



Bush Prairie HCP

Stakeholder Meeting, March 31, 2017

Attendees (24):

BUSH PRAIRIE HCP STAKEHOLDERS:	
Name	Organization
Thom Woodruff	Capitol Land Trust
Don Moody	CBRE
Patrick Dunn	Center for Natural Lands Management
Janell Barrilleaux	FAA (attended via telephone)
Jeff Pantier	Hatton Godat Pantier
Jake Homann	Kaufman Construction
Lisa Dennis-Perez	LOTT Cleanwater Alliance
Joel Baxter	Olympia Master Builders
David Schaffert	Thurston County Chamber of Commerce
Christina Chaput Andy Deffobis	Thurston County
Amy Hatch-Winecka	Thurston County Conservation District
Katrina Van Every	Thurston Regional Planning Council
Mel Murray	Tumwater School District
Glenn Wells	Vine Street Investors
Theresa Nation	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Marion Carey	Washington Department of Transportation
BUSH PRAIRIE HCP APPLICANTS:	
Mike Matlock Brad Medrud	City of Tumwater
Rachael Jamison Rudy Rudolph	Port of Olympia
BUSH PRAIRIE HCP CONSULTANT TEAM:	
Chris Earle	ICF
Ruth Bell Lynn Knapp	Cascadia Consulting Group

Arrival and Welcome:

- Meeting began at 9:08 AM
- Ruth Bell introduced facilitation ground rules and venue safety information.
- Rachael Jamison introduced new members: Marion Carey with Washington State Department of Transportation (present) and Farron McCloud with Nisqually Tribal Council (not present)

Meeting Overview (Chris Earle):

- There have been three memoranda distributed to stakeholders via email and time allotted for review and comments to be submitted. These memoranda provide a basis for what comes next.

Grant Application Review and Status Update (Brad Medrud):

- Application for the Phase 2 grant was due this month. Thanks to Rachael Jamison and Rudy Rudolph it was completed well ahead of time. Thanks to the organizations that sent letters. Local office of USFWS thought application looked good. The total grant amount is \$900,000 and the match is \$150,000 each for the City and Port.

Presentation and Discussion (Chris Earle):

- At the last stakeholder meeting in December the group discussed the potential HCP area and upcoming memorandums.
- These are all a part of Phase 1. Phase 2 is expected to move ahead with formal HCP and NEPA documents.
- Species and activities memorandum were distributed by email prior to this meeting. Thank you for the comments that were submitted. No proposed changes at this point, but comments will be incorporated into HCP draft during Phase 2.
- Stakeholder membership - WSDOT and Nisqually have joined. We are still talking with the Chehalis and Squaxin tribes.
- Discussed permit area for the covered species. One comment was whether mitigation banks could be used - and yes they could, but at this point existing mitigation banks are nowhere near meeting the demand.
- Gophers will probably not be relocated, and USFWS does not currently view efforts to relocate gophers as feasible.
- Mitigation land could be paid for in various ways; many HCPs developed in the past have used a development fee program. The City has not embarked on a funding process yet.
- Recap of covered activities memo:
 - Definition of “covered activities”.
 - Discussed the six criteria in the memorandum.
 - Thom Woodruff - confused about the HCP term of 30 years. When we say permit term is that the same as the HCP?
 - Chris Earle - yes, the specifics regarding permit term are in the HCP document. The permit itself enables implementation of the HCP.
 - Outlined the five types of projects that count as activities and added the distinction between aeronautical and non-aeronautical activities.
 - Question: What is the relationship between urban growth area (UGA) and the HCP?

- Chris Earle - since permittees will be the City and the Port, the UGA isn't covered, unless mitigation areas are in the UGA and then they would be covered.
- Patrick Dunn - Can you talk more about the airport in the HCP? Most of the species distribution is on the airport property but would not be included as part of the permit?
 - Chris Earle - USFWS has encouraged us to use the strategy of including airport activities in the HCP to streamline Section 7 consultations¹.
 - Rachael Jamison - our approach ensures that FAA is at the table through this process. We want to make the process as holistic and complete as possible. A streamlined Section 7 approach is needed.
 - Patrick Dunn - the airport has its own issues and requires information analysis.
 - Chris Earle - there are many HCPs around the country that have a federal component to them. USFWS is familiar with processes that need both Section 7 and Section 10 regulation.
 - Glenn Wells - the airport could bog down the HCP process.
 - Rudy Rudolph - how did we arrive at the assumption that the airport being part of this process creates a complexity?
 - Rachael Jamison - at the end of the day we want to expedite the process as much as possible. For actions that would need Section 7 approval, we want to move forward so if this becomes an issue we can problem solve.
 - Rudy Rudolph - We've been doing a project at the airport with Section 7 consultation and we've been effective and very good at it. This year, USFWS says they have nothing to change in the air show process and will look at a 5-year solution. This indicates we are working together effectively.
 - Chris Earle - pocket gopher, lark, and sparrow all exist inside and outside the airport fence. Some form of FAA participation will be necessary because of species movement.

