

**Recovery Plan for San Bruno Elfin Butterfly (*Callophrys mossii bayensis*) and Mission Blue Butterfly (*Icaricia icariodes missionensis*)**  
[\[Click here to view document\]](#)

**Original Approved: October 10, 1984**  
**Original Prepared by: USFWS Portland**

**RECOVERY PLAN AMENDMENT**

We have identified best available information that indicates the need to amend recovery criteria for this species since the recovery plan was completed. In this recovery plan modification, we reference the current criteria, document the criteria amendments and information we considered in drafting the criteria amendments, and add species-specific recovery actions designed to aid in the recovery. The criteria amendments are shown as an appendix that supplements the recovery plan, superseding only pages 43-46 (Part II: Recovery Outline and Prime Objective in the Step-down Outline) of the recovery plan.

**For**  
**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service**  
**Region 8**  
**Sacramento, California**  
**September 2019**

**METHODOLOGY USED TO COMPLETE THE RECOVERY PLAN AMENDMENT**

This amendment was prepared by the Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office (SFWO) of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) and was peer reviewed in accordance with the OMB Peer Review Bulletin following the publication of the Notice of Availability. We used information from our files, survey information and reports from monitoring and population augmentations at various localities of the species, and communication with species experts. Communication with species experts and information from monitoring reports were our primary sources used in this amendment. We developed the amended recovery criteria using the concepts described in the Species Status Assessment (SSA) framework (Service 2016), and framed the criteria in terms of the current threats to each species that are attributable to the Endangered Species Act's five listing factors. While a full SSA is beyond the scope of this recovery plan amendment, the Service used the SSA framework to consider what species need to maintain viability by characterizing the status of the species in terms of its resiliency, representation, and redundancy (Wolf *et al.* 2015).

### Resiliency

Resiliency describes the ability of populations to withstand stochastic events (arising from random factors). We can measure resiliency based on metrics of population health (*e.g.* population growth, numbers of individuals, demographic factors, etc.). Highly resilient populations are better able to withstand disturbances such as random fluctuations in reproductive rates (demographic stochasticity), variations in rainfall (environmental stochasticity), or the effects of anthropogenic activities.

### Representation

Representation describes the ability of a species to adapt to changing environmental conditions. Representation can be measured by the breadth of genetic or environmental diversity within and among populations and gauges the probability that a species is capable of adapting to environmental changes. The more representation, or diversity, a species has, the more capable it is to adapting to changes (natural or human-caused) in its environment. In the absence of species-specific genetic and ecological diversity information, we evaluate representation based on the extent and variability of habitat characteristics across the species' geographical range.

### Redundancy

Redundancy describes the ability of a species to withstand catastrophic events. Measured by the number of populations across the range of the species, as well as each population's resiliency, distribution, and connectivity, redundancy gauges the probability that the species has a margin of safety to withstand or the ability to bounce back from catastrophic events (such as a rare destructive natural event).

## **ADEQUACY OF RECOVERY CRITERIA**

Section 4(f)(1)(B)(ii) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) requires that each recovery plan shall incorporate, to the maximum extent practicable, "objective, measurable criteria which, when met, would result in a determination...that the species be removed from the list." Legal challenges to recovery plans (see *Fund for Animals v. Babbitt*, 903 F. Supp. 96 (D.D.C. 1995)) and a Government Accountability Audit (GAO 2006) also have affirmed the need to frame recovery criteria in terms of threats assessed under the five delisting factors.

### **Recovery Criteria**

See previous version of criteria in the original recovery plan on pages 43-45. [\[Click here to view document\]](#)

## **Synthesis**

### Overview

San Bruno elfin butterflies and mission blue butterflies are both small diurnally active and univoltine (one generation each year) butterflies. San Bruno elfin butterfly courtship, mating and reproduction are all carried out in the immediate space around the only known larval host plant,

stonecrop (*Sedum spathulifolium*), within coastal grassland and low scrub of north-facing slopes within the fog belt where the larval host plant grows. Typical habitat for mission blue butterfly is coastal scrubland and grassland vegetation that contains at least one of the three larval host plants: silver lupine (*Lupinus albifrons*), manycolored lupine (*L. varicolor*), and summer lupine (*L. formosus*). Adults have also been observed using the purple variety of yellow bush lupine (*L. arboreus*) for reproductive activities in the Marin headlands area (Crooker *in litt.* 2018). Adults feed on a variety of nectar flowers, but do not tend to wander far from areas containing the larval host plants.

### Spatial Distribution

The San Bruno elfin butterfly is restricted to San Mateo County. Here we use metapopulations to describe the spatial distribution. A metapopulation of San Bruno elfin butterflies is defined as a population of populations, referred to here as colonies. Sites occupied by San Bruno elfin butterflies and containing both host and nectar plants must be separated from each other by at least 100 m to count as separate colonies, but must be within 800 m of each other to facilitate connectivity. Distances within and between colonies are based on the average and maximum recorded distance of movements by San Bruno elfin butterflies (Arnold 1983, Service 1984). San Bruno elfin butterfly metapopulations occur on San Bruno Mountain, the Montara Mountain region, and Milagra Ridge. The original recovery plan refers to colonies in the Montara Mountain area at Whiting Ridge and Peak Ridge. The Montara Mountain region is now known to include colonies along the Bay Ridge Trail in the San Francisco Peninsula Watershed (SFPW; Service 2010a) and in Rancho Corral de Tierra (Bennett and Russo 2016a).

Mission blue butterflies occur in metapopulations throughout Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties. A metapopulation of mission blue butterflies is defined as a population of populations. Previous publications use both the terms “population” and “colony” (e.g., Service 2010a), but we use “population” here because the mission blue butterflies are not concentrated in discrete, persistent patches like the San Bruno elfin colonies. Habitat sites containing both host and nectar plants and occupied by mission blue butterflies that are separated from each other by at least 500 m are considered separate populations. Metapopulations consist of populations separated by a maximum nearest-neighbor distance of 2.5 km, or connected by stepping stones of suitable habitat with both host and nectar plants that are no more than 1 km apart. Separation distance between populations was chosen because most mission blue butterflies traveled less than 500 m during a mark-recapture study, while maximum nearest-neighbor distance is based on a documented dispersal event of 2.5 km by a female (Thomas Reid Associates 1982). Stepping stone habitat distance is based on similar requirements for the closely related Fender’s blue butterfly (*Icaricia icarioides fenderi*) (Service 2010b).

At the time of its listing in 1976, only two locations with metapopulations of mission blue butterflies were known: Twin Peaks in San Francisco County and San Bruno Mountain in San Mateo County. The original recovery plan also included a metapopulation in the Marin Headlands at Fort Baker in Marin County. Since then, additional metapopulations have been documented in San Mateo and Marin Counties (Service 2010a). In the Marin Headlands, mission blue butterflies are found west and north of Fort Baker (Coast Ridge Ecology 2017), and as far north as Oakwood Valley (Arnold and Lindzey 2003). In San Mateo County, the species’ range extends from Milagra Ridge through Sweeney Ridge and south through the SFPW (Service

2010a, Coast Ridge Ecology 2018). Additional observations of butterflies matching the mission blue butterfly phenotype have also been reported in both Marin and San Mateo Counties, including to the north and west of Oakwood Valley in Marin County (Bennett pers. comm. 2018, Wang 2018) and at Montara Mountain and Scarper Peak in San Mateo County (Arnold *in litt.* 2013).

