

Timeline of Significant Events:

Date	Significant Event
May 2003	A Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is prepared for the Santa Maria Animal Shelter project which includes a field assessment of project impacts on the California Tiger Salamander (CTS). Both the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and California Fish & Game comment by letter on the potential for incidental take of the CTS and habitat loss. Due to their comments, it is decided to prepare an EIR instead of the MND for both the Santa Maria Animal Shelter and the Public Works Service Center that was being designed to be built on the Foster Road Campus.
January 2004	The County Board certifies the EIR for the two capital projects. The certification includes the need to make a Statement of Overriding Consideration for unavoidable adverse impacts to the CTS. 14 mitigation measures are applied to reduce the potential for impact. These measures include engaging a biologist to monitor the site during grading and trenching activities.
September 2004	The biologist hired by the County to monitor grading and trenching activities on the two capital projects allegedly finds a dead salamander in a utility trench serving the Public Works Service Center. Work is initially stopped on both capital projects, but eventually both capital projects were allowed to proceed to completion.
January 2005 – March, 2006	Conversations occur between General Services staff and USFWS Staff about preparing either a large-scale Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for the entire range of the CTS in North County, or a small-scale HCP that covers the County’s Foster Road Campus. These conversations eventually lead to the suggestion from USFWS staff that the County considers a Regional Conversation Strategy (RCP).
November 2005	<p>During ADMHS installation of a temporary modular building behind ADMHS building on the Foster Road Campus, which included trenching for utilities, the County reported a potential violation to USFWS.</p> <p>Discussions with USFWS staff continue regarding an RCP as an alternative to a large-scale HCP for the entire 190,000 acre range of the CTS in North County.</p>
March 2006	The County Board directs staff to pursue a Regional Conservation Strategy.
April 2007	The County Board forms a Conservation Steering Committee of various stakeholders to guide staff in development of the RCS.
August 2007	USFWS and County agree to disband the Conservation Steering Committee and the effort to pursue an RCS, and consider other options.
October 2007	The County receives a letter from the US Department of the Interior, Office of the Solicitor summarizing their investigation into the two alleged takes. The letter concludes: “In the Services view, the County’s activities have resulted in take of the California Tiger Salamander, in violation of the ESA. [Endangered Species Act]. Pursuant to the Act, the Service may assess civil penalties for violations of the ESA, and the Service has requested that this Office initiate the process for assessing penalties...Before proceeding with issuance of a Notice of Violation to the County, however, the Service would like to explore whether the County is interested in resolving this matter

	through negotiation.”
November 2007	Negotiations occur between County staff and USFWS staff in accordance with the proposal contained in the October 2007 letter.
March 2008 – June 2008	The County negotiates with USFWS to obtain suitable CTS habitat.
November 2008-September 2009	<p>Nov. 2008: USFWS provides County with possible properties of known CTS breeding/upland habitat in critical Habitat Units 1 (Western Santa Maria/Orcutt) and Unit 5 (La Purisima Hills) for which the dedication and granting of conservation easement may be acceptable to the USFWS. The County inspects over 10 different sites within critical Habitat Units 1 and 5 provided by USFWS. Each site had physical constraints or the property owner is not interested.</p> <p>Dec.2008: USFWS concurs with identifying preferable candidate sites for preservation within Unit 5 (La Purisima Hills).</p> <p>Jan. 2009: County sent letters to landowners and visited over 10 parcels within Unit 5 (La Purisima Hills). While these owners did express some interest in conveying a conservation easement, the CTS ponds and habitat on the properties had various constraints to be suitable habitat. Of the potential sites in Unit 5, County staff through conversations with one landowner, Sonia Anderson, and after several site visits, the County identified the subject property as a potential area for a conservation easement since the property included 1 Known Pond (Pond 33) and 2 Potential Ponds (Pond 48 and 49).</p> <p>May 2009: County proposed to USFWS Pond 48 to be acquired along with a buffer around the pond. USFWS and County staff visited the site to evaluate the area, specifically Ponds 33, 48, and 49.</p> <p>Aug. 2009: County and USFWS agree to an alternative suggested by County staff to acquire Pond 49 along with a buffer.</p> <p>Sept 2009: County informed USFWS of the landowner, Sonia Anderson willingness to enter into an agreement with County to purchase a conservation easement that would include Pond 49 and buffer.</p>
March 2010	County and USFWS negotiate a settlement.
June 2010	<p>County and USFWS enter into a Conditional Settlement Agreement to resolve any potential civil or criminal penalties. The County agrees to purchase an approximately 16-acre conservation easement in perpetuity, grant the easement to an approved third party, and perform restoration on the pond.</p> <p>The County continues negotiating with the Land Trust for Santa Barbara County (SBLT) to be the third party holder of the easement.</p>
November 2010	<p>The County Board authorizes a Purchase Agreement and the opening of Escrow for the purchase of the 16-acre easement in the amount of \$240,000. The Escrow is a three-party Escrow in which the easement to be conveyed to SBLT prior to the close of Escrow.</p> <p>Additionally, the County Board approves a Budget Revision in the Amount</p>

