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## Executive Summary

The Hermes copper (Lycaena hermes) is a rare butterfly endemic to San Diego County and northern Baja California. This species is threatened by recent urbanization and wildfires throughout its range in the United States. Since most individuals and larger populations are found in the southern portion of San Diego County (Figure 1), one large fire could nearly extirpate the species. Assessment of the northern habitats will allow for prioritization of management actions and lead towards developing larger and more robust populations. The geographic separation reduces the extinction risk due to wildfires.

In 2016, we conducted butterfly surveys and habitat assessments at these small northern populations. We did not detect Hermes copper adults at any of the eight sites, although this was consistent with other (larger) sites in the county due to continuing drought conditions. Habitat assessments resulted in the mapping of 65 spiny redberry patches and 11 single redberry shrubs across the 8 sites. Up to 90 redberry shrubs were recorded in a single patch, but more patches were represented by a relatively low number of shrubs, and most of the redberry patches had at least $60 \%$ shrub cover. Additional insight may be gained from a more formal comparison to the habitat measured at Hermes copper sites in southern San Diego County.

## Introduction

The Hermes copper (Lycaena hermes) is a rare butterfly endemic to San Diego County and northern Baja California. This species is threatened by recent urbanization and wildfires throughout its range in the United States. In April of 2011 the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) issued a 12-month finding which concluded that listing the Hermes copper butterfly as threatened or endangered was warranted, and is currently on the USFWS list of candidate species (USFWS 2011). A proposed rule, including designated critical habitat, will be developed.

This report describes the field work conducted during the 2016 Hermes copper flight season. Monitoring populations provides an opportunity to understand how climatic conditions influence variation in adult densities and flight season phenology. Adult surveys are generally the most accurate and cost-effective way to monitor butterflies, using adapted Pollard walks through suitable habitat. Previous monitoring at multiple sites revealed that population changes tended to covary across sites (i.e. high degree of concordance). As a result, we have monitored only a handful of sites during 2012-2015. In 2016, we also conducted surveys for Hermes copper adults at northern populations that tend to be small (fewer than 10 individuals observed at peak numbers) and not detectible every year (Deutschman et al. 2011, Marschalek et al. 2016).

Assessment of habitats that support these small northern Hermes copper populations is important to update our understanding of the species. Since most individuals are found in the larger populations in the southern portion of San Diego County (Figure 1), one large fire could devastate the species. Protecting the northern populations will reduce extinction risk because of the geographic separation. Assessment of the northern habitats will allow for conservation management focused on developing larger and more robust northern populations.


Figure 1. Detections of Hermes copper butterflies on conserved lands, 2010-2013. Sampling locations where Hermes copper was not detected are represented by black diamonds. The relative size of Hermes copper populations is indicated by the size of the blue circles.

## Methods

## Hermes Copper Surveys

In 2016, we conducted surveys for Hermes copper adults at historically occupied populations in the northern portion of the species' range. Survey sites included Bette Bendixen, Black Mountain, Elfin Forest, Lopez Canyon, Meadowbrook Ecological Reserve, Mendocino, Mission Trails Regional Park, and Sabre Springs (Figure 2). Our goal was to record the maximum number of Hermes copper adults present on a single day at each site (maximum count). All surveys were conducted during periods of appropriate weather (sunny or partly sunny, 20 to 35 degrees C, and modest wind speeds) unless stated otherwise. Initial surveys occurred about one time per week and started on 16 April at Sycuan Peak. This site was chosen because past survey efforts have shown this area to regularly produce the first adults of the season. This initial survey is earlier than historical records of Hermes copper adults including the observation of adults on May 1 in 2015. Like 2015, the spring of 2016 was similarly warm and we expected that adults would emerge fairly early again. Once Hermes copper adults were found, we started surveys across all of the northern sites. Sampling occurred two times per week (weather dependent) throughout the Hermes copper flight season.


Figure 2. Map of 2016 northern Hermes copper population survey sites with an inset of San Diego County. Purple and black circles represent extant populations and extirpated populations, respectively. Blue circles denote sites of unknown status and black x's mark sites that have suitable habitat but have never been known to have Hermes copper populations. Green shading are conserved lands (SANDAG) and dark gray shading maps the footprints of the 2003 and 2007 wildfires.

