

Thurston County Board Briefing

<u>Briefing Date/Time:</u>	January 17, 2018 9:30-10AM
<u>Office/Department & Staff Contact:</u>	<p>CPED – Long Range Planning</p> <p>Josh Cummings, Director, ext. 3005</p> <p>Cynthia Wilson, Long Range Planning Manager, ext. 5475</p> <p>Christina Chaput, Associate Planner, ext. 5486</p> <p>Andy Deffobis, Associate Planner, ext 5467</p>
<u>Topic:</u>	Habitat Mitigation Concept discussion
<u>Purpose:</u> (check all that apply)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information only <input type="checkbox"/> Decision needed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Follow up from previous briefing
<u>Synopsis/Request/Recommendation:</u> <i>(One or two sentences identifying your primary objective for this session)</i>	
<p>The purpose of this briefing is to provide a follow up discussion on the pros and cons of a BoCC suggested mitigation approach that utilizes the frequency of gopher occupancy detection on property, as determined from the interim process during permit review (~10% occupancy on sites reviewed); to determine HCP mitigation acres needed.</p>	
<p><u>1. Previous Briefings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a follow up discussion from the BoCC check in meeting on December 14th. <p><u>2. Discussion</u></p> <p>The Board has requested information on the pros and cons of a mitigation approach that utilizes the frequency of gopher occupancy detection on property, as identified during the interim process for permit review to determine HCP mitigation acres needed. Currently, the permit review has shown ~10% occupancy on sites reviewed.</p> <p>As suggested by Board, this 10% relates to the proportion of land needed to purchase for mitigation, ie 10% of 300 acres = 30 acres needed per year for 30 years.</p> <p>Pros - if USFWS (US Fish and Wildlife Service) accepts this methodology, and depending on how mitigation approach is structured:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • constituents without MPG (Mazama Pocket Gopher) may not be required to pay mitigation, or could pay less than now envisioned in current draft HCP. • could require the County to seek fewer mitigation properties over life of HCP because take acreage is reduced. 	

Cons - if USFWS does not accept this methodology:

- ITP (Incidental Take Permit) will not be issued
- Grant and direct funding may be withdrawn or not awarded
- If the County still wants an HCP, County will then need to find their own funding to complete it

MPG Occupancy by parcel

2014:~10% (mixed sites)

2015: ~11% (mixed sites)

2016: ~18% screen team sites only, ~10% w/internal review factored in

2017: ~15% screen team sites only, ~10% with internal review factored in

Documents Attached:

No attachments

Summary & Financial Impact:

Affected Parties:

E.g. County residents, community organizations, other County offices/departments, etc.

All county residents and county capital facility construction may be affected in some way because of the extent of the coverage for the Thurston County Habitat Conservation Plan.

Options with Pros & Cons:

Below ~ List all viable options. Begin with underlined option title, then add pros and cons, financial impact of each, as well as affected parties (e.g. County residents, community organizations, etc.)

Board Direction:

Next Steps/Timeframe:

Based on the Board's recommendation, describe the next steps required in order to bring this item to conclusion. Include the time frame for each step, and when the Board should expect to see this issue before them again.