Using the definitions of metapopulation and population as defined above (based on known movement and dispersal data), we realize that it can be difficult at times to define the exact spatial boundaries of metapopulations or to distinguish separate populations because habitat (e.g., lupine patches) has not been mapped across the species range, and because populations can blink in and out of occupancy. For example, mission blue butterflies were last seen at Sweeney Ridge in 1987 and are believed to be extirpated from that location (Bennett and Russo 2016b). Changes in mission blue butterfly occupancy or habitat conditions in the area from Milagra Ridge through the SFPW could change the number of metapopulations or populations throughout this area. The potential confusion in defining populations versus metapopulations is acknowledged when setting recovery targets for the species (see below).

Because there are no geographic barriers to movement defining the northern and southern limits of its range, transition zones may occur between the closely related mission blue butterfly and the pardalis blue butterfly (*I. i. pardalis*). The mission blue and pardalis blue butterfly subspecies are differentiated by phenotypic characteristics (Arnold and Lindzey 2003, Shapiro and Manolis 2007), although it is unclear if the differences in characters between the two subspecies are a result of genetic, environmental, or other factors. Subspecific status is best determined at the population level rather than the individual level. Oakwood Valley in Marin County has been proposed as a northern transition zone (Service 2010a). Phenotypes resembling each subspecies, as well as intermediate phenotypes, have been documented in this location, with most observations more closely matching the mission blue butterfly phenotype (Arnold and Lindzey 2003). Similarly, phenotypic observations suggest that butterflies matching the mission blue butterfly phenotype occur in the SFPW (Arnold *in litt.* 2018). Historically, specimens labeled as pardalis blue butterfly have been collected from the SFPW (Steiner 1990), but mission blue butterflies have been monitored in this region intermittently since 1977 and annually since 2001 (except for 2002; Arnold *in litt.* 2018, Service 2010a, Coast Ridge Ecology 2018). For now, we consider Oakwood Valley to be the northern extent of the species range and the SFPW to be the southern extent, with the spatial distribution to include populations as described above (Service 2010a). This spatial distribution includes the caveat that photographs of individual butterflies with intermediate phenotypes or more closely resembling the pardalis blue butterfly phenotype originate from Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties (Arnold and Lindzey 2003).

### Threats

Threats to the San Bruno elfin and mission blue butterflies can be categorized according to the five listing factors defined in section 4 of the Endangered Species Act. At the time of listing, threats to both species were centered on destruction, modification, or curtailment of habitat through private development (Factor A). Because the majority of the butterfly metapopulations are on publicly protected lands, suburban development and habitat fragmentation are no longer considered an imminent threat to the species, although populations on private land are still at risk of habitat loss from development (Service 2010a). Ownership of lands occupied by San Bruno

elfin and mission blue butterflies is summarized in the 5-year review (Service 2010a), with the exception of Rancho Corral de Tierra which is mostly on lands managed by the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) through the National Park Service (NPS). The Rancho Corral de Tierra metapopulation extends north of GGNRA's property boundary on privately held land.

The 2010 5-year review provided an updated assessment of threats for both the San Bruno elfin and mission blue butterflies (Service 2010a), all of which are still current. For mission blue butterflies, habitat degradation via encroachment of coastal chaparral, coastal scrub succession, and non-native grasses and associated thatch build-up is now considered the most serious threat (Factor E; Service 2010a). At San Bruno Mountain, historically home to the largest metapopulation of mission blue butterflies, grassland acreage has decreased from 1419 acres to an estimated 1180 acres because of encroachment or succession since the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) was approved in 1983 (Weiss *et al.* 2015). The San Bruno Mountain Habitat Management Plan estimated that grassland habitat was being converted to coastal scrub at a rate of 5 acres/year (TRA Environmental Sciences 2007). Public infrastructure projects (Factor A) are the most serious current threat to the San Bruno elfin butterfly, and also threaten the mission blue butterfly (Service 2010a). Additional threats to both species identified in the previous status review (Service 2010a) but that are new since the original recovery plan was published include: poaching (Factor B); parasitism of larvae (Factor C), potentially exacerbated by the presence of the Argentine ant which has the potential to disrupt the facultative myrmecophile (an animal that lives with ants) relationship between the butterflies and native ants; small population size (Factor E); and climate change (Factor E). Updated threats to the San Bruno elfin include non-native plants and grazing (Factor E), both listed in the original recovery plan for the mission blue butterfly but updated in the 2010 5-year review to include the San Bruno elfin butterfly as well.

Another major threat recognized in the status review for the mission blue butterfly is a fungal pathogen (*Colletotrichum lupini*) that primarily infects the host plant silver lupine, but may also affect other lupine species to a lesser extent (Factor A). The fungal pathogen has resulted in massive die-offs of silver lupine, especially in El Nino years. Following population declines correlated with the fungal pathogen, population augmentation of mission blue butterflies to Twin Peaks began in 2009 and to Milagra Ridge in 2017, with translocations moving butterflies from San Bruno Mountain to the populations being augmented (Wayne *et al.* 2009, GGNRA 2018). Lupine propagation through planting and seeding is being investigated by multiple partners as a way to diversify and augment host plant populations across the mission blue butterfly range.

Several threats have been recognized since publication of the last 5-year review. Pesticide use (Factor E) poses a potential threat to both species if used in proximity to occupied habitat (*e.g.* Varela *et al.* 2008, Service 2009). Vole herbivory (Factor A) threatens the host plants of the mission blue butterfly, with herbivory in some years causing severe declines in available lupine (Arechiga pers. comm. 2018, O'Brien pers. comm. 2018, Wayne pers. comm. 2018). Population monitoring may pose a threat to San Bruno elfin butterflies because of the potential for monitors to inadvertently damage habitat and/or host plants (Factor B)(Bennett and Russo 2016a, Arechiga pers. comm. 2018).

## **AMENDED RECOVERY CRITERIA**

Recovery criteria serve as objective, measurable guidelines to assist in determining when an endangered species has recovered to the point that it may be downlisted to threatened, or that the protections afforded by the Act are no longer necessary and the San Bruno elfin butterfly or mission blue butterfly may be delisted. Delisting is the removal of a species from the Federal Lists of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants (Lists). Downlisting is the reclassification of a species from an endangered species to a threatened species. The term “endangered species” means any species (species, sub-species, or distinct population segment) which is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range. The term “threatened species” means any species which is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

Revisions to the Lists, including delisting or downlisting a species, must reflect determinations made in accordance with sections 4(a)(1) and 4(b) of the Act. Section 4(a)(1) requires that the Secretary determine whether a species is an endangered species or threatened species (or not) because of threats to the species. Section 4(b) of the Act requires that the determination be made “solely on the basis of the best scientific and commercial data available.” Thus, while recovery plans provide important guidance to the Service, States, and other partners on methods of minimizing threats to listed species and measurable objectives against which to measure progress towards recovery, they are guidance and not regulatory documents.

