

**DRAFT**

**General – Questions and Answers**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>
1. What is the plan to develop the East County MSCP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• For now, the County’s work program is currently focused on the North County Plan. Once this effort is complete, we will get direction from the Board of Supervisors on next steps for the East County MSCP.</li></ul>
2. Regional Conservation Investment Strategy – not permit-driven. Focus is to identify conservation strategies and mitigation sites to issue mitigation credits. Is this an option for East County?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Please see answer above – County is currently focused on North County, and will re-evaluate East County effort in the future.</li></ul>
3. USFWS – released memorandum about resolving logjams. There is a short list. Could we add North County to the list?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• County staff has followed up on this with the Wildlife Agencies – have not yet heard if we can be added to the short list.</li></ul>
4. How does each of these topics for future Steering Committee meetings relate or not relate to the chapters of the Working Draft?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Plan is interwoven so that pieces span several chapters. These topics are found throughout the plan. Our subject-oriented approach to the Steering Committee meetings is intended to provide more context for each of these topics.</li></ul>
5. Should we have subgroups for interests that may take up a lot of time (i.e. funding)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• For now we would like to keep the Steering Committee together so that we can get input from all parties. As the meetings move on, we will consider whether or not subgroups are appropriate.</li></ul>
6. What happens if a property has a species on their North County property that is covered under the South County Plan but not the North County Plan? We are concerned that CEQA is being used as “second bite” for additional mitigation for a species that was not given take coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• All projects will need to be evaluated for compliance with the Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO). The BMO, as you apply it to your project, will require a biological impact report and may allow vegetation to be tiered off based on the study findings.</li><li>• All projects will also have to comply with CEQA; however the habitat mitigation done for compliance with the MSCP may satisfy that requirement.</li></ul>
7. Do you have a record of the vegetation changes that have occurred over time?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Maps with changes in vegetation over time provided during meeting #4.</li></ul>
8. An additional permit from the Army Corps of Engineers may be required for take of Arroyo Toad.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If a project impacts a water of the US, the applicant may need a separate permit for that impact from the Army Corps of Engineers (401/404 Permit), however you wouldn’t need to receive take authorization from a separate entity. Even though a separate permit is needed from the Army Corps, they are required to consult with the Wildlife Agencies, so the consultation is streamlined.</li><li>• Unlike the South County plan where we only provided take for wetland species outside the wetlands, the North County plan will cover these species across the Plan Area, regardless of the location of jurisdictional waters.</li></ul>

**DRAFT**

**General – Questions and Answers**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>
9. To clarify for the committee, is there take authorization for vegetation communities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No, only on animal species. Vegetation Communities are mitigated for either on or off site while animal species are given take authorization.</li><li>• The exception is Wetlands, which are reviewed by the state.</li></ul>