## Habitat Assessment

At each site, redberry patches were mapped and in the same areas where we conducted surveys for adult Hermes copper. The abundance and cover of spiny redberry and California buckwheat was recorded, as well as general vegetation composition (Table 1). The site assessments were designed to be rapid and detect large differences in habitat. Individual redberry shrubs were also recorded but associated habitat data were not collected for single, isolated shrubs.

Table 1. Habitat assessment variables.

| Variables | Categories |
| :--- | :--- |
| Spiny Redberry | Number of shrubs, mapped extent |
| California Buckwheat | Distribution (evenly distributed, most along road, and/or few patches) |
| Vegetation Spiny redberry, buckwheat, shrubs (includes redberry and buckwheat), non- <br> Composition (\% cover) native grasses, non-native forbs, bare soil |  |
| Trees | Distance to redberry patch, tree species |

## Results

## Hermes Copper Surveys

In 2016, we did not detect Hermes copper adults at any of the northern populations (Table 2). Surveys were planned to occur two times per week at each site and this was the case when the weather was appropriate. However, there were several periods of cool and cloudy weather during the flight season. This prohibited surveys (due to unsuitable conditions) or restricted them to an hour or two during the middle of the day (when the marine layer had receded).

Table 2. Effort and results for 2016 Hermes copper surveys, and historical data for context.

| Site | Number of <br> 2016 Surveys | 2016 Count | Previous High Count <br> (Year of count) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Bette Bendixen | 4 | 0 | 0 (no historic observations but did <br> not burn in 2003 or 2007 wildfires) |
| Black Mountain | 5 | 0 | $1(2004)$ |
| Elfin Forest | 5 | 0 | $1(2011)$ |
| Lopez Canyon | 5 | 0 | $5(2011)$ |
| Meadowbrook <br> Ecological Reserve | 5 | 0 | 14 (2003) |
| Mendincino | 5 | 0 | 0 (no historic observations but close <br> to occupied habitat) <br> Mission Trails Regional <br> Park |
| Sabre Springs | 5 | 0 | Unknown (2002 or earlier, Hermes <br> copper was consistently observed) |

## Habitat Assessments

We mapped 65 spiny redberry patches and recorded 11 single redberry shrubs across the 8 sites. Up to 90 redberry shrubs were recorded in a single patch, but more patches were represented by a relatively low number of shrubs (Figure 3a). Most of the redberry patches had shrub cover that was at least $60 \%$ (Figure 3b). A more in depth analysis will be presented when the habitat is compared to the Hermes copper sites in southern San Diego County (Marschalek and Deutschman in preparation).


Figure 3: Spiny redberry patch size distribution (left) and shrub cover (right)

## Discussion

Few Hermes copper adults have been observed during the last two years due to the drought, particularly west of Cleveland National Forest (Marschalek and Deutschman in preparation). We have documented adult numbers rebounding following a one-year drought (Marschalek and Deutschman 2015) but it is unclear how multiple years of extremely dry conditions will impact the species. Surveys during years of closer to average, or above average precipitation, will be required to adequately assess occupancy of habitat patches and relative population sizes of these northern sites.

The habitat assessment data, including redberry mapping, should be included in site-specific vegetation maps to determine opportunities for restoration to enhance these northern
populations. Areas of degraded habitat adjacent to redberry patches present opportunities to increase the resources available to Hermes copper. Other degraded habitats should be explored for restoration, and could include spiny redberry and California buckwheat if the local conditions are determined appropriate to support these plants. Based on the patchiness of spiny redberry distribution, it should not be assumed that all locations can support the species. A more in depth analysis will be included in the south county report (Marschalek and Deutschman in preparation).
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Appendix A: Vegetation data associated with spiny redberry (Rhamnus crocea) patches at northern Hermes copper populations.