Recovery criteria should help indicate when we would anticipate that an analysis of the species’ status under section 4(a)(1) would result in a determination that the species is no longer an endangered species or threatened species. A decision to revise the status of or remove a species from the Federal Lists of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants, however, is ultimately based on an analysis of the best scientific and commercial data then available, regardless of whether that information differs from the recovery plan, which triggers rulemaking. When changing the status of a species, we first propose the action in the *Federal Register* to seek public comment and peer review, followed by a final decision announced in the *Federal Register*.

Although the original recovery plan contains primary and secondary objectives and states when reclassification can be considered, it does not contain objective, measurable recovery criteria. Because the original objectives do not clearly define the terms “secure”, “colonies”, and “self-sustaining”, we are not carrying over any of the objectives verbatim in this amendment.

We provide both downlisting and delisting criteria for the San Bruno elfin butterfly and mission blue butterfly, which will supersede those included in the 1984 San Bruno Elfin & Mission Blue Butterfly Recovery Plan, as follows:

## **San Bruno elfin butterfly**

### **Downlisting Recovery Criteria**

#### **FACTOR A: Present or Threatened Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range**

Present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of the habitat or range of the San Bruno elfin butterflies due to private development projects no longer poses as serious of a threat to these species as they did at the time of listing (Service 2010a). Public infrastructure development, however, is a serious threat that may destroy, modify, or curtail the habitat or range of the species. Exotic invasive plants and habitat loss due to succession are considered with Factor E in order to be consistent with organization of the five-factor analysis in the 5-year review.

In order to downlist the San Bruno elfin butterfly to threatened status, threats to species' habitat must be reduced. This reduction will have been accomplished if the following have occurred:

- A/1 Sites supporting metapopulations of the San Bruno elfin butterfly across the historic range of the species (see E/1 below), including San Bruno Mountain, Milagra Ridge, and the Montara Mountain region, must be managed to ensure the maintenance of habitat that includes a diversity of nectar plants and the larval host plant *Sedum spathulifolium* and to control threats. Long-term maintenance of the sites must be financially sustainable. Use of herbicides, mowing, burning, or livestock grazing in management should be implemented with appropriate methods and timing to avoid impacts to the butterfly and its nectar and host plants.

#### **FACTOR B: Overutilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Educational Purposes**

Although poaching and damage to habitat during population monitoring are now considered to be threats to the San Bruno elfin butterfly populations, they are unlikely to be a significant factor in population decline and no new recovery criteria have been developed for this factor. However, please see "Site Specific Recovery Actions" for recommendations regarding San Bruno elfin butterfly population monitoring.

#### **FACTOR C: Disease or Predation**

Although insect parasitism and rodent predation of larvae are considered threats, they are unlikely to be significant factors in population decline and no new recovery criteria have been developed for this factor.

#### **FACTOR D: Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms**

The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms is not a current threat. Therefore, no new recovery criteria have been developed for this factor.

#### **FACTOR E: Other Natural or Manmade Factors Affecting Its Continued Existence**

The following other natural or manmade factors that may affect the continued existence of the species: small population size, exotic invasive plants, recreation impacts, climate change, habitat loss due to succession, and unintended pesticide drift. Robust and redundant occurrences are needed across the species range to ensure that the species persists in light of these threats. This will have been accomplished when the following have occurred:

- E/1** Sites support metapopulations across the historic range of the species, including San Bruno Mountain, Milagra Ridge, and the Montara Mountain region. San Bruno Mountain must include a minimum of 7 colonies, the Montara Mountain region must include a minimum of 5 colonies (including Peak Mountain and Whiting Ridge), and Milagra Ridge must include a minimum of 2 colonies.<sup>1</sup> Each of these metapopulations must contain an average of at least 30 adults with a stable or increasing population trend for a minimum of 10 years.<sup>2</sup>
- E/2** Habitat patches in sites supporting colonies in E/1 have a stable or increasing areal extent over the same 10-year period of population growth.<sup>3</sup>

### **Delisting Recovery Criteria**

The San Bruno elfin butterfly will be considered for delisting<sup>4</sup> when, in addition to the downlisting criteria:

#### **FACTOR A: Present or Threatened Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range**

No additional recovery criteria have been established for this factor.

#### **FACTOR B: Overutilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Educational Purposes**

No additional recovery criteria have been established for this factor.

---

<sup>1</sup> The original recovery plan stated as a primary objective that “Secure, self-sustaining colonies of this species are established and/or re-established on Milagra Ridge, Montara Mountain, Peak Mountain, and Whiting Ridge, and colonies on San Bruno Mountain are secure. Numbers of colonies necessary for reclassification of the San Bruno elfin butterfly to threatened are 7 on San Bruno Mountain, 5 on Montara Mountain (including Peak Mountain and Whiting Ridge), and 2 on Milagra Ridge.” Note that SFPW monitoring includes subpopulations along Whiting Ridge and Fifield Ridge, which were originally lumped with Montara Mountain. Multiple colonies within metapopulations are recommended to ensure redundancy.

<sup>2</sup> This is the number of adults considered necessary for resiliency in a congener (member of the same genus), the frosted elfin butterfly (*Callophrys irus*) (Service 2018). A stable or increasing population trend over a 10-year period is recommended for another member of the Lycaenidae family, the Fender’s blue butterfly (Service 2010b), and also among other butterfly families (e.g. Behren’s silverspot butterfly *Speyeria zerene behrensii* (Service 2015)).

<sup>3</sup> This criterion helps to protect against scrub encroachment.

<sup>4</sup> The original recovery plan stated that: “Delisting of these species will be contingent upon protection, maintenance, and/or expansion of current colonies and establishment of additional colonies.”

### **FACTOR C: Disease or Predation**

No additional recovery criteria have been established for this factor.

### **FACTOR D: Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms**

No additional recovery criteria have been established for this factor.

### **FACTOR E: Other Natural or Manmade Factors Affecting Its Continued Existence**

- E/1 The metapopulations at San Bruno Mountain, Milagra Ridge, and the Montara Mountain regions must include on average a minimum of 18, 3, and 7 occupied colonies, respectively, with overall stable or increasing population trends over a 20-year period.
- E/2 Habitat patches in sites supporting colonies in E/1 have a stable or increasing areal extent over the same 20-year period of population growth.<sup>5</sup>

### **Mission blue butterfly**

#### **Downlisting Recovery Criteria**

### **FACTOR A: Present or Threatened Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range**

Although the reduction and fragmentation to habitat is no longer the primary threat to mission blue butterflies, public infrastructure development and private development are current threats to the species. Additionally, a fungal pathogen that primarily affects the host plant silver lupine, and vole herbivory of the host plants, are threats to species habitat. Modification of habitat through coastal scrub succession and non-native grass invasion are considered in Factor E. In order to downlist the mission blue butterfly to threatened status, threats to species' habitat must be reduced. This reduction will have been accomplished if the following have occurred:

- A/1 Sites supporting metapopulations of the mission blue butterfly (see E/1 below) must be managed to ensure the maintenance of habitat that includes host plants and a diversity of nectar plants. Sites shall have in place a management plan approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that supports grasslands and controls other threat to the species and its habitat. Long-term maintenance of the sites must be financially sustainable. Management tools including herbicides, mowing, burning, or livestock grazing should be implemented with appropriate methods and timing to avoid impacts to the butterfly and its nectar and host plants.
- A/2 Monitoring must determine that all mission blue butterfly metapopulation sites support populations of both silver and summer lupine (*Lupinus albifrons* and *L. formosus*), including a variety of size and/or age classes.<sup>6</sup> In some localities, habitat and/or microclimate is not appropriate for both of these species, and the presence of alternate

---

<sup>5</sup> This criterion helps to protect against scrub encroachment.

