovery plan for Pacific pocket mouse (USFWS 1998). No critical habitat has been designated for this species under the ESA.

1.4 Additional Species Status Designations

1.4.1 California Species of Special Concern

The Pacific pocket mouse is designated as a Species of Special Concern (SSC) by the Department. The Department has assigned the species a Global Rank of G5T2 and State Rank of S2, meaning the subspecies is considered imperiled and at high risk of extinction due to restricted range, few populations or occurrences, steep declines, severe threats, or other factors (CNDDB 2025)

1.4.2 NatureServe Conservation Status Ranks

The Pacific pocket mouse is ranked as T2 by NatureServe, a network of over 60 government and non-government organizations that uses a standardized approach to assess the conservation status of species. NatureServe describes the species as occurring in small, isolated populations and at risk from human activities and development (NatureServe 2025).

2 SPECIES DESCRIPTION AND TAXONOMY

CESA defines the "species" eligible for listing to include "species or subspecies" (Fish & G. Code, §§ 2062, 2067, 2068). Additionally, courts have held that the term "species or subspecies" includes "evolutionarily significant units" (*Central Coast Forest Assn. v. Fish & Game Com.* (2018) 18 Cal.App.5th 1191, 1236, citing *Cal. Forestry Assn.*, *infra*, 156 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1542, 1549).

2.1 Species Description

The petition describes the Pacific pocket mouse as a small rodent, with a body mass between 7–9 grams, with a total body length (head to tail) of 131 mm (109-152 mm, USFWS 2025), and a head-tail and body length ratio between 1.03–1.40. Like other pocket mice, the species has fur-lined external cheek pouches. The species lacks hair spines or bristles. The body pelage of Pacific pocket mice is brown and bicolored, buffy dorsally and light brown to whitish ventrally, with a bicolored tail. Additionally, individuals usually show two small, light-colored patches of fur at the base of the ear.

2.2 Species Taxonomy

The petition describes the taxonomy of the Pacific pocket mouse as a rodent belonging to the family Heteromyidae, genus *Perognathus*, species *longimembris*, and subspecies *pacificus*. The petition also notes that the Pacific pocket mouse was originally described as a unique species (*Perognathus pacificus*) and was reclassified as two subspecies of *P. longimembris* (ssp. *pacificus* and ssp. *cantwelli*) in 1932. The two subspecies were later combined into one subspecies (*P. longimembris pacificus*), and all extant populations are currently recognized as *P. longimembris pacificus*.

2.3 Population Structure and Genetics

2.3.1 Population structure

The petition does not provide data on population structure for Pacific pocket mouse. The petition does provide information on changes in population abundances and occupancy, and this information is discussed below in the Abundance and Population Trend section. Population structure information from the late 1990s is available in the federal Recovery Plan (USFWS 1998) and states that data from one population suggests that the population was dominated by juveniles at that time. Furthermore, the sex ratios at two populations were 1.1M:1F and 0.8M:1F, respectively (USFWS 1998). The petition does note on page 39 that high variability in age and sex ratios may increase extinction probabilities in species with small population sizes.

2.3.2 Genetics

On page 39 of the petition, the petitioners cite a report (Wilder et al., *in prep*.) that indicates a significant loss of genetic variation within all populations, with one population (Dana Point Preserve) exhibiting a greater loss in genetic variation than the other two populations. Additionally, on page 9, the petition notes fixed genetic differences between populations, with one population (Dana Point) having a diploid (2n) chromosome number of 58, while the other two populations (Santa Margarita and South San Mateo) having a 2n chromosome number of 56.

2.4 Similar Taxa

The petition describes that the Pacific pocket mouse is one of 16 recognized subspecies of little pocket mouse (*P. l*o*ngimembris*) and that another subspecies (Los Angeles pocket mouse [*P. longimembris brevinasus*]) also occurs within the region (cismontane southern California), but that it can be distinguished from Pacific pocket mouse through the "length of the tail, hind foot, and skull, and the small size of skull sutures."

3 SUMMARY OF PETITION COMPONENTS

Pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2072.3 and California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 670.1, subdivision (d)(1), the Department evaluated whether the petition contained information on each of the following petition components:

- Life history
- Range
- Distribution
- Detailed distribution map
- Kind of habitat necessary for survival
- Abundance
- Population trend
- Factors affecting the ability to survive and reproduce
- Degree and immediacy of threat
- Impact of existing management efforts
- Suggestions for future management
- Availability and sources of information

The Department did not receive new information from the public during the petition evaluation period (Fish & G. Code, § 2073.4). Pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2073.5, the Department evaluated the petition to determine whether there is, or is not, sufficient information to indicate that the petitioned action may be warranted. A summary of the relevant information from the petition for each of the petition

components is presented below. In some instances, the Department has grouped similar components together and renamed components to create a more cohesive and readable document.

3.1 Life History

This section summarizes the information in the petition regarding the species' life history (Fish & G. Code, § 2072.3; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (d)(1)).

The petition describes the life history of Pacific pocket mouse on pages 2–3 and pages 6–9, providing information on the species' life cycle, reproductive biology, sociality, home range, activity patterns, burrowing behavior, and diet. The following is a summary of the information presented.

