A-3.4 CALIFORNIA FISH AND WILDLIFE ATTACHMENT 4

Attachment 4
Email from Rob Cameron to City of Chula Vista and Wildlife Agencies referencing the Baldwin Agreement with Graphic Showing PV1, PV2, PV3 to “Add Preserve”
Comment Letters

from: "Rob Cameron"<rcameron@otayranch.com>
to: GLaube@ci.chula-vista.ca.us; mlundstedt@ci.chula-vista.ca.us; 
thelenee_brubaker@esd.ca.gov; Elucan@fig.ca.gov; Amber_Himes@esd.gov
subject: Quarry boundary Adjustment

time: 2/26/2009 4:12:43 PM

Thank you all for meeting with us last week to discuss the proposed MSFP boundary adjustment adjacent to the rock quarry. We are in the process of responding to all of your comments, but thought we would transmit a few of the more immediate items early. We have tried to briefly respond to some of the initial concerns you raised in our meeting.

1) With regard to the bio data, we are attaching exhibits that show (1) the survey boundaries and results from the Village Two/Three analyses conducted in 2003 and 2004; and (2) the survey boundaries and results from the 2007 surveys completed in conjunction with the CORR agency permits. For the areas outside these survey boundaries, we provided the species and vegetation data from the MSFP data set in the exhibits delivered to you previously. In this regard, please note - as we tried to explain in our meeting - that the MSFP data concluded that there were no species occupying the area that we are proposing to take, and there is no evidence to suggest that this area was included in the reserve due to the presence or densities of gnatcatchers within this portion of the Preserve. In addition, the more recent surveys show that gnatcatcher and other sensitive occurrences in and adjacent to the vegetation polygons that we are proposing to add to the Preserve. The 2007 survey, for example, shows gnatcatcher sightings in and around the .5 acre parcel of coastal sage in the southeast corner of the quarry property and in the vicinity of the 12.9 acre parcel of coastal sage land the western boundary of the quarry. Likewise, the 2003/2004 surveys show numerous special status plant species and a gnatcatcher sighting in the area adjacent to and within the Village 3 area that we are proposing to restore and add to the Preserve.

2) With regard to the RDV/LDA areas, you expressed concern that the location of the RDV/LDA areas might indicate that the original intent of the RDV was to preserve a corridor through this area and that the boundary adjustment might be compromising that intent. While you may be correct as to the original intent of the LDA, the preserve design in that area has, with the consent of the agencies, already been changed radically reducing the effectiveness of habitat connectivity in this area. When the LDAs were first established, they effectively served as an "entrance" into a 70 acre finger of the Preserve leading to the top of Rock Mountain (see attached RDV Preserve exhibit). In 1995, however, as a result of the "Baldwin Agreement," the USFWS, CDFG, City of Chula Vista and the County of San Diego, all agreed that this area was not a significant enough resource to preserve and, thus, agreed to eliminate...
70 acres from the Preserve and provide for development instead. Attached Baldwin Agreement exhibit]. What remains, even with the
is literally an appendage of the Preserve with a high edge to area, exposed to adverse indirect effects from an operating quarry
all the noise, air, dust and other effects associated with daily ing, trucking and crushing operations) and approved residential opment in Village 4. Connectivity with Rock Mountain is no longer
mulated as part of the Preserve.

...quite all of our conversations with the agencies over the years,
ve been informed that this isolated “sliver” of habitat is merely
ant, and is not deemed to be an important part of the Preserve. In
meetings — reiterating this position — we were told that the
es would prefer to support expansion of this quarry as a regional
rather than encouraging new quarries in other areas (e.g., Otay
. With this in mind, we hope you understand why we were somewhat
shock the other day by what we perceived to be hesitation on your
move forward with the boundary adjustment. This is, as we have
ized to you, a very important issue to us and — our self interest
involves a quarry that SANDAG and others have identified as a
cal asset for southern California as we move into the next decades.
e hopeful that all concerned will agree with the Dudek conclusion
the overall proposal significantly improves the design of the
rve while impacting, on a net basis, only 6 acres of poorly located
sage within our 11,375-acre Preserve.

l continue to put together a response to all of your comments,
ing the additional data and technical analyses you requested, and
hat to you as quickly as possible.

you again for all of your time the other day.