

MEETING NOTES

East Alameda County Conservation Strategy Steering Committee Meeting September 2, 2008 10 am – noon Zone 7 Conference Room 150A

Attendees

Mary Lim - Zone 7
Troy Rahmig – ICF Jones & Stokes
Liz McElligott & Dominic Farinha – Alameda County
Brian Mathews – Alameda County Waste Management Authority
Steve Stewart & Eric Brown – City of Livermore
Janice Stern – City of Pleasanton
Chris Barton – EBRPD
Jim Robins – Conservation Partnership
Kim Squires – USFWS
Marcia Grefsrud – DFG

- 1) Users Advisory Group Meeting – Debrief
 - a) Mary handed out the meeting notes from the August 14th UAG meeting.
 - b) There was a good discussion at the UAG meeting about how mitigation can be kept within this part of the County.
 - i) One suggestion was setting mitigation ratios by how far mitigation is from the actual impact area. The further away mitigation is done from the impact site, the higher the mitigation ratio would be.
 - ii) Alternatively, additional fees could be assessed if mitigation occurs outside of the county.
 - c) There were some additional questions about the land use and open space maps, mainly clarification questions. There was a request to develop additional maps as we move forward.
 - d) UAG received the draft land cover map along with Tables 4 and 5 that summarized mapping confidence and vegetation types, respectively.
 - i) Received initial comments to do additional review of certain vegetation types, like Serpentine Bunchgrass Grassland and desert olive scrub
 - ii) UAG was informed that ground verification will be conducted for those land cover types that received a low mapping confidence rating
 - e) Outreach
 - i) Landowners present at the meeting provided input on how to get landowner buy-in
 - (1) Want to show that conservation easements is an economically viable option for landowners
 - (2) Although EACCS is biologically based, need to show collateral benefits to landowners.
 - (3) Note there were no questions regarding the meeting notes from the Landowner Meeting in June.
 - ii) Informed UAG of planned outreach activities

- (1) One landowner volunteered to do a presentation to the Cattelwoman's Association
 - (2) Let UAG members know that Steering Committee is developing outreach materials for them to distribute to their respective constituents.
 - iii) There was a suggestion of developing a working glossary that translates technical jargon for the layperson
 - iv) There was a concern with development community not consistently participating in the UAG.
 - f) A UAG member suggested setting up a field trip to visit existing and potential conservation areas.
 - i) Steering Committee discussed the possibility of changing the October 16th UAG meeting to a one-day field trip with a working lunch
 - ii) Action: Mary to send out email to see how much interest there is in this field trip; if enough interest, Mary to set up tour for UAG and those Steering Committee members interested in attending
 - g) The Steering Committee suggested alternating the UAG meetings between the regularly scheduled time of 2 pm and evening meetings around 7 pm in order to get more participation.
 - i) Action: Discuss with UAG at next meeting.
- 2) Outreach Subcommittee Meeting Debrief
- a) The Outreach Subcommittee met on August 19th to discuss outreach needs.
 - i) Materials to be generated will include:
 - (1) Updating Landowner FAQs (currently ongoing)
 - (2) Summary for tables & maps to provide context
 - (a) Mary to send Troy draft summary.
 - (3) Project summary – take existing pamphlet that was distributed out in January and update and reformat it.
 - (4) Developed canned presentations
 - (5) Working glossary
 - ii) Meeting with key landowners to discuss how to better outreach to them still needs to be scheduled.
 - b) Troy talked to Leah Dreger (DeSilva Group) about lack of interest in EACCS by developers. She indicated that there is no one group that developers associate with other than the Home Builders Association. In addition, developer interests are currently focused on in-fill development. As a result, mitigation needs are minimal.
 - i) The Steering Committee agreed that we need to do our best to keep the development community in the loop on EACCS. Although developers are focusing on in-fill, there may be a time where they may think about developing in other areas and will have to live with the plan that is developed.
 - c) Actions
 - i) Conduct follow-up with missing UAG members
 - (1) Paul Campos - Mary
 - (2) James Richards, CalTrans – Mary
 - (3) James Paxon – Janice Stern
 - (4) Marty Inderbitzen – Steve Stewart
 - (5) Phil Wente – Karen Sweet

- ii) Karen Sweet & Allison Batteate are currently soliciting landowners to fill 3-4 UAG spots
- 3) Phase 1 Work Progress
- a) Maps provided in the EACCS will give guidance; additional on-the-ground surveys will still be needed when project mitigation is sought
 - b) Comments on Land Cover map
 - i) Some comments given at the UAG meeting but no additional comments have been received since then
 - c) Update on ground verification of Land Cover map
 - i) Ground verification is currently ongoing for key areas where there a low confidence rating was given when digitizing the various land cover
 - ii) RCD can lend support for areas in which access in order to conduct ground verification is an issue
 - d) List of expected figures and figure requests from UAG
 - i) A list of potential figures to be included in the EACCS document was distributed for Steering Committee review and comment
 - ii) Usefulness of map of Williamson Act lands
 - (1) Would show existing landscapes but probably will not add value to EACCS
 - iii) There was a question regarding how detailed these maps will be (i.e. will it show individual parcels?)
 - (1) Steering Committee agreed that these maps need to be as general as possible to minimize any pushback.
 - (2) Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy maps show parcels but Santa Rosa Plain is a smaller geographic area than East Alameda County.
 - iv) There was a suggestion at the UAG meeting to show areas of potential conservation in future (i.e. those in EBRPD's Master Plan)
 - (1) If not essential to EACCS, then will not be done.
 - (2) Want to be sure maps do not communicate that EACCS is a mechanism for a local agency to take land
 - v) There was a suggestion to show Ag enhancement areas, or areas where there is a possibility that areas currently dry farmed may be converted to irrigated ag in the future
 - (1) This will not be mapped as how ag land is farmed changes with the market.
 - (2) A short narrative about these areas will be provided in the EACCS document.
 - e) Species habitat modeling
 - i) Currently ongoing
 - ii) Not mapping all of the focal species
- 4) Phases 2/3
- a) Received Alameda County Waste Management Authority & City of Pleasanton's signature page of the Funding Agreement
 - b) City of Livermore will have their signature within the week
 - c) EBRPD will be taking the Funding Agreement to their Board on September 16th
 - d) Notice to Proceed for Phases 2/3 will not be issued until Zone 7 has a fully executed funding agreement.

- e) Action: Funding partners to send Mary their signed signature page of the Funding Agreement ASAP.
- 5) October 16th Users Advisory Group Meeting
- a) Action: Mary will send an email out to the UAG to see how many are interested in doing a field trip in lieu of having a meeting. This meeting will include a working lunch where updated maps and tables will be distributed.
 - b) If no field trip, then the meeting will still be on October 16, 2008, 2 pm @ Zone 7's Board Room.
- 6) Next Steering Committee Meeting Date: **October 7, 2008 @ 10 am**
- a) Discuss defining pilot projects for EACCS