The petition states that the average lifespan of a Pacific pocket mouse in the wild is approximately one year, but may be as high as 3–5 years, and that individuals may live up to 10 years in captivity. Mean annual survivorship of Pacific pocket mice is approximately 17% but varies seasonally with resource availability and environmental conditions. Females have short peak estrus periods, as short as one hour, and typically have one litter per year. In years of high resource availability, females may have up to two litters but may delay or forego breeding during years of low resource availability. A female's gestation period is approximately three weeks and females produce 2–8 pups per litter, with pups being weaned after 30 days. Pacific pocket mice reach sexual maturity in 2–5 months and female pups may reproduce in their first year of life.

The petition discusses that the Pacific pocket mouse is a solitary and non-social species. The species is typically the smallest rodent within its ecological community and appears to avoid larger rodent species. Additionally, females have been observed exhibiting aggressive behavior toward males in captivity.

The petition describes the estimated average home range of the Pacific pocket mouse to be 170 m^2 (roughly equal to a 13 m diameter circle). Generally, males have larger home ranges than females, with home range size varying likely due to biological (breeding timing, population density, demography) and ecological (resource availability) factors. The average linear distance moved in a single night is between 10–30 m (based on trap events); however, some individuals have been documented to travel >150 m in a single night, coinciding with a shift in use area. The petition notes limited adult and juvenile dispersal distances, but some individuals have been observed dispersing over long distances.

The petition states that the Pacific pocket mouse exhibits winter and summer torpor to reduce energy expenditure in response to environmental conditions and resource stress. Torpor may begin in June and last through November, with timing varying depending

on conditions. During torpor, mice may remain dormant except to feed on cached seeds. Individuals may emerge from torpor in early spring when resources are available. During the active season, the species is mainly nocturnal but may be active aboveground during dawn and dusk hours, with individuals spending much of the daylight hours in belowground burrow systems.

The petition states that Pacific pocket mouse burrow systems range from 1–12 inches in depth. The species uses burrows and tunnels for birthing and nesting, protection from predators, food caches, and protection from environmental extremes (e.g., heat or cold). Burrow locations are dependent on habitat characteristics (see section 3.3 Habitat, below).

The petition states that the Pacific pocket mouse is considered granivorous and specializes on seeds from grasses and forbs. The species has an apparent preference for seeds from forbs, perennial herbs, and native bunch grasses compared to those from perennial shrubs and other grasses. The species may also occasionally feed on green vegetation and insects. Similar to some other heteromyid rodents (e.g., kangaroo rats, *Dipodomys* spp.), the species obtains metabolic water from seeds.

3.2 Range and Distribution

This section summarizes the information in the petition regarding the species' range and distribution and provides a detailed distribution map (Fish & G. Code, § 2072.3; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (d)(1)). A species' range for the purposes of CESA and this petition evaluation is the species' range within California (*Cal. Forestry Assn. v. Cal. Fish and Game Com.* (2007) 156 Cal.App.4th 1535, 1551). Range describes the general geographical area in which a species occurs. Distribution describes the actual sites where individuals and populations of the species occur within the species' range.

The petition describes the historical range and distribution of Pacific pocket mouse on pages 2 and 10–12. The petition states that the species' historical range likely occurred within suitable habitat (see section 3.3 Habitat, below) located <180 m (600 ft) in elevation and within 4 km of the coast (with most records within 1.6 km of the coast), between Los Angeles County and the border with Mexico. The species has been documented from nine (9) general localities, including three (3) in Los Angeles County (Marina del Rey/El Segundo, Clifton, and Wilmington), two (2) in Orange County (San Joaquin Hills and Dana Point Headlands), and four (4) in San Diego County (San Onofre, Santa Margarita River, Los Peñasquitos Lagoon, and the lower Tijuana River). The petition highlights that six (6) of these historical localities, including the type locality (lower Tijuana River), have been extirpated due to coastal development and habitat loss. The petition provides a historical range map (**Figure 1a**) depicting general localities where Pacific pocket mouse has been recorded historically; this map was

attributed to thesis work conducted by Godfrey (2018). The species was thought to be extinct in the 1970s until it was discovered near the historical Dana Point Headlands locality in 1993. Additional populations were subsequently re-discovered at localities in San Diego County (see below).

The petition describes the contemporary range and distribution of Pacific pocket mouse on pages 1 and 10–16. The petition notes that the contemporary range of the species now occurs from southern Orange County to northern San Diego County and is estimated to occur on less than 300 ha (740 ac) of habitat. The contemporary distribution of the species is constrained to three localities. In Orange County, the species occurs on the Dana Point Preserve (in vicinity to the historical Dana Point Headlands locality), which is managed by the Center for Natural Lands Management (CNLM) as a nature preserve and conservation open space. The species is also intermittently detected within the adjacent Hilltop Park in Dana Point. In San Diego County, the species occurs at two localities on lands managed by Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton (MCBCP): Santa Margarita (in vicinity to the historical Santa Margarita River locality and includes the Oscar One and Edson training areas) and South San Mateo (in proximity to the historical San Onofre locality). The petition notes that the South San Mateo locality had an adjacent subpopulation of Pacific pocket mice (North San Mateo) until 2003, but that locality is likely now extirpated. The petition describes that "despite more than 150 surveys within their historic range, no additional" Pacific pocket mouse populations have been detected. The petition provides a map depicting the location of the three contemporary Pacific pocket mouse localities (**Figure 1b**). On page 21, the petition provides a table (***Table 1***) which lists the area of habitat at each locality as 885 ha, 105 ha, and 12 ha for the Santa Margarita, South San Mateo, and Dana Point Preserve, respectively. The petition notes that these localities are isolated from one another and no dispersal occurs between them; as such, each is a separate population rather than part of a functioning metapopulation (page 39). The petition also mentions a locality in Orange County (unspecified location) where captive-reared Pacific pocket mice have been released, but the petitioners do not consider it a current locality as they do not believe the population is established or self-sustaining. Not noted in the petition was a second site located on MCBCP where releases began in 2024, but this is also likely not an established population (E. Gray, CDFW, pers. comm).

