

**Small Group Meeting #1**  
**Multiple Species Conservation Program – North County Plan**

Date: March 27, 2017

Time: 3:00-4:30 p.m.

Place: County Operations Center

5510 Overland, Drake Central

<u>Question</u>	<u>Response</u>
Is there no North County Plan now?	A draft plan was released in 2009; however, a plan has never been adopted for the North County. Currently, the County issues habitat loss permits for impacts to Coastal Sage Scrub under a Planning Agreement with the Wildlife Agencies. Part of this Planning Agreement includes a stipulation that the County adopts a North County MSCP.
To Confirm, there are no cities within the North County MSCP Plan Area?	Correct, the County does not have land use authority over any incorporated cities so they will not be included in this Plan.
Does each jurisdiction have its own individual plan?	No, in North County, only Carlsbad has an adopted plan. Each city has its own individual permit within the one overarching MSCP in the South County subregional plan. The County has one subregional plan with individual subarea plans.
Why are the Plan Area and Permit Area different?	The County does not have land use authority over special area lands including Tribal, Military, USFS, so we cannot extend or enforce our permit requirements on these lands.
How will the County fund the implementation of this plan?	The Plan requires the County to stipulate funding assurances for implementation of the Plan. The Plan has a detailed chapter that discusses this. For now, we propose using annual appropriations as has been done in the South County.
How will the Preserves be monitored?	The County has monitoring and management plans for all County-owned preserves, requiring staff to monitor preserves on an annual or triannual basis. Preserve lands resulting from mitigation is monitored by a qualified Land Manager, approved by the County.

<b><u>Question</u></b>	<b><u>Response</u></b>
If funding is set aside on an annual basis, maintaining a permanent funding source may be an issue as policies change. How can the Wildlife Agencies approve a plan without specific funding assurances?	So far, the funding assurances used for South County have been accepted by the Agencies. We are currently working closely with the Agencies to ensure our funding proposals for North County are acceptable.
Preserve Management, Implementation Costs, Climate Change, and Plan Connectivity were issues brought up through the South County Plan. Many of us will be concerned with these issues moving forward with the North County Plan.	The HCP Handbook was updated in 2016 to include specific requirements to plan for these issues and future impact to the Plan Area. The North County Plan incorporates these requirements to plan for future effects to the Preserve.
Explain the difference between the Plan Area, Permit Area, and PAMA.	Plan Area – the unincorporated North County Permit Area – the area within the unincorporated North County where the County has land use jurisdiction PAMA – high diversity areas within the Permit Area where we expect to create the Preserve
There is a lot of developed land and agricultural lands in the North County. Previous drafts discussed agricultural land as a working landscape. The current team may want to review previous drafts to see how agriculture was previously addressed.	We reviewed and updated the data used in the 2009 draft to remove areas from the PAMA that either were developed or had agricultural lands. The Plan does consider certain agricultural activities as covered activities.
Non-native grassland does not appear to be shown within the North County, I recommend allowing mitigation for NNG with Agricultural lands.	Staff can review our current data and mitigation requirements.
Are lands within the PAMA prioritized from high to low? Are there some areas that the County absolutely has to preserve to ensure survival of a species?	Lands within the PAMA are not currently prioritized, however our staff biologists can review the PAMA design to determine if there are areas that will have to be conserved to ensure plan success.
Will the maps shown in today's presentation be made available?	The presentation will be uploaded online, Crystal Benham will email when it is available.
To verify, the 29 species number is subject to change prior to finalization.	Correct, the Covered Species are subject to negotiation with the Wildlife Agencies and may be altered based on public input.
How many species that are listed in the ESA are not covered?	None, all ESA listed species in the North County Plan Area are included in the 29 Covered Species list.
Are all species in the Covered Species list on the ESA?	The Englemann oak is the only species not on the ESA but on the Covered Species list.
Were the Watch List species included in the conservation analysis?	Yes, all watch list species were included in the conservation analysis.

<b><u>Question</u></b>	<b><u>Response</u></b>
What is the conservation analysis?	The Conservation Analysis is a sustainability analysis to determine how the County can reasonably conserve the Covered Species. From the conservation analysis, we derive our Goals & Objectives for each species and vegetation community.
We are at a disadvantage not having the Covered Species list in front of us. Can the County adequately protect the Golden Eagles in San Diego County? We suggest removing it from proposed coverage (Bill Scheidt, Audubon, Sierra Club).	The Golden Eagle is currently on the Covered Species list, which is in negotiation with the Wildlife Agencies.
Is it possible to have an in-lieu fund for the Golden Eagle?	We will look into this as a potential option.
The Regional Conservation Investment Strategy and Regional Conservation Framework are moving forward to replace NCCPs. How does the County see the North County MSCP moving forward if it is going to be eclipsed by these plans?	The County is meeting with stakeholders next week to discuss options moving forward and how these plans may affect the East County Plan. At this time, we do not see these plans affecting the North County Plan. County staff meets regularly with CDFW, and this has not yet been raised as a concern.
Will you have a document discussing what the County spends and how the County has managed the South County Preserves to date?	These are discussed in the annual South County MSCP reports, which are public documents available on the County's website.
The Sierra Club is concerned with how Climate Change will be addressed in the plan.	Noted.
In which documents will adaptive management be discussed?	Adaptive management is discussed in the FRMP and the Plan itself.
Is it possible to establish some type of reciprocal agreements with other jurisdictions so that mitigation credits can be purchased outside the County boundary?	We will check with County Council on applicability.
How will you address the relationship of Preserve lands in the North County and preserves set aside by other jurisdictions?	We will be having meetings with the neighboring jurisdictions to coordinate with their ongoing efforts and discuss connectivity of our preserve lands.
What is the County's stance on the annexations occurring in San Marcos/Escondido? It appears the County has had a weak defense of protecting their preserves.	The County has provided a letter to San Marcos, requiring the integrity of the Preserve to be protected. We will continue to comment on the importance of maintaining the integrity of the Preserve; however, LAFCO has the ultimate determination on whether or not those lands will be annexed.

<b><u>Question</u></b>	<b><u>Response</u></b>
Can you explain how the County will maintain the Preserve integrity if the Plan is not approved until 2021?	Currently, projects are reviewed against the 2009 draft plan. When the current draft plan is released for public review, staff will likely begin reviewing projects against the current draft plan. Additionally, projects in the North County are currently reviewed by the Wildlife Agencies and are required to obtain their own take permits.
How will mitigation ratios be determined?	Mitigation ratios will be discussed in both the BMO and the Plan. Like-for-like mitigation is required for some vegetation communities. There will also be requirements for specific species if found onsite.
The contents of the BMO will be important to protect linkages and mitigation ratios, as projects deciding to go through their own permit process will still need to apply the BMO.	All of the goals and objectives will be translated into the BMO to ensure application of the plan.
Does the plan allow up tiering or in-kind tiering? There has to be some reasonable substitution for habitat.	Noted. Staff will discuss this with Counsel.
<p>Many of the MHCPs are moving towards in-lieu fee tiering, is the County proposing this at all? Private transactions for mitigation lands are difficult and often impractical. It might be better for the County to be the holder of mitigation lands via in-lieu fees.</p> <p>The in-lieu fee system would need a bulletproof auditing system conducted by a third party to ensure that money goes to Preserve purchase. Additionally, there needs to be a clear separation between monies to acquire lands and those used to pay time and materials.</p> <p>In-lieu fees however have separate requirements, so calling it something else may be required.</p>	Staff will discuss feasibility with Counsel.