| Site | \# Redberry | Percent Cover |  |  |  |  |  | Distribution of Buckwheat | Trees | Tree 1 | Tree 2 | Tree Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Redberry | Buckwheat | Shurbs | NN Grass | NN Forbs | Soil |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bette Bendixen | 5 | 3 | 10 | 74 | 3 | 3 | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bette Bendixen | 11 | 5 | 3 | 76 | 1 | 3 | 20 | most along road | No |  |  | 0.5 |
| Bette Bendixen | 21 | 10 | 3 | 30 | 64 | 5 | 1 | few patches | No |  |  | 0.5 |
| Bette Bendixen | 29 | 10 | 3 | 90 | 5 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bette Bendixen | 29 | 8 | 5 | 95 | 1 | 2 | 2 | few patches | Yes |  |  |  |
| Bette Bendixen | 62 | 10 | 1 | 75 | 2 | 2 | 20 | few patches |  |  |  |  |
| Black Mountain 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 55 | 2 | 5 | 38 | few patches |  |  |  | 150 ft |
| Black Mountain 1 | 3 | 40 | 20 | 90 | 0 | 2 | 8 | few patches |  |  |  | 100 ft |
| Black Mountain 1 | 3 | 10 | 7 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | few patches |  |  |  | 100 ft |
| Black Mountain 1 | 3 | 7 | 12 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 7 | few patches |  |  |  | 250 ft |
| Black Mountain 1 | 5 | 5 | 25 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 5 | evenly distributed |  |  |  | 100 ft |
| Black Mountain 1 | 6 | 20 | 5 | 90 | 2 | 1 | 7 | few patches |  |  |  | 75 ft |
| Black Mountain 1 | 7 | 10 | 2 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 3 | few patches |  |  |  | 75 ft |
| Black Mountain 1 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 3 | few patches |  |  |  | 200 ft |
| Black Mountain 1 | 15 | 9 | 65 | 96 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 3 | evenly distributed |  |  |  | 150 ft |
| Black Mountain 1 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | evenly distributed |  |  |  | 100 ft |
| Black Mountain 1 | 80 | 2 | 7 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | Yes | Quercus agrifolia |  |  |
| Black Mountain 2 | 2 | 12 | 11 | 33 | 60 | 0 | 7 | few patches |  |  |  | 100 ft |
| Black Mountain 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 60 | 40 | 0 | 0 | evenly distributed, few patches |  |  |  | 375 ft |
| Black Mountain 2 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 90 | 10 | 0 | 0 | evenly distributed, along road |  |  |  | 300 ft |
| Black Mountain 2 | 3 | 45 | 0 | 60 | 30 | 10 | 0 | evenly distributed, few patches |  |  |  | 500 ft |
| Black Mountain 2 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 80 | 7 | 3 | 10 | evenly distributed, few patches |  |  |  | 400 ft |
| Black Mountain 2 | 5 | 10 | 70 | 90 | 5 | 0 | 5 | evenly distributed |  |  |  | 300 ft |
| Black Mountain 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 98 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1 | evenly distributed, few patches |  |  |  | 300 ft |
| Black Mountain 2 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 45 | 40 | 15 | 0 | evenly distributed, few patches |  |  |  | 400 ft |
| Black Mountain 2 | 15 | 5 | 2 | 85 | 8 | 7 | 0 | evenly distributed, few patches |  |  |  | 500 ft |
| Black Mountain 3 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 90 | 4 | 0 | 6 | few patches |  |  |  | 500 ft |
| Black Mountain 3 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 90 | 3 | 0 | 7 | few patches |  |  |  | 500 ft |
| Black Mountain 3 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 95 | 2 | 0 | 3 | few patches |  |  |  | 400 ft |
| Black Mountain 3 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 98 | 1 | 0 | 1 | few patches |  |  |  | 450 ft |