Table 1. Estimated area occupied (ha) and proportion of area occupied (PAO) for each known population with Santa Margarita also broken out into the individual sampling areas (Oscar One and Edson). Source: Brehme et al. 2022; CNLM 2024. This table was provided in the Petition as Table 4.

	Santa Margarita (885 ha)		*Santa Magarita sub-areas*				South San Mateo (105 ha)		Dana Point (12 ha)	
			Oscar One (411 ha)		*Edson (474 ha)*					
Year	Area occupied	PAO	Area occupied	PAO	Area occupied	PAO	Area occupied	PAO	Area occupied	PAO
2012	169.4	0.19	39.3	0.10	130.1	0.27	20.2	0.19	4.0	0.54
2013	212.4	0.24	45.0	0.11	167.4	0.35	20.6	0.20	3.7	0.51
2014	259.9	0.29	67.8	0.16	189.1	0.40	27.7	0.26	5.8	0.81
2015	281.1	0.32	28.0	0.07	253.1	0.53	38.2	0.36	--	--
2016	291.3	0.33	9.7	0.02	281.6	0.59	43.8	0.42	5.3	0.71
2017	167.0	0.19	22.2	0.05	145.0	0.31	41.1	0.39	0.6	0.08
2018	179.6	0.20	37.4	0.03	142.2	0.30	43.6	0.41	1.8	0.24
2019	92.8	0.10	22.6	0.05	70.2	0.15	24.9	0.24	1.1	0.14
2020	137.8	0.16	68.6	0.17	69.2	0.15	40.1	0.38	3.7	0.46
2021	76.9	0.09	48.5	0.12	28.4	0.06	33.9	0.32	7.4	0.95
2022	122.9	0.14	65.5	0.16	57.4	0.12	41.8	0.40	6.4	0.82



Figure 1. Map depicting the historical range and distribution of the Pacific pocket mouse (1a); Map depicting the contemporary range and distribution of the Pacific pocket mouse (1b). Credit: Godfrey 2018. This map was included in the Petition as Figure 1.

3.3 Habitat

This section summarizes the information in the petition regarding the kind of habitat necessary for species survival (Fish & G. Code, § 2072.3; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (d)(1)).

The petition discusses the habitat of the Pacific pocket mouse in the "Habitat" section on pages 5–6 and within the "Behavior" section on page 8.

The petition states that Pacific pocket mice "are associated with fine grain, sandy or gravelly substrates in coastal strand, coastal dunes, river alluvium, and coastal sage scrub habitats." The petition also mentions that loose or friable soils seem to be an important habitat characteristic necessary for Pacific pocket mice, due to their burrowing and dustbathing requirements. While the species historically used multiple habitat types (e.g., dune habitats), the extant populations of Pacific pocket mice now occur mainly in coastal sage scrub habitats, although other habitat types (sage scrub-grassland ecotone, low density non-native grasslands, areas of bare ground) are used at lower frequency. Within sage scrub habitats, the species is associated with relatively open vegetated areas, with areas of moderate to high bare ground and forb cover being preferred. Areas with moderate to high non-native grass cover are considered lower quality habitat for the species. As described earlier (Section 3.1 Life History), native forbs, perennial herbs, and native bunch grasses are important forage species for Pacific pocket mice, and habitats which contain these species may be associated with higher quality habitat.

3.4 Abundance and Population Trend

This section summarizes the information in the petition regarding the species' abundance and population trend (Fish & G. Code, § 2072.3; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (d)(1)).

The petition discusses the abundance and population trends of the Pacific pocket mouse on pages 15–22. The petition does not describe the historical status of the species but discusses its contemporary status. The petition notes that the Pacific pocket mouse has relatively small populations which exhibit annual variability. The petition addresses each locality separately due to differences in monitoring methods and efforts.

3.4.1 Dana Point Preserve

The petition notes that the Dana Point Preserve locality has the smallest Pacific pocket mouse population of the three localities. This locality has been monitored through annual live-trapping (**Table 2**) and/or track-tube monitoring (detection of Pacific pocket mouse using track presence, **Figure 2**) since it was acquired by CNLM in 2008.

Prior to 2008, the locality was surveyed sporadically. The petition cites that the lowest number of captures of Pacific pocket mouse occurred in 2001 (n = 4), but that captures increased after CNLM commenced habitat management activities in 2005. The number of annual live-captures has been variable, with a peak in 2009 (n=82), very few captures in 2017 (n=6) and 2019 (n=2), and 77 captures in 2020. The petition states that these findings are reflected by a similar pattern in habitat use (**Figure 3**). The petitioner attributes the increase in captures in 2020 to a COVID-19-related closure of the preserve to the public, and a decrease in the proportion of area occupied (PAO) in 2022 (**Table 3**) with an increase in public visitation. The petitioner highlights that management agencies (the Department and USFWS) have noted that regardless of the cause of fluctuations in the species' population, monitoring efforts show that the population remains vulnerable to extinction.



