

COMMENT SUMMARY. The table below includes comments from condensations of the public meeting and written comments (20 letters/cards from a total of about 19 people). About 7 of the comments were on comment cards from the public meeting. HCP project staff made their best effort to synthesize and categorize comments. Many letters that were submitted included comments on multiple topics.

Comment Topic	Sub-topic	Total
Alternatives	Alternatives unsupported and unexplained	1
	Other alternatives with USFWS interpretation	1
	Alternatives biased	1
Alternatives Total		3
Conflicts of Interest	Desire for recovery and mitigation \$	1
	Restoration industry will benefit	1
Conflicts of Interest Total		2
Costs	Costs to County too high	2
	Lack of county commitment	2
	Depending on public money	1
	Funding too uncertain	1
	Is HCP responsible for increased Sr. Center class fees?	1
	Risk of setting precedents	1
	Underestimated and no assured funding	1
	Planning dollars should have been spent differently	4
Costs Total		13
Covered species/lands/activities	Should cover subdivision	1
	Pocket gopher excluded	1
	Western Benton County excluded	1
Covered species/lands/activities		3
Data Sharing	Need open data sharing	1
	Data being privatized by sending it to ORNHIC	1
Data Sharing Total		2
EIS Needed	Alternatives unsupported and unexplained	1
	Consequences widespread and uncertain	1
	Final Recovery Plan lacking, so need EIS	1
EIS Needed Total		3
Fender's Blue Zone	Have removed Critical Habitat	1
	Arbitrary and inequitable mapping	1
	Mapping questionable	1
	Like that no habitat finding good 10 yr	1
FBB Zone Total		4
Good Neighbor Principle	Clarify where applies	1
	Support principle	1
Good Neighbor Total		2
Habitat Restoration	Invasive spp. threats	3
	Consider pocket gopher	1
	Include recovery permit?	1
	Burning allowed for conservation but not ag?	1
Habitat Restoration Total		6
HCP	General negative	1
	Too open ended	1
	Request more notification for next comment period	1
	Will free landowners and County from liability	1
	Promotes development, no balance with conservation	1
	Do not support	2
	Funding questionable, needs outside review, more public redress	1
HCP Total		8

HCP Development	Need social science input	1
	Poorly written	1
	SAC Representation Concerns	2
	Data analysis should include historical data/landowner knowledge	1
	Revisions and PCS moving in right direction	1
HCP Development Total		6
HCP Implementation	ROW management*	1
	Future modification process*	2
	Plant materials collection/use concerns*	5
	Encourage landowners to avoid impacts	1
HCP Implementation Total		9
HCP needs independent evaluation	Needs independent evaluation	3
	Review of FBB zone needed	1
HCP needs independent		4
Mitigation	Support removal of fees	3
	Should restore fees	1
	Clarify funding limitations for mitigation	1
	Inbreeding planned for mitigation sites	1
Mitigation Total		6
Prairie Conservation Strategy	General negative	2
	Forest Deferral conflicts	1
	Conservation tax deferral needed	1
	Fear of regulation in PCS	1
	Space requirements need more analysis	1
	Strategy suggestions	1
	Outreach suggestions	1
Prairie Conservation Strategy		8
Protection for private landowners	HCP inequitable*	1
	Potential refusal of take coverage problematic*	1
	Support that it makes it easier to build	1
	Landowners not actually protected*	1
Protection for private		4
Regulation Concerns	Plan goes beyond what is required	1
	HCP provides USFWS a "way out"	1
	Benton County cannot regulate property under the ESA	1
	Enforcement lacking currently	1
Regulation Concerns Total		4
Risk of regulatory disincentives	Conflict with biological goal*	1
	Need careful communication	1
	PCS doesn't address disincentives*	1
	HCP doesn't address risks of regulation*	1
	Safe Harbor still brings liability*	1
	USFWS is mis-interpreting discretion*	1
	No removal of conservation disincentives for ag/developers*	1
Candidate Conservation Agreements still require commitment*	1	
Risk of regulatory disincentives		8
Grand Total		95

*Comments within a single topic with asterisks are from a single individual.