	of \$400,000 to pay for the easement, the restoration of the easement, and a one-time payment to the SBLT for perpetual management and preservation of the easement.
February 2011	The Executive Director of the SBLT informs the County that they cannot be the third party to hold the easement because the landowner's bank will not agree to subordinate the deed of the property to the easement. Under the SBLT Bylaws, conservation groups national policy doesn't allow such groups to hold conservation easement that have not been made senior in title.
April 2011	County seeks approval from USFWS for alternate approved third-parties to hold the conservation easement, including UCSB.
May 2011	USFWS is willing to pursue County's proposal of UCSB under certain conditions.
June 2011	<p>UCSB notifies County & USFWS they will not precede with project based on budgetary concerns by Regents.</p> <p>County staff met with Land Trust to discuss and review Conservation Easement language relating to subordination to lenders.</p> <p>USFWS agreed to allow County to temporary holding Conservation Easement and then transfer to a USFWS approved third-party at a later time. USFWS suggested County contact the California Rangeland Trust.</p>
July 2011	<p>As requested by USFWS, County contacted California Rangeland Trust to discuss the possibility of holder the Conservation Easement.</p> <p>SBLT sends County conditional letter of acceptance of the Conservation Easement.</p> <p>The County Board and USFWS agree to modified Purchase Agreement. In addition, USFWS insist that the Conservation Easement must be held by a third party, however, the County may hold the Conservation Easement temporarily until an approved third party is found.</p> <p>Escrow closes on purchase of the Anderson Conservation Easement.</p> <p>Limited, informal discussions continue with CRT to evaluate their interest in holding the easement should transfer to SBLT not work out.</p> <p>Discussions continue with SBLT to transfer the easement by January 2012.</p>
September 2011	County staff transmits elements of the Restoration, Management and Monitoring Plan to USFWS for approval
December 2011	CRT informs County they cannot accept the Conservation Easement if it could be extinguished or subordinated.
February 2012	County staff meet to discuss implementation of the Restoration Plan which was recognized to be initiated during the up-coming dry season
April 2012	County staff met with USFWS to discuss County permanently holding the Conservation Easement
July 2012	<p>County informs USFWS that restoration is planned for Fall 2012 and anticipated completion Dec. 2012.</p> <p>County receives Notice of Trustee's Sale from 2nd and 3rd Deed of Trust</p>

	holder.
August 2012	Trustee Sale date set for August 20, 2012. Property Owner files for bankruptcy.
September 2012	USFWS and County staff meet on site of Conservation Easement in preparation of the proposed Restoration project.
October 2012	USFWS concurred with Restoration start date in Oct., and County staff commenced the Restoration project without incident, and the monitoring and management of the Conservation Easement is on-going.
November 2012	4 th Deed of Trust informs County staff that he purchased the 2 nd and 3 rd Deed of Trust.
December 2012	Bankruptcy Court granted Relief from Stay Motion, allowing the property to be sold at foreclosure. County staff notified USFWS that Restoration project has been completed.
January 2013	Potential foreclosure of the 2 nd and 3 rd Deed of Trust is scheduled for March 11, 2013.
February 2013	County staff met with USFWS to explore alternate approaches for County to meet its obligations under the CSA. County staff continued to contact senior lien holders requesting discussion of subordination with regard to Conservation Easement, with no response from lenders.
March 2013	County staff received USFWS determination that the Restoration project was successfully conducted in accordance with the Restoration plan. 2 nd and 3 rd Deed of Trust holder discontinues March foreclosure.
April 2013	County staff completes the Spring quarter Monitoring Report.
May 2013	County Board adopts a Resolution of Necessity to re-acquire the Conservation Easement. County files a Lis Pendens on the subject property. County files an eminent domain action in the Santa Barbara Superior Court.
July 2013	County staff completes the Summer 2013 Quarterly Monitoring Report detailing minor maintenance of the irrigation system and restoration area.
October 2013	County staff completes the Fall 2013 Quarterly Monitoring Report showing maintenance and monitoring efforts, with additional plantings of native plants.
January 2014	County staff completes the Winter 2014 Quarterly Monitoring Report.
March 2014	County staff completes the Spring 2014 Quarterly Monitoring Report.
July 2014	County staff completes the Summer 2014 Quarterly Monitoring Report including a water sampling update.
October 2014	County staff completes the Fall 2014 Quarterly Monitoring Report noting that there was not enough rain to fill the restored pond.
January 2015	County staff completes the Winter 2014 Quarterly Monitoring Report noting that the native plant restoration continued to perform well.
February 2015	A jury verdict was reached in the Eminent Domain Case of <i>County of Santa Barbara v. Anderson et al</i> , with a verdict of \$87,562 as the value of the easement.
April 2015	County staff completes Spring 2015 inspection and quarterly report.

May 2015	Property owner appeals the trial court verdict.
July 2015	County staff completes Summer 2015 inspection and quarterly report.
October 2015	County staff completes Fall 2015 Quarterly Monitoring Report.
March 2016	The Second Appellate District Court affirmed the trial court's ruling in favor of the County. County staff completes the Winter 2015/Spring 2016 monitoring report.
June 2016	Final Order of Condemnation issued by the Court and recorded against the property.
October 2016	Meeting with SBLT to verify condition of the Conservation Easement and discuss terms of transfer.