Figure 2. Image of track-tube monitoring method (a) and example Pacific pocket mouse tracks from a track-tube (b). Source: Brehme et al. 2019.



Figure 3. Total area in hectares (ha) estimated to be occupied by Pacific pocket mouse for each population from 2012 to 2022. Data sourced from Brehem et al. 2023 and CNLM 2024. This graph was included in the Petition as Figure 2.

Table 2. Results from all live-trap Pacific pocket mouse monitoring events at the Dana Point Preserve since CNLM acquisition, 2008–2020. Source: Merrill et al. 2023. This table was provided in the Petition as Table 1.

Month(s) and Year of Trapping Events	Level of Effort (trap nights)	Trapping Results (unique individuals)
May–June 2008	3280	30
May 2009[1]	2770	82
May 2012	3330	57
May 2017	2286	6
June 2019	792	2
June 2020[2]	1254	77

[1] The trail was opened to public access in December 2009.
[2] The trail was closed to public access in March 2020.

Table 3. Pacific pocket mouse track-tube monitoring data from the Data Point Preserve, 2017–2024. This table was provided in the Petition as Table 2.

Track-tube Monitoring Year	Estimated Proportion of Area Occupied
2017	0.08
2018	0.24
2019	0.14
2020	0.46
2021	0.95
2022	0.81
2023	0.78
2024	0.56

3.4.2 South San Mateo

This locality has been monitored through systematic annual track-tube monitoring and live-trapping by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) since 2012. The petition describes the average PAO of Pacific pocket mice at South San Mateo as 34 ha (32% of available habitat). The petition notes a decline in PAO and habitat-use in 2019 (**Figure 3**) associated with poor resource availability the previous season, and a decline in PAO from 2020 to 2021, with little documented reproduction and no recruitment.

3.4.3 Santa Margarita

Similar to South San Mateo, this locality has also been monitored through annual track-tube monitoring and live-trapping by USGS since 2012. The petition notes that this locality has the largest Pacific pocket mouse population of the three extant localities. This population occurs on two training grounds (Oscar One, Edson Range), which are monitored separately; however, the petitioner states they should be treated as one population. The petitioner provides details of each area separately but summarizes that the combined population experienced a significant population increase (based on PAO and total area occupied analysis) between 2012–2016, with a peak of >23,000 individuals, followed by a decrease in abundance 2017–2019 (**Figure 3**). The petition relates these changes in population with environmental conditions, non-native grass presence, and potentially invasive fire ants. The petition highlights a recent population viability analysis for the locality (GSRC and SDZWA 2022), which showed a 100% chance of extirpation at this locality within 100 years (assuming starting population size <3,100 individuals).

3.5 Threats

This section summarizes the information in the petition regarding the factors affecting the ability of the species to survive and reproduce, and the degree and immediacy of threats (Fish & G. Code, § 2072.3; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (d)(1)).

The petition discusses threats to the Pacific pocket mouse in the section titled "Factors Affecting the Ability of the Species to Survive and Reproduce," on pages 1–3 and 23–42.

The petition discusses four (4) main types of threats:

1. Habitat availability
    a. Habitat modification and destruction
    b. Non-native vegetation and habitat succession
    c. Habitat management
    d. Land use and human activity
2. Small population size
3. Climate change
4. Disease, predation, and competition

3.5.1 Habitat availability

The petition states that availability of habitat within the Pacific pocket mouse range is limited and extant populations are isolated from one another. Habitat fragmentation may continue to limit population size and dispersal, making populations susceptible to stochastic events and inbreeding effects and may help drive declines in habitat quality via edge effects. The petition cites the USFWS Recovery Plan (USFWS 1998), suggesting that habitat modification and destruction via coastal development and land-use was a causative agent of the extirpation of historical Pacific pocket mouse populations and details how negative effects may continue in the future. Erosion is a specific risk factor for the Dana Point population, exemplified by the fact that portions of some neighboring parcels have collapsed from the bluff. The petition also describes how the introduction of non-native grasses threatens habitat quality for Pacific pocket mouse by hindering Pacific pocket mouse movements and having negative impacts on forage plant species. The abundance of non-native grasses has been shown to be a strong negative predictor of Pacific pocket mouse occupancy and colonization and positive predictor of extirpation. Similarly, the petition describes the negative effects of habitat succession on the species' habitat, with increases in shrub cover negatively impacting more beneficial forage species and environmental conditions necessary (e.g., decreased bare ground) for Pacific pocket mice. Additionally, habitat management activities, such as fire management or managing habitat for other sensitive species (e.g., managing for higher

shrub cover for California gnatcatcher [*Polioptila californica californica*] at the Dana Point Preserve) may negatively affect Pacific pocket mouse populations.

The petition identifies land-use and land activities as threats to Pacific pocket mouse and breaks land-use into five (5) subcategories:

Development and Project Construction – The petition describes habitat degradation and loss via human land and housing development as the largest historical cause of the species' decline. The petition describes development as a specific threat near the Dana Point Preserve, with continued and future potential habitat destruction and degradation through edge effects (e.g., noise and light pollution, domestic animals). The petition relates habitat degradation within the Dana Point Preserve to influences from nearby development and use of the established and unofficial hiking trails within the preserve.