<sup>6</sup> Species experts recommended multiple species of lupine as necessary for recovery.

lupine species may be more appropriate, as determined by property managers. Monitoring over a 15-year period<sup>7</sup>, which includes at least two years that have above average local spring rainfall<sup>8</sup>, must demonstrate natural recruitment of both lupine species and an average of 250 lupine plants/hectare.<sup>9</sup> Mission blue butterflies must be documented using both species of lupine.<sup>10</sup>

**A/3** Suitable habitat has a minimum of 250 nectar plants/hectare.<sup>11</sup>

### **FACTOR B: Overutilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Educational Purposes**

Although poaching is now considered a threat to the mission blue butterfly populations, it is unlikely to be a significant factor in population decline and no new recovery criteria have been developed for this factor. However, we recommend captive breeding to ensure source stock for population augmentation, as discussed below in “Site Specific Recovery Actions.”

### **FACTOR C: Disease or Predation**

Although insect parasitism and rodent predation of larvae are considered threats, they are unlikely to be significant factors in population decline and no new recovery criteria have been developed for this factor. Parasitism of larvae may be exacerbated by the presence of Argentine ants, which have been documented in the Marin Headlands (Service 2010a) and on San Bruno Mountain (TRA Associates 2007). The extent and effects of the Argentine ant invasion on mission blue butterfly populations are poorly understood (Service 2010a), and for this reason we do not include criteria associated with this potential threat at this time (with the caveat that emerging evidence of negative impacts from the Argentine ant invasion may necessitate criteria in the future).

### **FACTOR D: Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms**

The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms is not a current threat. Therefore, no new recovery criteria have been developed for this factor.

### **FACTOR E: Other Natural or Manmade Factors Affecting Its Continued Existence**

The following other natural or manmade factors that may affect the continued existence of the species: small population size, exotic invasive plants, recreation impacts, climate change, habitat

---

<sup>7</sup> A 15-year period showing a stable population is recommended for threatened congeners (member of the same genus) Kincaid’s lupine (*Lupinus sulphureus* ssp. *kincaidii*) (Service 2010b) and Tidestrom’s lupine (*L. tidestromii*) (Service 1998).

<sup>8</sup>The criterion specifies at least two years with above average rainfall because the fungal pathogen that threatens silver lupine is most prevalent following wet, El Niño years.

<sup>9</sup> Recommended lupine cover in the habitat restoration guidelines in the San Bruno Mountain Habitat Management Plan is 2.5% over 0.125 acre or 100 plants in high quality patches, with approximately one high quality patch per acre (TRA Environmental Sciences 2007). This translates to 250 plants/hectare. Maintaining a healthy population of host plants will help to protect against threats posed by non-native grasses.

<sup>10</sup> Using multiple host plants will add to population representation.

<sup>11</sup> This is the approximate recommended number of nectar plants in the San Bruno Mountain Habitat Management Plan, which specifies that there should be 100 nectar plants/acre (TRA Environmental Sciences 2007). Nectar flower abundance is also a criterion for the closely related Fender’s blue butterfly (Service 2010b).

loss due to succession, unintended pesticide drift. Habitat loss due to succession is widely considered the most serious threat to the species. Robust populations are needed across the species range to ensure that the species persists in light of these threats. This will have been accomplished when the following have occurred:

- E/1** Metapopulations are maintained or re-established in suitable habitat within the historical range of the species, including at least one metapopulation each in Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties.<sup>12</sup> The San Mateo County metapopulation must be maintained on San Bruno Mountain contain populations across Guadalupe Hills, Southeast Ridge, Radio Ridge, and Reservoir Hill.<sup>13</sup> The metapopulation in Marin County must contain at least three populations.<sup>14</sup>
- E/2** Patches of suitable habitat must be at least 6 hectares (15 acres)<sup>15</sup> to support each of the populations designated in E/1. Patches of occupied suitable habitat of this size that are contiguous to each other may also satisfy the numerical target for number of populations as defined in E/1 for metapopulations in Marin and San Francisco Counties (but see specific location requirements for San Bruno Mountain). Component habitat features (e.g., host plants, nectar plants) within each patch of suitable habitat must be free of barriers to movement between them. Suitable habitat patches must have stable or increasing grassland acreage over at least a 25-year period, with management focused on maintaining larger habitat patches. For each site, woody vegetation should make up no more than 15 percent of the absolute vegetative cover at the metapopulation level.<sup>16</sup> San Bruno Mountain must have a minimum of 1200 acres of grassland as designated in the Habitat Management Plan (TRA Environmental Sciences 2007).
- E/3** Population viability analysis determines that mission blue butterflies have a 90% probability of persistence over a 25-year period across all three counties of the historic range as referred to in E/1.<sup>17</sup> Probability of persistence may be based on varying numbers of metapopulations or populations within each county.

---

<sup>12</sup> The original recovery plan stated that “*Reclassification of the mission blue butterfly to threatened status can be considered when secure, self-sustaining colonies of this species are established and/or reestablished on Twin Peaks and Fort Baker (one colony at each site) and when colonies on San Bruno Mountain (as noted in the HCP) are secure.* Multiple metapopulations across the species range ensures redundancy.

<sup>13</sup> These San Bruno locations are mentioned as colony locations necessary for reclassification in the primary objective of the original recovery plan (Service 2010a). San Bruno Mountain is specified within San Mateo County because it is central in the historic range of the species and is listed in the original recovery plan.

<sup>14</sup> Having multiple populations ensures redundancy. Multiple populations are not required in San Francisco County because of the small areal amount of suitable habitat.

<sup>15</sup> This is the minimum patch size for an isolated population to persist in the absence of immigration from other patches in the Fender blue butterfly Recovery Plan, based on a conservative approach to studies showing a minimum patch size of 2-6 hectares (Service 2010b).

<sup>16</sup> Limiting woody vegetation to 15 percent absolute vegetative cover is part of the habitat quality guidelines for the closely related Fender’s blue butterfly (Service 2010b).

<sup>17</sup> Population viability analysis can be used to determine minimum or average population sizes to ensure persistence. This criteria is modelled after methodology used to develop minimum population sizes necessary for recovery of the closely related Fender’s blue butterfly (*Icaricia icarioides fenderi*)(Service 2010b). This probability of persistence was chosen to ensure resiliency, and can be based on different monitoring protocols including, but not limited to, surveys of various life stages or to detect occupancy.

## **Delisting Recovery Criteria**

All downlisting criteria remain applicable for delisting, and are to be extended to include the populations mentioned in delisting criterion A/1. The mission blue butterfly will be considered for delisting<sup>18</sup> when, in addition to the downlisting criteria:

### **FACTOR A: Present or Threatened Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range**

No additional recovery criteria have been established for this factor.

### **FACTOR B: Overutilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Educational Purposes**

No additional recovery criteria have been established for this factor.

