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Top 5 Reasons for a Habitat Conservation Plan

• Makes Permitting Easier
• Keep Permit Decisions Local
• Keep the Local Economy Fired up and Growing
• Help our Permit Applicants Comply with State and Federal Law
• Help our Residents with Costs
Status: Where we are now

• On-boarding new commissioners
• Course correcting based on new leadership
• Continue writing the chapters: requires USFWS technical assistance
  • Technical contract merges highly detailed biological information and complex regulations – in detail.
• Re-engaging the stakeholders
HCP Development

Lengthy development process, lots of steps with many moving parts

1. Develop Habitat Assessment Mechanisms
2. Identify HCP Coverage Area and Covered Activities
3. Quantify Estimated Impacts from Future Covered Activities
4. Identify Conservation Measures and Strategy
5. Identify Implementation Process and Funding Mechanisms
6. Develop Draft HCP
7. NEPA/SEPA Process
8. Complete Public and USFWS Review
9. Finalize HCP
10. Incidental Take Permit Issued
Overview of a HCP: 3 Main Parts

1. Impacts (“Take”)
   • Identify Species and Associated Habitat
   • Identify Coverage Area (affected land area)
   • Identify Activities
   • Length of HCP

2. Mitigation
   • Conservation Measures
   • How to replace what is lost to development

3. Fiscal
   • How much it costs
   • How to pay for it

Quantify Estimated Impacts
Part 1: Impacts ("take")
HCP Covered Habitats & Species

**HABITATS**
- Prairie
- Oak Woodland
- Wetland/Riparian

**SPECIES**
- Mazama pocket gopher
- Oregon spotted frog
- Taylor’s checkerspot butterfly
- Streaked horned lark
- Western Gray Squirrel
- Slender-billed white-breasted nuthatch
- Oregon vesper sparrow
- Mardon skipper butterfly
- Oregon branched skipper butterfly
- Hoary elfin butterfly
- Puget blue butterfly
- Valley silverspot butterfly
Covered Activities
(What creates the impacts)
Part 2: Mitigation
Proposed Conservation Strategy

- New Acquisition Lands
- Acquisition of Permanent Working Lands Easements
- Acquisition of Temporary Working Lands Easements
- Avoid Impacts
- Enhance Existing Conservation Lands
Cost Components of Conservation Strategy

• Management and administration of plan implementation
• Acquire mitigation conservation lands
  • Temporary/permanent working lands easements, fee title acquisition, or donations of land
• Enhancing mitigation conservation lands to high quality habitat
• Long-term mitigation management and monitoring funds (e.g., endowments)
Part 3: Fiscal Management
Fiscal Planning

• County’s Role in Fiscal Planning
  • Identify real cost components (land, enhancement, maintenance)
  • Reasonable estimate is a requirement of document

• Community weighs in and County decides how to finance

• Community weighs in and County decides how much impact (take) coverage

• Note: only estimate of real costs; only spend it if you need it
  Pay as you go
Example of a Dollar of Mitigation – how it’s spent

- Easement and Land Acquisition: 41% (0.41 cents)
- Long Term Maintenance and Monitoring: 38% (0.38 cents)
- Enhancement: 13% (0.13 cents)
- Administration & Report: 8% (0.08 cents)

% Break Down by Activity – based on where we left off

ALL NUMBERS ARE DELIBERATIVE
Options Being Considered by Commissioners
# New Board Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Cost (total annual)</th>
<th>HCP Coverage (functional acreage)</th>
<th>Expense by conservation strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary Working Lands Easements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Option</td>
<td>$5.1 million</td>
<td>7,565</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>$1 million</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$2.2 million</td>
<td>2,652</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>$2.8 million</td>
<td>2,107</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>$3.5 million</td>
<td>3,653</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All numbers are deliberative*
Original Option: $5.1M/Yr for 30 years  
(what you saw last time)

- County Capital Facilities Projects
- Individual Single Family Residential impacts
- Temporary Impacts
- Public Facilities
- Plats (short, large lot, subdivision)
- Commercial development
- Industrial activities

7,565 “take” amount

Projected take amount maximizes development flexibility and capability for the county.
Option A: $1M/Yr

ESA Coverage

1,175 “take” amount for 30 years

- County Capital Facility Projects
- Individual single family residential lot impacts <1ac

- Likely have to cap number of single family permits per year

- Caps annual mitigation revenue at $1 million
- More minimization required
- Less flexibility to accommodate UGA increases

On their own:
- Public Facilities (Fire/Schools)
- Temporary Impacts
- Accessory Structures
- Plats (Short, Large Lots)
- Subdivisions
- Commercial
- Industrial Activities
- Mining activities
- Federal projects
Option B: $2.2M/Yr

ALL NUMBERS ARE DELIBERATIVE

ESA Coverage

2,652 “take” amount for 30 years

- Capital Facility Projects
- Public Facilities
- Temporary Impacts
- Accessory structures
- Individual single family residential lot impacts <1 ac

On their own:
- Plats (Short, Large Lots)
- Subdivisions
- Commercial
- Industrial Activities
- Mining activities
- Federal projects

- Likely have to cap number of permits per year
- Caps annual mitigation revenue at $1 million plus 100% use of conservation futures each year.
- More minimization required
- Less flexibility to accommodate UGA increases
Option C: $2.8M/Yr

ESA Coverage
20 Year
2,107 “take” amount

• Capital Facility Projects
• Public Facilities
• Temporary Impacts
• Accessory structures
• Individual single family residential lot impacts <1 ac

On their own:
• Plats (Short, Large Lots)
• Subdivisions
• Commercial
• Industrial Activities
• Mining activities
• Federal projects

• Likely have to cap number of permits per year
• More minimization required
• Assumes 70% build out
• Less flexibility to accommodate UGA increases

ALL NUMBERS ARE DELIBERATIVE
Option D: $3.5M/Yr

ESA Coverage
30 Year
3,656 “take” amount

- County Capital Facility Projects
- Public Facilities
- Temporary Impacts
- Accessory structures
- Single family residential
- Plats (Short, Large Lots, subdivisions)
- Commercial
- Industrial Activities

On their own:
- Mining Operations
- Federal Projects

Potential funding sources:
- $1.2M Conservation Futures
- $2.3 mitigation fees and/or other funding sources

• Less development flexibility and capability for the county.
• More minimization measures would be required
Summary

• Reducing the quantity of impacts covered in the HCP reduces the potential costs

• Reduces flexibility – less able to adapt to unpredicted increase in growth

• HCP is a pay-as-you-go system
  • No mitigation costs associated with any projected impact that does not occur

• Full HCP costs are not required to be available on day one
Discussions and Q/A

Submit Comments Anytime to:
Hcpinfo@co.thurston.wa.us