For the populations on MCBCP, the petition describes that several development projects have occurred within Pacific pocket mouse-occupied and potential habitat areas. The petition notes that there are planned future development projects within or adjacent to occupied areas. In addition to development, maintenance activities of developed areas are expected to have negative impacts on habitat and direct take of individuals.

The petition notes that, for all populations, development and construction can create barriers to dispersal from occupied areas into nearby potential habitat patches.

Military activities – The petition notes that populations of Pacific pocket mouse are threatened by direct (habitat loss and degradation) and indirect (artificial lighting, noise, vibrations, soil compaction, habitat trampling, rodenticide use, predator attractants, shifts in space use into low quality habitat, shifts in daily activity pattern, non-native plant effects) effects of military activities within mouse habitat. The specific military activities described in the petition include "land navigation, troop movement, live firing ranges, bivouac sites, dirt roads and trails and associated facilities." The petition discusses military activities as a primary threat to the Santa Margarita population, where approximately 17,000 troops train annually on 134.8 ha of potential Pacific pocket mouse habitat. Military activities are a smaller impact for the South San Mateo population, with the area having limited off-road use by the military. The petition also relates military activities to Pacific pocket mouse subpopulation decline and extirpation in specific areas (south of Macs Road) on MCBCP. The petition notes that USFWS has conducted Section 7 consultations for these activities, but threats to the species from military activities remain.

Fire and Fire Management Practices – The petition notes that fire and fire management practices (prescribed burns and firebreak maintenance) can cause direct negative harm to individuals and indirect harm to Pacific pocket mouse habitats. Inadequate fire frequency, timing, and severity can negatively impact habitats through

habitat succession. Too infrequent fire (natural and/or prescribed fires) may shift vegetation communities toward shrub dominated communities unsuitable for Pacific pocket mice. Alternatively, too frequent fires may shift vegetation from sage scrub habitats toward grassland habitats and increase non-native vegetation cover unsuitable for Pacific pocket mice. Additionally, fire management activities such as the creation and maintenance of fire breaks through disking is a practice used by MCBCP and California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR; San Onofre State Beach), including within Pacific pocket mouse habitat. This disking can crush burrows, directly harm individuals, and displace individuals from habitat. Pacific pocket mice can recolonize disked areas; however, it is unclear whether repeated disking may deter mice from recolonization. The petition also relates habitat degradation within the extirpated North San Mateo population to CDPR's practice of adding mulch to fire breaks (to reduce plant cover) and an increase in invasive Argentine ants.

Road and Utility Maintenance – The petition cites a Biological Opinion which allows for incidental take of 1–3 Pacific pocket mice on MCBCP during road maintenance and suggests this as a risk to individuals annually. Additionally, a 2012 emergency road project resulted in grading an estimated 0.34 ha of habitat within the South San Mateo population and is suggested to have resulted in the take of 7 or more individual mice. Subsequently, a permanent composite road has been established in the habitat. The petition also discusses that MCBCP has been resurfacing dirt roads within Pacific pocket mouse habitat and that such activities may exasperate habitat fragmentation and create barriers to dispersal.

Recreation Activities and Unauthorized Habitat Disturbance – The petition elucidates the potential consequences of recreation and habitat disturbance on Pacific pocket mouse habitat and behaviors. The petition lists altered habitat use, extirpation from suitable habitat, shifts in space use into low quality habitat, shifts in daily activity patterns, altered predator interactions and avoidance behavior, and habitat fragmentation as potential threats of recreation activities. Specific threats include trampling of burrows; damaging forage plant resources, nesting locations, and shelter; changes in predator dynamics; impacts to reproduction; and vibrations impacting belowground activity (e.g., torpor, rearing young). The petition highlights that even small disruptions in the species biology can have detrimental effects on the population due to the short peak estrus period of females.

There may be specific effects of recreation within the Dana Point Preserve, which is managed as an open space with public access. The petition cites a report (Merrill et al. 2023) which showed that 15.6–89.5% of the reserve may be impacted by recreation on the developed trail in the reserve, depending on how far from the trail effects may reach. The petition provides a map from the report (**Figure 4**) depicting the area of the Dana Point Preserve potentially impacted by trail use. The petition also lists recreation-related

risks (increased invasive species, off-trail hiking and biking, dogs off leash) and nearby development (rodenticide use, artificial lighting, noise, and disease transmission) as potential threats to the species at the preserve. The petition hypothesizes that recreation has negative impacts on Pacific pocket mouse abundance due to the observation of an increased mouse population when the park was closed or had reduced visitation hours in 2020–2021 and reduced mouse abundances beginning in 2022, when visitation hours and visitation rates increased. Additionally, recreational use of the trail has been attributed to the death of one (1) individual mouse.

The petition notes that the populations on MCBCP receive fewer impacts from recreation than the Dana Point Persevere, but residents may use existing roads and trails which may impact Pacific pocket mouse populations and habitats. The petition hypothesizes that the extirpated North San Mateo population was impacted by recreation activities on nearby recreation areas and trails.



Figure 4. Zones of varying distance (13 m, 50 m, 100 m) from the trail at the Dana Point Preserve. Values show proportion (%) and area (acres) of the Preserve covered by each zone. Source: Merrill et al. 2023. This map was included in the petition as Figure 4.