### **FACTOR C: Disease or Predation**

No additional recovery criteria have been established for this factor.

### **FACTOR D: Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms**

No additional recovery criteria have been established for this factor.

### **FACTOR E: Other Natural or Manmade Factors Affecting Its Continued Existence**

**E/1** Metapopulations are maintained or re-established in suitable habitat within the historical range of the species, including at least one additional metapopulation in Marin County<sup>19</sup> and three additional metapopulations in San Mateo County.<sup>20</sup> The additional metapopulations in San Mateo County must be at locations other than San Bruno Mountain<sup>21</sup>.

**E/2** Population viability analysis determines that mission blue butterflies have a 95% probability of persistence in Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties over a 100-year period. Probability of persistence may be based on varying numbers of metapopulations or populations.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> The original recovery plan states that “*Delisting of these species will be contingent upon protection, maintenance, and/or expansion of current colonies and establishment of additional colonies.*”

<sup>19</sup> The current range of mission blue butterflies is considered to include populations in the Marin Headlands in addition to Fort Baker, as well as a population in Oakwood Valley (Service 2010a). Observations in other locations (e.g. Tennessee Valley) suggest that other areas in the county may support mission blue butterflies.

<sup>20</sup> Mission blue butterflies have been documented in San Mateo County at Milagra Ridge, Sweeney Ridge, and the SFPW, which could all support metapopulations.

<sup>21</sup> Having multiple metapopulations ensures redundancy. Having contiguous occupied habitat outside of San Bruno Mountain which satisfies the patches sizes as defined in downlisting criteria E/2 to meet the total number of habitat for this requirement may also satisfy this criteria (three patches of at least 6 hectares (15 acres) per metapopulation).

<sup>22</sup> Population viability analysis can be used to determine minimum or average population sizes to ensure persistence. This criteria is modelled after methodology used to develop minimum population sizes necessary for recovery of the closely related Fender’s blue butterfly (*Icaricia icarioides fenderi*)(Service 2010b). This probability of persistence was chosen to ensure resiliency.

All classification decisions consider the following five factors: (1) is there a present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of the species' habitat or range; (2) is the species subject to overutilization for commercial, recreational scientific or educational purposes; (3) is disease or predation a factor; (4) are there inadequate existing regulatory mechanisms in place outside the ESA (taking into account the efforts by states and other organizations to protect the species or habitat); and (5) are other natural or manmade factors affecting its continued existence. When delisting or downlisting a species, we first propose the action in the *Federal Register* and seek public comment and peer review. Our final decision is announced in the *Federal Register*.

### **Rationale for Recovery Criteria**

We have amended the recovery criteria for the San Bruno elfin butterfly and mission blue butterfly to include objective, measurable downlisting and delisting criteria that incorporate the biodiversity principles of resiliency, redundancy, and representation (Service 2016) and threats addressed under the five factors. The amended criteria were developed based on the Service's current understanding of the species needs and requirements. This understanding includes information gathered since the original recovery plan was published, such as more recent information about population status and trends, along with an updated understanding of the threats acting on the species, as summarized in the synthesis above. The criteria presented are based on the reduction of threats to the species, and they include a temporal aspect to ensure that the species are resilient to expected variation within a reasonable time frame.

### **ADDITIONAL SITE SPECIFIC RECOVERY ACTIONS**

Actions identified in the step-down outline in the original recovery plan are still applicable towards meeting these amended recovery criteria. In certain cases, actions may be expanded to include more recently discovered San Bruno elfin butterfly colonies and mission blue butterfly populations.

The actions identified below are those that, based on the best available science, are necessary to bring about the recovery of the listed species in this amendment and ensure their long-term conservation. However, these actions are subject to modification as might be indicated by new findings, changes in species status, and the completion of other recovery actions.

#### Key to Terms and Acronyms Used in the Recovery Action Narrative and Implementation Schedule:

Priority numbers are defined per Service policy (Service 1983) as:

- Priority 1:** An action that must be taken to prevent extinction or to prevent a species from declining irreversibly.
- Priority 2:** An action that must be taken to prevent a significant decline of the species population/habitat quality or some other significant negative impact short of extinction.
- Priority 3:** All other actions necessary to provide for full recovery of the species.

The priority assigned to each action is specified within parentheses at the end of the description.

The numeric recovery priority system follows that of all Service recovery plans. Because situations change over time, priority numbers must be considered in the context of past and potential future actions at all sites. Therefore, the priority numbers assigned are intended to guide, not to constrain, the allocation of limited conservation resources.

- 1. Establish captive breeding of mission blue butterflies at a captive breeding facility.** This action will assist in the recovery of mission blue butterflies by further protecting existing populations and allowing for population augmentation in an effort to maintain and re-establish self-sustaining populations to persist in the long-term. (Priority 1)
- 2. Conduct a population genetics study of the mission blue butterfly across the proposed range.** This study will aid in genetic management at the captive breeding facility, and can more clearly define the boundaries of the species range. (Priority 3)
- 3. Conduct population viability analyses for metapopulations of the mission blue butterflies.** This action will assist in the recovery for the species by determining the target populations, minimum populations, or occupancy at each population or metapopulation site needed to achieve recovery criteria. (Priority 3)
- 4. Coordinate among habitat managers and regulatory agencies to establish recommended San Bruno elfin butterfly monitoring protocols.** Concern about damage to host plants and habitat should be considered when determining monitoring activities and frequency. (Priority 3)
- 5. Investigate biology of San Bruno elfin butterflies to guide population estimates.** Studies on oviposition rates and larval survival will help determine how to estimate adult populations from larvae monitoring. (Priority 3)
- 6. Develop lupine propagation methods through seeding across the range of the mission blue butterfly.** Lupine diversification research and techniques are important for successfully establishing multiple lupine host plant species at all sites. (Priority 2)

## LITERATURE CITED

- Arnold, R. A. 1983. Ecological studies of six endangered butterflies (Lepidoptera, Lycaenidae): island biogeography, patch dynamics, and design of habitat preserves. University of California Publications in Entomology 99:1-161.
- Arnold, R. A. and S. Lindzey. 2003. Taxonomic identity of the *Plebejus icarioides* population at Oakwood Valley, Marin County, California. National Park Service Report, Golden Gate National Recreation Area.
- Bennett and Russo 2016a. 2016 San Bruno elfin butterfly survey: Montara Mountain—Rancho Corral de Tierra. Unpublished report prepared by the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.
- Bennett and Russo 2016b. 2016 Mission blue butterfly survey: Sweeney Ridge—Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Unpublished report prepared by the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.
- Coast Ridge Ecology. 2017. 2017 survey results for mission blue butterfly at Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Marin Headlands, CA. Unpublished report prepared for Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy, San Francisco, CA.
- GGNRA 2018. 2018 Mission Blue Butterfly Translocation Project Summary. Unpublished report prepared for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Fund for Animals v. Babbitt, 903 F. Supp. 96 (D.D.C. 1995). U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. September 29, 1995.
- (Service) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1983. Endangered and threatened species listing and recovery priority guidelines. Federal Register 48: 43098-43105.
- (Service) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1984. Recovery plan for the San Bruno elfin and mission blue butterflies. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon. 81 pp.
- (Service) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998. Seven coastal plants and the Myrtle's silverspot butterfly recovery plan. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon. 141 pp.
- (Service ) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2003. Final recovery plan for the Karner blue butterfly (*Lycaeides melissa samuelis*). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Fort Snelling, Minnesota. 273 pp.
- (Service) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2009. Intra-service biological opinion on the amendment to the San Bruno Mountain Habitat Conservation Plan. Service file 81420-2008-F-0946. Dated May 20, 2009.
- (Service) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2010a. San Bruno elfin butterfly (*Callophrys mossii bayensis*) and mission blue butterfly (*Icaricia icarioides missionensis*) 5-year review: Summary and evaluation. Sacramento Field Office, Sacramento, CA.

