

Appendix B

Summary of Quino Checkerspot Butterfly Habitat Assessments, Protocol Surveys, and Non-Protocol Sightings

Table A provides a detailed summary of the Quino checkerspot butterfly potential habitat and host plants which will either be impacted or conserved through each of the three projects. Note that Table A reflects the acreages presented in the Quino Checkerspot Butterfly Conservation Strategy and Framework Management Plan in Appendix C for the Proposed Project Amendment.

Summary of 2017, 2018, and 2019 Non-Protocol Sightings of Quino Checkerspot Butterfly

In addition to the Quino checkerspot butterfly (QCB) protocol surveys that HELIX conducted on behalf of the project applicant during 2015–2016, biologists from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and non-agency biologists accompanying the USFWS (collectively, “biologists”) made incidental observations of QCB individuals at or near the Development Footprints of the Approved Project and the EIR Land Exchange Alternative during the QCB “flight seasons” of 2017, 2018, and 2019.⁷ All of these sightings were addressed during the Final EIR process for the Approved Project.

Because the Proposed Project Amendment is a composite of portions of the Approved Project and the EIR Land Exchange Alternative, the 2017–2019 QCB sightings discussed below also reflect all QCB sightings during that period within the Development Footprint of the Proposed Project Amendment. In other words, the Proposed Project Amendment’s Development Footprint does not encompass any QCB sightings from 2017–2019 beyond those assigned to either the Approved Project Development Footprint or the EIR Land Exchange Alternative Development Footprint.

2017 Sightings

As disclosed in the Final EIR, in 2017, biologists sighted ~~eleven QCB in five at various~~ locations near, but not within, the Approved Project’s Development Footprint (a total of 11 butterflies were documented): four QCB immediately to the west of Proctor Valley Road (Figure 8i); one QCB east of Proctor Valley Road (Figure ~~8e~~8i); ~~two at least one~~ QCB at a location west of Village 14 (Figure ~~8n~~8h); one QCB at a location west of Planning Area 16 (Figure 8e); and three QCB at different locations west of PV1 (Figures 8h and 8n).

According to data in the Final EIR, the 2017 incidental surveys also included ~~six QCB sightings in two additional locations~~ within the Development Footprint for the EIR Land Exchange Alternative (a total of six additional butterflies): four QCB at one location immediately west of Proctor Valley Road and two QCB at a location east of Village 14.

Of the 2017 sightings described above for both the Approved Project and the EIR Land Exchange Alternative, only one location consisting of four QCB west of Proctor Valley Road (Figure 8i) occurred within the Development Footprint of the Proposed Project Amendment. Thus, as pointed out above, there were no QCB sightings within the Development Footprint of the Proposed Project Amendment beyond those already identified as having occurred within the respective Development Footprints of the Approved Project and/or the EIR Land Exchange Alternative. There were also two QCB locations documented in 2017 that were located in lands to be preserved in accordance with the Proposed Project Amendment, in the southern portion of PV-1 (Figure 8n) and in the central portion of R-16.

⁷ Note that the QCB sightings from 2017–2019 were not made pursuant to protocol surveys, nor did the biologists prepare formal survey reports identifying survey routes and areas covered.

2018 Sightings

As disclosed in the Final EIR, in 2018, biologists made a single incidental observation of ~~nine~~ at least one QCB immediately west of Proctor Valley Road (see Figure 8i). The sighting location is outside the Development Footprint of the Approved Project but within the Development Footprint of the EIR Land Exchange Alternative. This same sighting would be within the Development Footprint of the Proposed Project Amendment.

2019 Sightings

In 2019, biologists observed ~~nine~~ QCB in four locations near those where they had sighted QCB previously in 2017 and 2018 (a total of nine butterflies were documented). Specifically, the biologists sighted four QCB west of Proctor Valley Road, just west of the central portion of Village 14 (Figure 8i); two QCB west of Proctor Valley Road near the northwestern portion of Village 14 (Figure 8j); two QCB west of PV1 (Figure 8h); and one QCB south of Planning Area 16 (Figure 8e). As explained in memoranda submitted to the County of San Diego by the project's biologist (HELIX), each of these sightings occurred outside the Approved Project's Development Footprint, but within the Development Footprint of the EIR Land Exchange Alternative (see HELIX memoranda dated June 21, 2019, and June 24, 2019, submitted to the County of San Diego Development and Planning Services Department on behalf of the project applicant). ~~These same sightings. Three of the four locations would fall within the Development Footprint of the Proposed Project Amendment (i.e., the QCB sighting west of PV1 and not within the Development Footprint of the Proposed Project Amendment) as well. In addition, the USFWS documented a QCB larva within the southern portion of PV1 in December 2019; this additional location occurs within lands to be preserved in accordance with the Proposed Project Amendment.~~

Summary of 2017-2019 Sightings within the Proposed Project Amendment

While there were different numbers of QCB documented each year, the sightings occurred in consistent locations. In summary, QCB were documented in three locations within the Development Footprint of the Proposed Project Amendment between 2017-2019: northeastern portion of the Development Footprint (Figure 8e); west of Proctor Valley Road (Figure 8i), and east of Proctor Valley Road (Figure 8j). In addition between 2017-2019, QCB were documented in three additional locations within lands to be preserved as part of the Proposed Project Amendment: two locations within PV1 and one location within R-16.