3.5.2 Small Population Size

The petition notes that each extant population is small and isolated and does not act as part of a larger metapopulation. Additionally, the petition cites a genetic analysis (Wilder et al., *in prep*.) which shows that each population has a small effective population size (Dana Point [Ne = 14.9], South San Mateo [Ne = 20.5], Santa Margarita [Ne = 36.5]) and has recently lost genetic variation, and the Dana Point population may already be showing deleterious genetic effects of a small population. Each population is susceptible to extirpation due to stochastic events, inbreeding, variability in age and sex ratios, other natural events such as disease, or anthropogenic causes. Since populations are isolated, there is no potential for natural recolonization following extirpation.

3.5.3 Climate Change

According to the petition, climate change is expected to produce prolonged droughts, variation in rainfall timing and quantity, and increase annual temperatures within the range of the Pacific pocket mouse. These effects are projected to lead to a >50% decline in habitat suitability of sage scrub-associated species. The petition states that variability in precipitation and influences on forage quality and fire frequency also make it difficult to predict how Pacific pocket mouse will be affected by climate change. An increase in precipitation or extreme weather may cause Pacific pocket mouse populations to delay or forego breeding, resulting in reduced recruitment. Increases in rainfall may benefit some forage species but may also reduce bare ground cover within Pacific pocket mouse habitats, spoil food caches, and increase energetic demands during torpor. Alternatively, periods of drought may be beneficial to the species as seen from an increase in PAO during a 5-year drought.

3.5.4 Disease, Predation, and Competition

The petition notes that the impact of disease on Pacific pocket mouse populations is unknown, but that intracellular coccidia parasites, which have led to fitness declines and death in other mouse species, have been detected in the South San Mateo population.

The petition states that non-native red fox and domestic cats were recognized predator threats to the Pacific pocket mouse at the time of listing (USFWS 1994b) and since then, five (5) additional potential predators which may threaten the species have been identified: opossum, raccoon, raven, crow, and Argentine ants (USFWS 2020). Domestic cats may be especially important due to the proximity of Pacific pocket mouse populations to human development and the impacts of cats on native wildlife. The petition also notes that red fox abundance is high within the species' range, and they are known to prey upon other mouse species. The petition discusses nonnative Argentine

ants and fire ants as a threat to the species because ants have been documented killing Pacific pocket mice in live-traps and could potentially kill young in burrows.

The petition states that Pacific pocket mouse is generally the smallest and least dominant species in its rodent community and appears to actively avoid larger rodent species. The petition also states that Pacific pocket mouse competes for seed resources with other rodent species and harvester ants and Argentine ants.

3.6 Existing Management

This section summarizes the information in the petition regarding the impact of existing management efforts on the species (Fish & G. Code, § 2072.3; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (d)(1)).

The petition discusses the impact of existing management efforts on the Pacific pocket mouse in the section titled "The Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms and Impact of Existing Management Efforts" on pages 43–55.

The petition describes the current regulatory mechanisms that may provide protections for the Pacific pocket mouse, including its status as an endangered species under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA); biological opinions between USFWS and MCBCP; consideration of the effects of Federal agency actions under the National Environmental Policy Act and Section 7 consultation under the ESA; natural resource management through the Department of the Navy; protection through provisions of the Clean Water Act; designation as a Species of Special Concern by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife; designation as a Species of Greatest Conservation Need under California's State Wildlife Action Plan; land and development and management guidance under the California Coastal Act; designation of the Dana Point Preserve as "conservation open space"; and the California Environmental Quality Act.

The petition also describes the current management efforts for Pacific pocket mouse, including the federal Recovery Plan; one (1) joint federal Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP)/state Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP); the Marine Corps Pendleton Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan; San Diego Gas & Electric NCCP; the MCBCP Pacific pocket mouse Management Plan; and Dana Point Preserve Draft Habitat Management Plan (however, the Draft Habitat Management Plan has not been fully implemented due to litigation with the City of Dana Point). Though not mentioned in the petition, the Department is aware that Pacific pocket mouse is also covered under the San Diego Multiple Habitat Conservation Program. The petition notes that other management efforts include the Pacific pocket mouse Working Group and a captive breeding and reintroduction program led by the San Diego Zoo Institute for Conservation Research, which includes crossbreeding populations to improve genetic diversity.

According to the petition, existing regulatory protections and management actions are insufficient to manage the species, as evidenced by the species becoming more endangered since it was listed and seen in the loss of the North Mateo Creek locality, increasing threats at other localities, and failure to establish new populations. The petition states that, while there is a federal Recovery Plan for the species with a predicted reclassification date in 2023, none of the down-listing or de-listing benchmarks for the species have been achieved. The petitioners also argue that previous justifications relied on by USFWS to not designate critical habitat are no longer relevant and additional protections under CESA are needed. The petitioners also argue that current regulatory mechanisms (e.g., Section 7 consultation) are not protecting the species as originally designed, which is indicated by continued "unauthorized impacts" to the species on MCBCP. According to the petition, even though MCBCP has committed to the Pacific pocket mouse Management Plan, implementation of the Plan is constrained by funding. The petition states that designation as an SSC by the Department has not provided significant protection for the species. Additionally, the petition notes that the Pacific pocket mouse is a covered species on an HCP/NCCP (County of Orange Central and Coastal Subregion HCP/NCCP), but the petitioners know of no funds specifically dedicated for the species in implementation of the NCCP. However, the Department has information that the NCCP has used funds for a variety of Pacific pocket mouse conservation measures including surveys, captive breeding, reintroductions, habitat restoration, and other efforts. Finally, the petition notes that while the captive breeding program has been successful in producing enough individuals to attempt reintroductions, the goal of establishing three new populations has not been achieved after seven years of reintroduction attempts and there is not an established self-sustaining population in the wild. The petition argues that these "inadequacies" of regulation mechanisms and management highlight that protections as a CESA-listed species are necessary for the species' survival.