- (Service) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2010b. Recovery plan for the prairie species of Western Oregon and Southwestern Washington. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon. xi + 241 pp.
- (Service) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2015. Recovery plan for Behren's silverspot butterfly (*Speyeria zerene behrensii*). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Pacific Southwest Regional Office, Region 8, Sacramento, California. xi + 95 pp.
- (Service) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2016. USFWS Species Status Assessment Framework: an integrated analytical framework for conservation. Version 3.4 dated August 2016.
- (Service) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2018. Species status assessment report for the frosted elfin (*Callophrys irus*). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Cortland, NY. Version 1.2. April 2018.
- Steiner, J., 1990. Bay area butterflies: The distribution and natural history of the San Francisco region Rhopalocera. Master's thesis. California State University at Hayward.
- TRA Environmental Sciences. 2007. San Bruno Mountain Habitat Management Plan. Prepared for the County of San Mateo.
- U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2006, April). Endangered species: Time and costs required to recover species are largely unknown (Publication No. GAO-20548).
- Varela, L.G., M.W Johnson, L. Strand, C.A. Wilen, and C. Pickel. 2008. Light brown apple moth's arrival in California worries commodity groups. California Agriculture 62: 57-61.
- Wang, T. 2018. 2018 Mission blue butterfly (*Icaricia icarioides missionensis*) monitoring report. Unpublished report prepared for Mariner's Pointe Owner's Association. Pacific, California.
- Weiss, S.B., Naumovich L. and C. Niederer. 2015. Assessment of the past 30 years of habitat management and covered species monitoring associated with the San Bruno Mountain habitat conservation plan. Prepared for the San Mateo County Parks Department.
- Wolf, S., B. Hartl, C. Carroll, M. C. Neel, and D. Greenwald. 2015. Beyond PVA: Why recovery under the endangered species act is more than population viability. BioScience 65: 200-207.

### **Personal Communication**

- Arechiga, R. 2018. Natural Resource Manager, San Mateo County Parks and Rec. Phone calls with Samantha Lantz, Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office. July 23 and August 22, 2018.
- Arnold, R. 2018. Entomologist, Entomological Consulting Services, Ltd. Phone call with Samantha Lantz, Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office. July 13, 2018

Bennett, S. 2018. Biologist, WRA, Inc. Phone call with Samantha Lantz, Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office. August 16, 2018.

O'Brien, L. 2018. Amateur lepidopterist. Phone call with Samantha Lantz, Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office. July 13, 2018.

Wayne, L. 2018. Natural Areas Manager, San Francisco Recreation & Parks. Phone call with Samantha Lantz, Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office.

*In litteris* communication

Arnold, R. 2013. Entomologist, Entomological Consulting Services, Ltd. Email to Ben Solvesky, Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office. July 7, 2013.

Arnold, R. 2018. Entomologist, Entomological Consulting Services, Ltd. Email to Samantha Lantz, Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office. September 5, 2018.

Crooker, C. 2018. Restoration Manager, Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy. Email to Samantha Lantz, Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office. August 16, 2018.

## **APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF PUBLIC, PARTNER, AND PEER REVIEW COMMENTS RECEIVED**

### **Summary of Public Comments**

We published a notice of availability in the *Federal Register* on June 27, 2019 (84 FR 30760) to announce that the draft recovery plan amendment was available for public review, and to solicit comments by the scientific community, State and Federal agencies, Tribal governments, and other interested parties on the general information base, assumptions, and conclusions presented in the draft revision. An electronic version of the draft amendment was posted on the Service's Species Profile website

([https://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery\\_plan/dAPG%20amendment%20Mission%20blue%20and%20San%20Bruno%20elfin%20butterflies.pdf](https://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plan/dAPG%20amendment%20Mission%20blue%20and%20San%20Bruno%20elfin%20butterflies.pdf)). We also developed and implemented an outreach plan that included (1) publishing a news release on our webpage (<https://www.fws.gov/sacramento/outreach/2019/06-26/>) on June 26, 2019, (2) sending specific notifications to Congressional contacts in Districts 2, 12, and 14, and (3) sending specific notifications to key stakeholders in conservation and recovery efforts. These outreach efforts were conducted in advance of the *Federal Register* publication to ensure that we provided adequate notification to all potentially interested audiences of the opportunity to review and comment on the draft amendment.

We received one response from a Federal agency.

Public comments ranged from providing minor editorial suggestions to specific recommendations on plan content. We have considered all substantive comments; we thank the reviewer for these comments and to the extent appropriate, we have incorporated the applicable information or suggested changes into the final recovery plan amendment. In general, these comments did not lead to significant changes in the draft plan. Below, we provide a summary of public comments received; however, some of the comments that we incorporated as changes into the recovery plan amendment did not warrant an explicit response and, thus, are not presented here. We also provided copies of all comments received during the formal public comment period to all relevant Federal agencies for their consideration prior to implementation of the final recovery plan amendment, in accordance with section 4(f)(5) of the Endangered Species Act (Act).

### **Summary of Peer Review Comments**

We solicited independent peer review between the draft and final amendment in accordance with the requirements of the Act from species experts and local partners. Criteria used for selecting peer reviewers included their demonstrated expertise and specialized knowledge related to the species. The qualifications of the peer reviewers are in the decision file and the administrative record for this recovery plan amendment.

In total, we solicited review and comment from four peer reviewers. We received comments from three peer reviewers. Peer reviewers that responded included representatives from one non-governmental organization (NGO) and two species experts. In general, the draft recovery plan amendment was well-received by the peer reviewers and garnered positive comments. Several

reviewers provided additional specific information, as noted below; we thank the reviewers for these data and we have added the information where appropriate.

We considered all substantive comments, and to the extent appropriate, we incorporated the applicable information or suggested changes into the final recovery plan amendment. Below, we provide a summary of specific comments received from peer and partner reviewers with our responses; however, we addressed many of the reviewers' specific critiques and incorporated their suggestions as changes to the final recovery plan amendment. Such comments did not warrant an explicit response, and as such, are not addressed here. We appreciate the input from all commenters, which helped us to consider and incorporate the best available scientific and commercial information during development and approval of the final recovery plan amendment.

***Peer Review:***

*Peer Review Comment (1):* One peer reviewer provided new information on the geographic extent and land management of a population of San Bruno elfin butterflies at Rancho Corral de Tierra.

*Response:* We have incorporated this information under the Threats section. Information about land management was presented in the context of development and fragmentation as threats to the species, and the majority of the species' metapopulations are still located on publicly protected lands.