Stakeholder Input (open to all):

- Glenn Wells -is there a general guess as to when this HCP will be in place?
 - Chris Earle - Phase 1 will be completed by the end of 2017. Phase 2, including the HCP document and its NEPA compliance process, will then occur in 2018. We hope to secure a permit by the end of 2018.
 - Ruth Bell - we're in Phase 1 now.
- Jeff Pantier - can you describe at what point in the process we will dive into funding mechanisms?
 - Chris Earle - certainly after the 3rd stakeholder meeting, so hopefully later this year. The funding process is needs to go through administrative action with the City council and we anticipate that process will take some time.

¹ The Endangered Species Act provides two mechanisms to authorize incidental take. Section 7 applies to actions performed, permitted, or funded by a federal agency; Section 10 (which requires preparation of an HCP) applies to actions by non-federal parties such as state or local government, or private parties.

- Marion Carey - suggest being more detailed on the covered actions list. There are a number of activities that are missing and there will be a lot of questions once completed, especially in the areas of transportation and drainage system maintenance, repaving, striping, and signage. Another example is in parks activities - maintaining lawns and fields.
 - Chris Earle - this is a summary of covered activities. Within the HCP document, we are expecting to have to list every detail of how maintenance activities are performed. Having direct control over activity at the Port is important.
- Patrick Dunn - There is nothing in particular that's missing, but as we look at impacts for species will we have a general discussion to provide a basis for the information?
 - Chris Earle - at this point, we are looking for gaps or particular areas that need to be described. That's why the covered activities are presented in broad terms.
 - Patrick Dunn - details matter; if the details aren't available then we [stakeholders] can't comment.
 - Chris Earle - the draft HCP for will contain the details. That HCP will be part of the draft NEPA document that will be open for public comment. There will be another round of comments after the first are incorporated.
 - Patrick Dunn - what is the purpose of the stakeholder group if there are no firm details to comment on?
 - Chris Earle - the primary focus is to identify any missing categories or types of activities that should be included in the process. We are also interested in discussion of experience that identifies where additional planning might be needed.
 - Patrick Dunn - the group is limited by what you provide us.
 - Rachael Jamison - what would be helpful to you? Is there a missing link between the general work and the more detailed HCP?
 - Patrick Dunn - my expertise is not covered activities, but impact on species. I don't see much I can comment on the general impact categories. How do stakeholders improve the process if it's so general?
 - Rachael Jamison - we can look at bringing sections of the draft HCP to the stakeholders for comment before it goes before the broader public.
 - Patrick Dunn - that seems like the right step, keeping in mind there is a different amount of work for each stakeholder. The City is asking us to participate so that obstacles are avoided at that last step.
 - Rachael Jamison - great, the deep dive in phase 2 will be a great place to get stakeholder input.
- Glenn Wells - since the UGA won't be covered in the HCP, I wouldn't be able to use the mitigation plan.
 - Chris Earle - Thurston County is writing a separate HCP that will cover lands in the UGA. As UGA lands are annexed for the city of Tumwater, they are then covered under this HCP. We are working on coordinating the City and County HCPs so that requirements will be similar both before and after annexation.
 - Glenn Wells - would the landowner in the UGA be stuck for a while?
 - Chris Earle - We can't speak to the timeline on the Thurston County HCP.
 - Glenn Wells - Can private landowners use this HCP and whatever mitigation it includes to offset their own private development?
 - Chris Earle - that is the intent of the HCP: to cover private development in the city of Tumwater.
 - Rachael Jamison - you would need your own HCP until your land is annexed into the city of Tumwater.
 - Christina Chaput - there are new County Board [of Commissioners] members that are being educated on the importance of the HCP, so the Thurston County

HCP is delayed and looking to start the NEPA process later this year - close to the City's timeline.

- Glenn Wells - How are you planning to complete the HCP process at the end of 2018 if the NEPA process is 18 months?
- Chris Earle - 18 months may be excessive. We'll need to develop that timeline in more detail.
- Marion Carey - please make an early draft of the HCP available for stakeholders so input can be provided.
 - Rachael Jamison - as we work on the memoranda we are saving comments to be included in the first draft of the HCP.
 - Brad Medrud - agree with the idea that stakeholders are involved in draft review. Encourages written comments because they are easier to track.
- Katrina Van Every - as you are writing the HCP, suggest communicating back to public. Memorandum as written is not very accessible to the general public.
 - Chris Earle - Phase 2 will include NEPA process public meetings. We recognize there is need for an education component.

Next Steps (Chris Earle):

- We are thinking about having a field trip in early May to visit recently developed sites, in-process sites, and those that constitute good habitat.
 - Ten hands raised to indicate interest.
 - Chris Earle - any recommended sites for the field trip?
 - Rachael Jamison - some of the Port properties.
 - Thom Woodruff - property across from the airport?
 - Patrick Dunn - doesn't have anything currently in restoration phase. We can talk about some of the sites and what they are doing.
 - Patrick Dunn - encourages people to attend Prairie Appreciation Day (see <http://www.prairieappreciationday.org/> for further information).
- The next stakeholder meeting will be in the summer.
- Until then, we are developing terminology for how impacts are avoided and minimized, GIS exercise, and effects analysis memoranda. We are just at the start of the analysis process, so timing is difficult to predict.
- We are planning to have more further stakeholder meetings as we enter Phase 2 of the process.

Meeting Concluded: 10:14 AM