3.7 Future Management

This section summarizes the information in the petition regarding suggestions for future management (Fish & G. Code, § 2072.3; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (d)(1)).

The petition makes suggests for future management in the section entitles "Recommendations" on pages 55–56.

The petition recommends eight (8) management and recovery actions for Pacific pocket mouse:

1. Prepare a recovery plan under CESA.
2. CDPR should develop and implement species-focused management plans for state park units within the species' range.

3. CDPR should seek to acquire habitat to establish new parks or natural reserves to protect and restore Pacific pocket mouse habitat and expand and connect existing properties to protect and restore the species' habitat.
4. The Department should expand cooperation with relevant federal agencies to protect Pacific pocket mouse habitat on federal lands.
5. The Department and USFWS should expand cooperation with state and federal agencies and public entities to implement agreements for Pacific pocket mouse introductions.
6. The Department should make recommendations to the City of Dana Point regarding sustainable public access at the Dana Point Preserve.
7. The Department should make recommendations to the City of Dana Point regarding improvements in its management and monitoring of the Pacific pocket mouse on its property adjacent to the Dana Point Preserve.
8. The Department should seek a transfer of the Conservation Easement for the Dana Point Preserve for the long-term benefit and management of the Pacific pocket mouse.

3.8 Availability and Sources of Information

This section summarizes the information in the petition regarding availability and sources of information (Fish & G. Code, § 2072.3; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (d)(1)).

The petition cites an extensive list of sources on pages 57–71. The Department referenced additional literature when developing this petition evaluation (see Literature Cited section).

4 OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO THE DEPARTMENT

Pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2073.5, the Department also evaluates petitions in relation to other relevant information the Department possesses or receives.

The Department possesses information related to the petitioned species that was not mentioned or cited in the petition. Time constraints do not allow for a comprehensive review of all information available at the petition evaluation stage of the CESA process; however, the Department evaluated readily available information and expertise.

Additional sources reviewed by the Department include:

- USFWS Recovery Plan for Pacific Pocket Mouse (USFWS 1998).

- 2024 USGS permit report summarizing survey efforts and results on MCBCP in 2024 (USGS 2024).
- Summary of mouse survey efforts on the Dana Point Preserve (2020–2024; CNLM 2025).
- Information relating to captive reared mouse release locations.
- Information related to NCCP and HCP and Pacific pocket mouse

To the extent the Department was able to review additional information in its possession as it relates to the petition, the Department concluded that none of the additional information constitutes countervailing information that wholly undercuts the conclusions in the petition at this juncture in the listing process. If the Commission accepts the petition for consideration, all reasonable attempts will be made by the Department to notify affected and interested parties and to solicit data and comments on the petitioned action (Fish & G. Code, § 2074.4). At that time, the Department will commence a review of the status of the species and produce a written peer-reviewed report, based upon the best scientific information available to the Department, which indicates whether the petitioned action is warranted (Fish & G. Code, § 2074.6).

5 SUFFICIENCY OF SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMISSION

The Department evaluated the petition components set forth in Fish and Game Code section 2072.3 and California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 670.1, subdivision (d)(1) for sufficiency of information pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2073.5. Based upon the information contained in the petition and other relevant information, the Department determined there is sufficient information to indicate that the petitioned action may be warranted (Fish & G. Code § 2073.5). Therefore, the Department recommends the Commission accept the petition for further consideration under CESA. If the Commission accepts the petition for further consideration, the Department will commence a review of the status of the species at that time pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2074.6 and California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 670.1, subdivision (f).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This petition evaluation was prepared by Austin Roy in the Department's Wildlife Branch.

LITERATURE CITED

Brehme, C.S., Matsuda, T.A., Adsit-Morris, D.T., Clark, D.R., Burlaza, M.A.T., Sebes, J.B., and Fisher, R.N., 2019, Track tube construction and field protocol for small mammal surveys with emphasis on the endangered Pacific pocket mouse (Perognathus longimembris pacificus): U.S. Geological Survey Techniques and Methods, book 2, chap. A15, 18 p., plus appendix, https://doi.org/10.3133/tm2A15.

Brehme, C. S., D. T. Adsit-Morris, T. K. Edgarian, and R. N. Fisher. 2022. Permit Report: Pacific pocket mouse monitoring results for 2021 on Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton. Draft Final. Prepared for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton.

Brehme, C.S., D.T. Adsit-Morris, T.K. Edgarian, and R.N. Fisher. 2023. Permit Report: Pacific pocket mouse monitoring results for 2022 on Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton. Draft Final. Prepared for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton.

California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). 2025. Special Animals List. Sacramento, CA.