*Peer Review Comment (2):* One peer reviewer and one partner commented on mission blue butterfly downlisting criteria A/2 with questions about the lupine requirements. Specifically, they both questioned at what level (population or metapopulation) the two lupine species needed to be present. One peer reviewer and one partner both commented that not all sites are suitable for both silver and summer lupine. Another peer reviewer stressed that our current understanding of lupine numerical goals should be considered as preliminary, pending better data, and that some isolated mission blue butterfly populations may persist in areas with lower lupine numbers.

*Response:* We have clarified the criteria to specify that two species of lupine must be present at the metapopulation level. We have further modified the criteria such that at some sites the presence of alternate lupine species may fulfill this criteria, in accordance with habitat assessments by land managers. We based our lupine numerical targets on guidance in the San Bruno Mountain Habitat Management Plan.

*Peer Review Comment (3):* One peer and one partner reviewer found the description and usage of the terms "metapopulation" and "population" for mission blue butterflies to be unclear. They also found the phrase "several metapopulations consisting of distinct populations" to be unclear without clearly identifying the populations.

*Response:* We have amended the text to add additional clarification about populations and metapopulations for the species. We have removed the phrase "consisting of distinct populations" because we agree that they are not clearly distinct. We did not change our definitions of population and metapopulation because these definitions are based on known dispersal distances and movements traveled by individual butterflies, but we acknowledge that distinguishing specific boundaries or distinction between populations or metapopulations may be

difficult. We have amended the downlisting criteria E/2 to state that contiguous habitat may be used to meet the criteria E/1 for three populations (e.g., 18 hectares of contiguous habitat is considered equivalent to three separate 6-hectare patches). We have also added a footnote to delisting criteria E/1 to again clarify that contiguous habitat supporting a metapopulation may stratify habitat size requirements for separate populations.

*Peer Review Comment (4):* One peer and one partner reviewer noted that we incorrectly cited Varela et al. (2008) when stating that herbicide use was a potential threat, while the paper actually refers to insecticide use.

*Response:* We have replaced “herbicide” with “pesticide” on p. 5 to be inclusive of the insecticide use referred to in Varela et al. (2008) while also acknowledging the potential threat of unintended drift from other pesticides.

*Peer Review Comment (5):* One partner suggested that we amend mission blue butterfly Downlisting Criteria A/2 to specify that the 15 year lupine monitoring period must include 2 years of above average spring (February through May) rainfall (specifically, they suggested adding “spring”). They recommended this change because fungal dieback of the host plants is specifically related to above average rainfall in spring months but not impacted by high rainfall in November through January.

*Response:* We have incorporated this comment into Downlisting Criteria A/2.

*Peer Review Comment (5):* One peer reviewer provided additional information about the use of yellow bush lupine (*Lupinus arboreus*) by the mission blue butterfly.

*Response:* We have added text in the overview of the document that clarifies that mission blue butterflies observed using yellow bush lupine have only been seen using the purple variety in the Marin headlands area.

*Peer Review Comment (6):* One peer reviewer asked about our consideration of Argentine ants on mission blue butterflies.

*Response:* We included mention of argentine ants as a potential threat to mission blue butterflies recognized in the 2010 Status Review in the Threats section of the report. We have included additional text under Downlisting Criteria: Factor C that explains our rationale for not incorporating criteria about the ants at this time.

*Peer Review Comment (7):* One peer reviewer suggested that mission blue butterfly populations counted for delisting or downlisting should not have their component habitat patches separated by features that would discourage or make it impossible for the species to move between them (e.g., tall stands of trees, roads), even if they were within 500 m.

*Response:* We have incorporated additional text into Criteria E/2 that “Component habitat features (e.g., host plants, nectar plants) within each patch of suitable habitat must be free of barriers to movement between them.”

*Peer Review Comment (8):* One partner requested clarification on whether downlisting criteria E/2 required 6 hectares of habitat for each population designated in E/1 or for all populations combined, and recommended that it be for each.

*Response:* We clarified the criteria to say that patches of suitable habitat must be at least 6 hectares for each of the populations.

*Peer Review Comment (9):* One partner requested clarification on the acceptable monitoring protocols to inform the population viability analyses for mission blue butterflies (Downlisting Criteria E/3). Another peer reviewer expressed concern as to how current monitoring protocols can be used to generate population estimates. They further suggested clarification on how frequently populations needed to be measured. One reviewer has the same comment (but of lesser concern because of our Recovery Actions) for San Bruno elfin.

*Response:* We have added text in the footnote for this criteria that explains that the monitoring protocols to inform population viability analyses can be based on methodologies including, but not limited to, surveys of different life stages or to detect occupancy. Further, in the Site Specific Recovery Action 3, we state that the population viability analyses may include the target populations, minimum populations, or occupancy at each population or metapopulation site. We do not currently have an official monitoring protocol that we recommend over others, and do not have official guidelines for how often populations needed to be monitored to establish trends.

*Peer Review Comment (10):* One partner and one peer reviewer suggested that Downlisting Criteria E/1 for the San Bruno elfin butterfly at Milagra Ridge should include 3 colonies (instead of 2) because of the number of extant colonies currently at Milagra Ridge according to the definitions in the Revision. Similarly, they both suggested that the downlisting criteria for mission blue butterfly should explicitly include populations at Milagra Ridge and on SFPUC lands in San Mateo County. Another peer reviewer commented that the downlisting criteria of mission blue butterflies at San Bruno Mountain only includes a fraction of the historical sites.

*Response:* Section 4(f)(1)(B)(ii) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) requires that each recovery plan shall incorporate, to the maximum extent practicable, “objective, measurable criteria which, when met, would result in a determination...that the species be removed from the list.” Legal challenges to recovery plans (see *Fund for Animals v. Babbitt*, 903 F. Supp. 96 (D.D.C. 1995)) and a Government Accountability Audit (GAO 2006) also have affirmed the need to frame recovery criteria in terms of threats assessed under the five delisting factors. The goal in drafting the recovery plan amendment was not to change existing criteria but to add objective measurable criteria framed under the five delisting factors, when such criteria were lacking. Quantitative downlisting criteria were already included in the 1980 Recovery Plan for both the mission blue and San Bruno elfin butterflies, and these criteria were retained in the current amendment. Rather than add additional colonies or populations in downlisting criteria, we have incorporated additional protections in delisting criteria for both species.

*Peer Review Comment (11):* One peer reviewer commented that the delisting criteria of 4 colonies of San Bruno elfin butterfly at Milagra Ridge seemed like an overestimate. Another peer reviewer did a spatial analysis of the current extant populations and habitat at Milagra Ridge and found there to be 3 populations based on the definition of population in the amendment.

*Response:* We changed the delisting criteria E/1 for San Bruno elfin colonies at Milagra Ridge to 3 based on spatial analysis of the currently extant populations and available habitat, using the definition of a population provided in the Recovery Plan amendment.

*Peer Review Comment (12):* One reviewer commented on our statement that a fungal pathogen “primarily infects the host plant silver lupine” with her understanding that some effects may be seen in other host plant species as well.

*Response:* This comment concurs with information we received from species experts, and we added additional text to make it explicit that although the pathogen primarily infects silver lupine it may affect other lupines as well.

*Peer Review Comment (13):* One peer reviewer made several comments with regard to mission blue butterflies and a stable or increasing population of 30 adults.

