## 1. Steering Committee Meeting #3 Notes

## **Multiple Species Conservation Program – North County Plan**

## **Attendees:**

PDS: Mark Wardlaw, Mary Kopaskie, Peter Eichar, Crystal Benham, Chelsea Oakes, Melanie Casey, Claudia Anzures, Tom Oberbauer

**DPR:** Brian Albright, Deb Mosley, Jennifer Price

**DPW:** LeAnn Carmichael

**USFWS:** Doreen Stadtlander, Susan Wynn

CDFW: Dave Mayer, Carol Williams

SC: Ann Van Leer, Jim Whalen, Rikki Schroeder, Frank Landis, Doug Goad, Matt Adams, Dan Silver, Eric Larson

Steering Committee Member:	Question/Comment/Topic:	Response/Way Forward:	Date Action Item Anticipated for Completion:
• Jim W.	• For all the maps provided at today's meeting, what is the data source?	We used our vegetation data created for the County in 1995 using the Holland code. This data has since been updated using new data as well as aerial imaging to analyze urban expansion.	No action item.
• Rikki S.	• Do you have a record of the vegetation changes that have occurred over the years? Is this producible for the committee?		• April 5 <sup>th</sup>
• Frank L.	Where are the PAMA boundaries in relation to the vegetation communities being shown (Slide 9)?	This map shows the vegetation communities located within the entire Plan area. The PAMA boundary was not shown on this map as it would become difficult to see the vegetation communities.	No action item.
		• The distribution of each individual vegetation community and the PAMA boundary are shown on the next several slides (Slides 10-15).	

(	Steering Committee Member:		Question/Comment/Topic:		Response/Way Forward:		Date Action Item Anticipated for Completion:
•	Ann V.	•	Will all vegetation shown outside the PAMA boundary potentially be lost?	•	This is discussed in the Plan's Impact Analysis and Conservation Analysis, which will be discussed at later Steering Committee meetings.  The majority of lands located outside the PAMA are	•	Show impacts outside PAMA during conservation analysis discussion on April
					either already developed or are located outside the County's land use jurisdiction (i.e. Tribal Lands, Special District Lands, incorporated cities).		25.
				•	The PAMA was designed to conserve areas of highest value vegetation and, correspondingly, the areas where the greatest numbers of species are predicted.		
•	Frank L.	•	The Grassland map (Slide 12) is difficult to read because of the color scheme used (green on green).	•	Noted. Staff will update colors so layers are distinguishable.	•	Will update as part of the Public Draft Plan.
•	Frank L.	•	Are Vernal Pools found elsewhere besides Ramona?	•	Staff will verify.	•	April 5 <sup>th</sup>
•	Jim W.	•	Can we receive a copy of the Predicted Species hotspot map (Slide 16)?	•	Staff will produce and provide to the Steering Committee.	•	April 5 <sup>th</sup>
•	Ann VL	•	There are several very narrow areas of the PAMA that do not appear to have enough buffer area and areas that are shown to have wildlife crossings but are really roads. Does the plan provide adequate connectivity and linkage?	•	The wildlife crossings shown are existing crossings, either with existing culverts used by small animals or aerial crossing used by gnatcatchers.  The Plan also has a section requiring future road improvements to include crossing elements.  It's important to realize that many of these areas in the North County are already developed by single family homes. County Staff and the Wildlife Agencies have worked together to ensure these narrower areas are wide enough to allow adequate protection for and the movement of species within the PAMA.	•	No action item.

Steering Committee Member:	Question/Comment	:/Topic:	Response/Way Forward:		Date Action Item Anticipated for Completion:
• Frank L.	<ul> <li>Concerned about the lack of coastal areas and islands jurisdiction.</li> </ul>		• The islands of the Plan Area located in Carlsbad, San Marcos, and Encinitas are either County-owned properties or those that fall under the County's jurisdiction. These pieces must be included in the Plan and include Palomar Airport, San Marcos Landfill, Lake San Marcos, county-owned properties, and unincorporated communities.	•	No action item.
			<ul> <li>The majority of land located in the coastal area is densely developed or outside the County's jurisdiction. However, the PAMA is designed to allow species movement from inland to coastal areas by connecting to the Preserve lands of the Incorporated MHCP and Incorporated MSCP.</li> </ul>		
• Eric L.	• Do we have a map of all surrollands?	ounding HLP Preserve	• Yes, this map is located within your handouts ("Map 3 – Regional Plans with Parcels") and in the draft Plan ("Figure 2-1 Regional Conservation Plan")	•	No action item.
• Rikki S.	<ul> <li>What is NC2 and how does th it?</li> </ul>	is plan help it or hurt	<ul> <li>NC2 (San Luis Rey Linkage) is one of the eleven regional linkages identified within the Plan Area. This is an important linkage connecting lands along the San Luis Rey River with both coastal and inland areas.</li> <li>The Plan requires wildlife corridors to be conserved through land acquisitions and incorporated into the design of future development projects within the North County Permit Area. These corridors may help to reduce some of the adverse effects of habitat fragmentation.</li> </ul>	•	No action item.
• Eric L.	<ul> <li>The parceled map provided see, can you provide large committee to review?</li> </ul>	•	Yes, staff will print large scale copies for the Steering Committee.	•	April 5 <sup>th</sup>

Steering Committee Member:	Question/Comment/Topic:	Response/Way Forward:	Date Action Item Anticipated for Completion:
• Jim W.	• I think the Steering Committee should provide the County something in writing to memorialize our position on the PAMA.	Please provide any comments or questions you may have by email to Crystal Benham.	• TBD
Susan W.	• The current PAMA is slightly smaller (~10%) than the 2009 PAMA, because we removed outlying islands and parcels too small to obtain discretionary discretion.	Comment.	No action item.
Doug G.	From a habitat standpoint, it is not easy to negotiate on a parcel by parcel level. We could get bogged down by going piece by piece when we need to focus on the global habitat.	<ul> <li>County Staff has worked with the Wildlife Agencies to ensure that the PAMA was designed to conserve areas of highest value vegetation and, correspondingly, the areas where the greatest numbers of species are predicted.</li> <li>If the Steering Committee has concerns or questions regarding specific parcels, please provide them to Crystal Benham by email so that we may discuss these properties at future meetings.</li> </ul>	• TBD
Rikki S.	An additional permit from the Army Corps of Engineers may be required for take of Arroyo Toad.	<ul> <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>	No action item.