For additional information on the 2017–2019 QCB sightings, please see Appendix A1, HELIX's memorandum dated June 20, 2019, re: 2019 QCB Data, and Appendix ~~A2B2~~, HELIX's memorandum dated June 24, 2019, in response to the Endangered Habitats League's late QCB comments. Both of these memoranda are herein incorporated by reference and attached hereto as Appendices ~~A1-B1~~ and ~~A2B2~~.

Table A. Summary of Quino Checkerspot Butterfly Habitat Assessments and Protocol Survey Data

Description	Proposed Project Amendment		Approved Project		EIR Land Exchange Alternative	
	Development Footprint	Conserved Footprint	Development Footprint	Conserved Footprint	Development Footprint	Conserved Footprint
Total Acres (All Habitat Types)						
Village 14	513.2	259.7	432.7	254.1	601.7	403.9
PA 16/19	25.3	91.0	278.4	150.7	0	113.5
LDA	N/A	N/A	12.6	82.7	N/A	N/A
Off sites	40.1	249.8	85.4	N/A	56.6	N/A
Conserved Open Space	0	24.5	0	72.4	N/A	N/A
Total^a	578.6	625.0	809.1	559.9	658.2	517.4
Predominant Habitat Acres (Percent of Project Area)						
Chamise Chaparral	355.9 (61%)	62.7 (10%)	249.6 (31%)	59.0 (11%)	431.6 (66%)	147.3 (28%)
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	132.8 (23%)	430.7 (69%)	432.6 (53%)	371.2 (66%)	142.7 (22%)	334.1 (65%)
Non-native Grassland	56.9 (10%)	56.4 (9%)	82.5 (10%)	29.7 (5%)	51.8 (8%)	23.2 (4%)
Southern Mixed Chaparral	3.2 (<1%)	56.1 (9%)	15.9 (2%)	85.0 (15%)	3.0 (<1%)	2.1 (<1%)
Other	29.8 (5%)	19.0 (3%)	28.4 (4%)	15.0 (3%)	29.0 (4%)	10.7 (2%)
Total^a	578.6	625.0	809.1	559.9	658.2	517.4
Non-surveyed Areas^c (Percent of Project Area)						
2016	46.2 (8%)	5.3 (<1%)	14.4 (2%)	6.2 (1%)	47.4 (7%)	7.3 (1%)
2015 ^b	157.3 (27%)	68.6 (11%)	118.6 (15%)	72.4 (13%)	214.0 (33%)	91.6 (18%)
Acreeage of Potential Quino Checkerspot Butterfly Habitat^d						
2016	529.3 <u>527.1</u> (91%)	620.0 <u>613.7</u> (99%)	794.7 (98%)	553.7 (99%)	610.8 (93%)	510.1 (99%)
2015	455.0 <u>421.3</u> (73%)	17.2 <u>556.4</u> (2,889%)	N/A ^b	N/A ^b	444.2 (67%)	425.8 (82%)

Table A. Summary of Quino Checkerspot Butterfly Habitat Assessments and Protocol Survey Data

Description	Proposed Project Amendment		Approved Project		EIR Land Exchange Alternative	
	Development Footprint	Conserved Footprint	Development Footprint	Conserved Footprint	Development Footprint	Conserved Footprint
Mapped Host Plant Acres (Cumulative Acres Based on HELIX 2016)						
Village 14	4.08	1.25	3.51	1.17	6.01	1.74
PA 16	0.08	0.01	0.74	0.04	0	0.05
PA 19	0	0	0	0	0	0
LDA	N/A	N/A	0.02	0.01	N/A	N/A
Conserved Open Space	N/A	0.81	N/A	1.08	N/A	N/A
Off sites	0.05	0.53	1.11	0	0.1	0
Total^a	4.21 acres scattered & patchy	2.60 acres scattered & patchy	5.38 acres scattered & patchy	2.30 acres scattered & patchy	6.11 acres scattered & patchy	2.12 scattered & patchy

- a. Totals may be off due to rounding.
- b. Planning Areas 16/19 were not included in the 2015 assessment. Of the 415 total acres evaluated by HELIX in 2015 for Village 14, 122.2 were deemed unsuitable and thus not included in protocol surveys. A total acreage of potential Quino checkerspot butterfly habitat is not provided since Planning Area 16/19 were not evaluated in 2015.
- c. Non-surveyed Areas are those areas where habitat was deemed unsuitable for Quino checkerspot butterfly (i.e., no physical or biological features for the species), and thus not included as a part of protocol survey.
- d. Potential habitat is defined as the Total Acres minus the Non-surveyed Areas and the 5.3 acres of Proctor Valley Road within the City of Chula Vista where Quino checkerspot butterfly is a covered species. The 613.7 acres of potential Quino checkerspot butterfly habitat within the Conserved Footprint does not include an isolated patch of Preserve which the Wildlife Agencies do not count towards conservation. Potential Habitat is the acreage that was surveyed for Quino checkerspot butterfly.