*Response:* We assume that this reviewer confused the criteria for San Bruno elfin butterflies with the criteria for mission blue butterflies, and have not addressed these comments explicitly. A response to questions about how frequently the populations need to be assessed is addressed in comment 9.

*Peer Review Comment (14):* One peer reviewer commented on the difficulty in assessing San Bruno elfin population abundance given current monitoring protocols, and because observations of adults are rare.

*Response:* We acknowledge that the numerical targets outlined in this recovery plan amendment do not line up perfectly with current monitoring efforts. The population abundance target for San Bruno elfin was determined based on the best available science, and it does not negate any current efforts to monitor populations nor does it necessitate different monitoring protocols. Recovery Action 5, to investigate the biology of San Bruno elfin butterflies to guide population estimates, is intended to help align monitoring efforts with estimating population abundances.

*Peer Review Comment (15):* One peer reviewer stressed that population estimates be considered on a logarithmic scale such that “average” population estimates are actually a geometric average of population estimates.

*Response:* We feel that the numerical population targets (using population viability analyses for mission blue butterfly and a stable or increasing trend for San Bruno elfin butterflies) will take this comment into account when assessing viability.

*Peer Review Comment (16):* One peer reviewer commented on habitat for San Bruno elfin butterflies at the quarry on San Bruno Mountain.

*Response:* We agree that the quarry can provide valuable habitat for the San Bruno elfin. Colonies in the quarry would help fulfill the downlisting and delisting criteria E/1, but we do not identify specific locations on San Bruno Mountain in the recovery plan amendment for this species.

*Peer Review Comment (17):* One peer reviewer commented on potential unoccupied habitat that may be suitable for San Bruno elfin butterflies in the Marin Headlands, and on potential introduction into these sites.

*Response:* We agree that additional areas may be suitable for the species and represent an exciting opportunity to expand the species' range, but in the context of this recovery plan revision we only consider the historical range of the species.

*Peer Review Comment (18):* One peer reviewer commented on terminology of subspecific designations and the use of the term hybrid when referring to progeny of sister subspecies. They recommended use of the term "transition" or "blend".

*Response:* We originally referenced the past status review for the mission blue butterfly when referring to hybrid zones between the mission blue and pardalis blue butterflies, but have changed our terminology to use the term "transition," as suggested. We refer to individuals that have phenotypic characteristics that are more consistent with one subspecies or another, but assign the subspecific designation at the population level.

*Peer Review Comment (19):* One peer reviewer mentioned ongoing work by partners aimed at diversifying and augmenting lupine populations within the range of the mission blue butterfly, and specifically recommended adding researching lupine propagation methods by direct seeding as a high priority action.

*Response:* We recognize the important and exciting steps toward lupine diversification that our partners are already taking. We have included additional text about lupine diversification efforts when originally discussing the fungal pathogen that threatens the host plants of mission blue butterflies. We also added a priority 2 action to research lupine seeding techniques.

*Peer Review Comment (20):* One peer review requested clarification on mission blue butterfly downlisting criteria for Factor E/2 regarding woody vegetation, asking whether the 15% cover referred to the metapopulation, population, or patch area. They suggested an average at the metapopulation or population level because woody vegetation varies widely across the sites.

*Response:* We have clarified Factor E/2 to be at the metapopulation level.

## Recovery Plan Amendments for 15 Pacific Southwest Species

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has identified best available information that indicates the need to amend recovery criteria for the species listed below. Each amendment is recognized as an addendum that supplements the specific portions of the existing recovery plans.

<p><b>Recovery Plan for Gabbro Soil Plants of the Central Sierra Nevada Foothills: El Dorado bedstraw (<i>Galium californicum</i> ssp. <i>sierrae</i>) and Pine Hill flannelbush (<i>Fremontodendron californicum</i> ssp. <i>decumbens</i>)</b></p>	
Original Recovery Plan Approved:	2002
Page(s) Superseded:	III-2 through III-37
Species Included:	El Dorado bedstraw ( <i>Galium californicum</i> ssp. <i>sierrae</i> ) and Pine Hill flannelbush ( <i>Fremontodendron californicum</i> ssp. <i>decumbens</i> )
<p><b>Recovery Plan for Large-flowered Fiddleneck (<i>Amsinckia grandiflora</i>)</b></p>	
Original Recovery Plan Approved:	1997
Pages superseded:	26-27
Species Included:	<i>Amsinckia grandiflora</i> (Large-flowered Fiddleneck)
<p><b>Recovery Plan for San Bruno Elfin Butterfly (<i>Callophrys mossii bayensis</i>) and Mission Blue Butterfly (<i>Icaricia icariodes missionensis</i>)</b></p>	
Original Recovery Plan Approved:	1984
Pages Superseded:	43-46
Species Included:	<i>Callophrys mossii bayensis</i> (San Bruno Elfin Butterfly) <i>Icaricia icariodes missionensis</i> (Mission Blue Butterfly)
<p><b>Recovery Plan for Coastal Plants of the Northern San Francisco Peninsula: Raven's manzanita (<i>Arctostaphylos hookeri</i> ssp. <i>ravenii</i>)</b></p>	
Original Recovery Plan Approved:	2003
Pages superseded:	147-150
Species Included:	<i>Arctostaphylos hookeri</i> ssp. <i>ravenii</i> (Raven's manzanita)
<p><b>Recovery Plan for Serpentine Soil Species of the San Francisco Bay Area</b></p>	
Original Recovery Plan Approved:	1998
Pages superseded:	Section II: p. 14 for San Mateo thornmint, p. 53 for fountain thistle, p. 64 for Presidio clarkia, p. 72 for Pennell's bird's-beak, pp. 92-93 for San Mateo woolly sunflower, and p. 128 for Tiburon jewelflower. Also, the overview of recovery criteria for the species (Section III, pp. 10-19).
Species Included:	<i>Acanthomintha duttonii</i> , formerly <i>Acanthomintha obovata</i> ssp. <i>duttonii</i> (San Mateo thornmint) <i>Calochortus tiburonensis</i> (Tiburon mariposa lily) <i>Cirsium fontinale</i> var. <i>fontinale</i> (fountain thistle) <i>Clarkia franciscana</i> (Presidio clarkia) <i>Cordylanthus tenuis</i> ssp. <i>capillaris</i> (Pennell's bird's-beak) <i>Eriophyllum latilobum</i> (San Mateo woolly sunflower) <i>Streptanthus niger</i> (Tiburon jewelflower)

**Draft Recovery Plan for Seven Coastal Plants and the Myrtle's Silverspot Butterfly: *Chorizanthe valida* (Sonoma Spineflower)**

Original Recovery Plan Approved: 1998  
Pages superseded: Section I: pp. 25-29  
Section II: pp. 89-90  
Species Included: *Chorizanthe valida* (Sonoma Spineflower)

**Recovery Plan for Seven Coastal Plants and the Myrtle's Silverspot Butterfly**

Original Recovery Plan Approved: 1998  
Pages superseded: Section II: pp. 89-91  
Species Included: *Chorizanthe howellii* (Howell's spineflower)

**For  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Pacific Southwest Region  
Sacramento, CA**

**September 2019**

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Pacific Southwest Region

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

9/26/19