Steering Committee Member:	Question/Comment/Topic:	Response/Way Forward:	Date Action Item Anticipated for Completion:
Matt A.	<ul> <li>What, if any, changes would come from this plan concerning species that are not covered and how would that work?</li> </ul>	This will be addressed later in today's discussion.	March 16 <sup>th</sup>
• Ann VL	What is the process for species to move from the Covered Species to the Watch List and vice versa?	<ul> <li>As time passes, a species might become healthy and be taken off the endangered species list. Species status will be evaluated over time.</li> <li>If a species becomes listed in the future, we will need to obtain new take authorization for it to become a Covered Species.</li> <li>The overall PAMA design is based on habitat and the intention is a habitat based conservation plan resulting in take coverage established for the Covered Species. A corollary benefit is that there are other species that will be preserved to some degree within the Preserve.</li> </ul>	No action item.
• Rikki S.	<ul> <li>Moving into the practical aspects of the Plan, are the Watch List species something we're going to have to survey for? I'm very concerned with how the Watch List species will be tracked, how the Watch List will be implemented, and the process should any of these species need to be moved to the Covered Species List.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Claudia will discuss this in today's presentation.</li> <li>Rikki will catch up with other Steering Committee members and County staff.</li> </ul>	• TBD
Matt A.	<ul> <li>Are all the endangered species we know of part of the 29 Covered Species?</li> </ul>	Yes — all listed species within the Plan Area are included.	No action item.

Steering Committee Member:	Question/Comment/Topic:	Response/Way Forward:	Date Action Item Anticipated for Completion:
• Frank L.	<ul> <li>Is there a process to add future endangered species list candidates to the Covered Species or Watch List?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Those species will need to be added separately at a later date.</li> <li>It is important to understand that just because something is rare, doesn't mean it's endangered. The County and Wildlife Agencies would need to evaluate the actual threats to the species before determining if that species should be a Covered Species or on the Watch List.</li> </ul>	No action item.
Matt A.	• Will there be a process by which the Wildlife Agencies can rescind take for Covered Species in the future?	This is addressed in the Plan and will be discussed at a later Steering Committee meeting.	• March 16 <sup>th</sup>
• Jim W.	• Is there a guaranteed no "second bite of the apple" if all 63 species are evaluated in the EIR?	<ul> <li>For the most part, however projects will need to be evaluated for compliance with the 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>The project will have to comply with CEQA; however the habitat mitigation done for compliance with the MSCP may satisfy that requirement.</li> </ul>	No action item.
Mary K.	To clarify for the committee, is there take authorization for vegetation communities?	<ul> <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>	No action item.

Steering Committee Member:	Question/Comment/Topic:	Response/Way Forward:	Date Action Item Anticipated for Completion:
Ann VL	<ul> <li>How frequently are County-owned lands surveyed for species? What is the role of the SANDAG monitoring?</li> </ul>	Survey frequency depends on how many species make it into the plan, the amount of funding available, and the funding sources. It also depends on the specific Preserve, as some Preserves are surveyed every year while some are surveyed every five years.	• May 15 <sup>th</sup>
		<ul> <li>We will further discuss monitoring and management at a later Steering Committee meeting.</li> </ul>	
• Eric L.	• If the County is doing the monitoring and management of the Watch List species, why are grants needed? Will a lack of grants create a monitoring gap?	<ul> <li>The grant comment on Slide 29 is referring to grants obtained by others to monitor Watch List species.</li> <li>The funding assurances do not rely on grants – there will be no monitoring gap if grant funding is not obtained.</li> </ul>	No action item.
• Jim W.	• It would be nice if a process length was defined ahead of time for moving Watch List Species to Covered Species. There should be a time limit.	The County is restrained by federal law on how we obtain take authorization, however we are making it as easy as possible to move forward with the Wildlife Agencies should any of the Watch List species become listed.	No action item.
• Susan W.	• The hotspot map (Slide 17) makes it look like there is a lot of habitat outside PAMA, however most of it is Tribal or Special District lands. You may want to specify this on the map.	Noted. Staff will discuss feasibility in adding additional layers to the hotspot map.	Will update as part of the Public Draft Plan.
Dave M.	<ul> <li>There's nothing stopping the County from adding to the Watch List should speciation change in the future.</li> </ul>	Noted. We will discuss this with the Wildlife Agencies.	Will potentially update as part of the Public Draft Plan.

March 30, 2017 Page | **7** 

Steering Committee Member:	Question/Comment/Topic:	Response/Way Forward:	Date Action Item Anticipated for Completion:
• Jim W.	• There are so many topics the Steering Committee is reviewing; I think we need to provide you some sort of feedback before we move forward.		• TBD
Frank L.	When addressing Climate Change, some of these Preserves may become inadequate.	Climate Change is addressed for each species in the Conservation Analysis, which will be discussed at a future Steering Committee meeting.	April 25 <sup>th</sup>