| Site | \# Redberry | Percent Cover |  |  |  |  |  | Distribution of Buckwheat | Trees | Tree 1 | Tree 2 | Tree Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Redberry | Buckwheat | Shurbs | NN Grass | NN Forbs | Soil |  |  |  |  |  |
| Elfin Forest | 3 | 1 | 3 | 60 | 25 | 1 | 10 | mostly along road | No |  |  |  |
| Elfin Forest | 4 | 5 | 5 | 30 | 54 | 1 | 5 | evenly distributed | Yes | Oak |  | adjacent |
| Elfin Forest | 5 | 1 | 10 | 35 | 15 | 1 | 5 | evenly distributed | Yes | Oak | Sycamore |  |
| Elfin Forest | 20 | 2 | 2 | 42 | 42 | 2 | 10 | mostly along road | Yes | Oak |  |  |
| Elfin Forest | 20 | 2 | 2 | 60 | 19 | 2 | 15 | mostly along road | Yes | Scrub oak |  |  |
| Elfin Forest | 25 | 3 | 5 | 50 | 40 | 1 | 1 | mostly along road | Yes | Oak |  | adjacent |
| Elfin Forest | 27 | 5 | 2 | 60 | 33 | 2 | 5 |  | Yes | Coast Live Oak |  |  |
| Elfin Forest | 33 | 5 | 2 | 50 | 46 | 2 | 2 | few patches | Yes | Coast Live Oak |  |  |
| Elfin Forest | 34 | 3 | 3 | 25 | 30 | 15 | 30 | mostly along road | Yes | Coast Live Oak |  |  |
| Elfin Forest | 38 | 5 | 3 | 40 | 49 | 5 | 6 | few patches | Yes | Coast Live Oak |  |  |
| Lopez Canyon | 14 | 10 | 5 | 90 | 1.5 | 0 |  | few patches | Yes | Willow |  |  |
| Lopez Canyon | 16 | 5 | 10 | 60 | 20 | 10 | 10 | few patches | No |  |  | 50 ft |
| Lopez Canyon | 22 | 5 | 15 | 40 | 25 | 25 | 10 | evenly distributed |  |  |  | 50 ft |
| Lopez Canyon | 22 | 3 | 7 | 85 | 5 | 10 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lopez Canyon | 25 | 5 | 5 | 90 | 3 | 3 | 4 | most along road | Yes | Oak |  |  |
| Meadowbrook | 9 | 3 | 3 | 60 | 10 | 25 | 5 | few patches | No |  |  | 0.5 |
| Meadowbrook | 37 | 4 | 2 | 70 | 5 | 20 | 5 |  | No |  |  | 0.5 |
| Meadowbrook | 50 | 10 | 5 | 90 | 4 | 4 | 2 | few patches | Yes | Oak |  |  |
| Meadowbrook | 90 | 15 | 10 | 70 | 20 | 10 | 0 | few patches | Yes | Oak |  |  |
| Mendincino | 4 | 2 | 10 | 64 | 30 | 5 | 1 | evenly distributed | Yes | Eucalyptus |  |  |
| Mendincino | 4 | 3 | 1 | 80 | 15 | 5 | 0 |  | Yes | Eucalyptus | Pepper Tree |  |
| Mendincino | 5 | 2 | 4 | 30 | 35 | 34 | 1 | few patches | No |  |  | 20 ft |
| Mission Trails | 10 | 1 | 10 | 40 | 30 | 20 | 10 | few patches | No |  |  |  |
| Mission Trails | 20 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 75 | 5 | 7 | mostly along road | Yes | Oak |  |  |
| Mission Trails | 25 | 1 | 5 | 75 | 9 | 3 | 7 | mostly along road | No |  |  | . 35 mi |
| Mission Trails | 25 | 3 | 10 | 75 | 2 | 5 | 5 | evenly distributed | No |  |  | . 7 mi |
| Mission Trails | 40 | 5 | 5 | 75 | 2 | 8 | 5 | evenly distributed | No |  |  | . 5 mi |
| Mission Trails | 50 | 5 | 15 | 70 | 10 | 5 | 5 | evenly distributed | No |  |  | . 34 mi |
| Sabre Springs | 8 | 2 | 1 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | Yes |  |  |  |
| Sabre Springs | 10 | 3 | 1 | 70 | 10 | 10 | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sabre Springs | 14 | 3 | 4 | 80 | 7 | 6 | 7 | most along road | Yes | Oak |  |  |
| Sabre Springs | 23 | 5 | 5 | 60 | 20 | 10 | 10 | most along road | Yes | Oak |  |  |
| Sabre Springs | 31 | 10 | 15 | 85 | 5 | 5 | 5 | most along road | Yes | Oak |  |  |
| Sabre Springs | 32 | 10 | 3 | 70 | 10 | 17 | 3 | few patches | Yes | Oak |  |  |
| Sabre Springs | 50 | 10 | 5 | 60 | 15 | 20 | 5 | few patches | Yes | Oak |  |  |