Center for Natural Lands Management (CNLM). 2024. Update to Draft 2023 Habitat Management Plan for Public Access for the Dana Point Preserve (Draft 2023 HMP) (March 14, 2023).

Center for Natural Lands Management (CNLM). 2025. CNLM Dana Point Preserve Pacific pocket mouse Management Plan Final Summary Report (1 October 2020 – 30 September 2024). CAN: N62472-20-2-0018. CNLM Ref. G2036 & S057. Center for Natural Lands Management, Temecula, CA.

Godfrey, S. 2018. Spatial Distribution of the Endangered Pacific Pocket Mouse (*Perognathus longimembris* ssp. *pacificus*) Within Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat at Dana Point Headlands Conservation Area. University of Southern California.

Gulf South Research Corporation (GSRC), and San Diego Zoo Wildlife Alliance (SDZWA). 2022. Pacific Pocket Mouse Translocation Feasibility Study, Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, California. Prepared for Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, Environmental Security Department. Draft Report. 103 pp.

Merrill, K. C., M. A. Labbe, and D. L. Rogers. 2023. Draft 2023 Habitat Management Plan for Public Access for the Dana Point Preserve.

NatureServe. 2025. *Perognathus longimembris pacificus*. Available from: https://explorer.natureserve.org/Taxon/ELEMENT_GLOBAL.2.102167/Perognathus_longimembris_pacificus

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 1994a. Emergency Rule to List the Pacific Pocket Mouse as Endangered. Federal Register 59:5306-5310.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 1994b. Determination of Endangered Status for the Pacific pocket mouse. Federal Register 59:49752-49764.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 1998. Pacific Pocket Mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) Recovery Plan. Portland, OR.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2020. Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*) five-year review: summary and evaluation. Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office, Department of the Interior. 34 pp.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2025. Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*). Available from: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8080#:~:text=The%20Pacific%20pocket%20mouse%20ranges,of%20the%20Pacific%20pocket%20mouse. Accessed May 27, 2025.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). 2024. 2024 Annual Permit Report for U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Collecting Permit (Entity) and MOU: SCP838. Western Ecological Research Center, San Diego, CA.

Wilder, A.P., D.M. Shier, S.N.D. King, O. Dudchenko, E.R. Funk, A. Misuraca, M. Houck, W.B. Miller, C.J. Curry, H. Fronczek, R. Khan, R.N. Fisher, E.A. Lieberman, O.A. Ryder, and C.C. Steiner. *In prep*. Costs of inbreeding versus outbreeding depression in favor genetic rescue in the endangered Pacific pocket mouse. Unpublished manuscript. 17 pp.

PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS

Emily Gray. 2025. California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Petition Evaluation for the Pacific pocket mouse

Perognathus longimembris pacificus

Presentation to the California Fish and Game Commission

October 8, 2025

Austin Roy
Wildlife Branch

Presentation Overview

Status and Listing History

Petition Components

- Life History
- Range and Distribution
- Habitat
- Population Abundance and Trend
- Threats
- Existing and Future Management

Recommendation

Status and Listing History

Presumed extinct in 1970s

Federal ESA:

- Emergency listed after rediscovery in 1993
- Endangered in 1994

CESA Petition Received: March 25, 2025

Petitioners: Center for Biological Diversity

Life History

Small rodent

Short lifespan

Small home range

Short reproductive period

Burrow specialist

Orange County Register

Habitat

- Coastal sage scrub
  - Within 1 mile of coast
  - Native forbs and bunch grasses
  - Low vegetation cover
- Loose soils

Coastal Sage Scrub habitats

Range

- LA County to Mexico
  - "Extinct" in 1970's
- Re-discovered in 1993

Distribution & Abundance



Map provided by petitioner

Dana Point Preserve

12 ha; < 100 mice

Distribution & Abundance



Map provided by petitioner

Dana Point Preserve

12 ha; < 100 mice

South San Mateo

105 ha; ~1,000 mice

Distribution & Abundance



Map provided by petitioner

Santa Margarita



885 ha; ~2,600 mice

Dana Point Preserve

12 ha; < 100 mice

South San Mateo



105 ha; ~1,000 mice

Threats

- **Habitat**
  - Modification and destruction
  - Non-native vegetation and succession
  - Habitat management
  - Land-use
- **Small population size**
- **Climate change**
- Predation
- Competition

Military activities

Resource management

Recreation

Map provided by the petition

Current Management

Regulatory Mechanisms

- Federal ESA Protections
- Navy – Natural Resource Management Policy
- CA Species of Special Concern
- CEQA
- Conservation Open Space

Current Management

- Federal Recovery Plan
- Two (2) joint HCP/NCCP
- MCBCP PPM Management Plan
- Captive breeding program + Reintroductions
- CNLM land management activities

Recommended Future Management

- CESA recovery planning
- Species management planning
- Habitat acquisition and restoration
- Increase reintroduction efforts

Summary

- Small and isolated populations
- Ongoing and future threats
- Current regulation and management practices are not sufficient to stop extinction

Recommendation

In completing its Petition Evaluation, the Department has determined that the Petition **does provide sufficient scientific information** that the petitioned action to list the Pacific pocket mouse as threatened or endangered under the California Endangered Species Act **may be warranted**.

Thank you

Austin Roy
CESA Recovery Coordinator
wildlifemgmt@wildlife.ca.gov

Photo: J. Gilkeson

CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF
FISH &
WILDLIFE