

MEETING NOTES
East Alameda County Conservation Strategy
Steering Committee Meeting
March 3, 2009

Attendees

Jill Duerig & Mary Lim - Zone 7
Troy Rahmig & David Zippin – ICF Jones & Stokes
Liz McElligott & Dominic Farinha – Alameda County
Karen Sweet & Jim Robins – Alameda County Conservation Partnership
John Hemiup – Alameda County Congestion Management Agency
Brian Mathews – Alameda County Waste Management Authority
Mark Lander – City of Dublin
Steve Stewart – City of Livermore
Janice Stern – City of Pleasanton
Chris Barton– EBRPD
Scott Wilson, Liam Davis, Marcia Grefsrud – DFG
Brian Wines - RWQCB
Cay Goude & Kim Squires – USFWS

- 1) Steering Committee Letter on North Livermore Area Resource Conservation Plan
 - a) Comments received on letter included:
 - i) Include USFWS, DFG and RWQCB in the Steering Committee list and alphabetize list.
 - ii) Conservation Strategy is being developed in *partnership* with the Resource Agencies as opposed to in coordination with the Resource Agencies.
 - iii) Include statement that the Conservation Strategy will provide defined mitigation ratios for focal species and habitat.
 - b) Steering Committee's comment letter was submitted to Tri-Valley Conservancy on March 5th.

- 2) Project Update
 - a) Review of Chapter 1 and associated information
 - i) Chapter 1 is the introduction chapter that sets the regulatory stage for the Conservation Strategy.
 - ii) Steering Committee recognized that the chapter will likely evolve as subsequent chapters developed. As such, need to let the UAG know that the Conservation Strategy is a working document.
 - iii) Figure 1-2
 - (1) Want show how EACCS will be used to inform the project planning and implementation
 - (2) Will include bullets stating what information the EACCS will provide
 - (3) Also want to show that using the EACCS as part of project planning/implementation is optional
 - iv) Chapter 2 – Environmental Setting is currently being drafted. This chapter will include habitat modeling efforts.
 - v) Action: Provide comments to Troy by Wednesday, March 11th
 - b) Update on Corridor Study

- i) Draft corridor models will be available in a couple of weeks
 - ii) Want to be sure that the corridor maps are not misconstrued. As with all other maps, corridor maps showing linkages will have disclaimers on them.
 - iii) Will highlight in the text there are existing corridors on private land that are not shown on the map

- 3) Technical Review
 - a) Technical review process to date: informal discussions with species experts in order to develop a platform of information to work off of
 - b) Anticipate that there will be more formal technical review when the conservation goals and priorities are drafted. This may be done in a workshop setting.
 - c) CNPS letter
 - i) CNPS is concerned that the 10 acre minimum mapping unit is too large to adequately show plant communities with the greatest value.
 - ii) CNPS wants to include a longer list of plant species in the focal species list.
 - (1) Adding additional species may require additional modeling.
 - iii) CNPS provides some valid comments that the Steering Committee will have to consider.
 - iv) CNPS's comments will be inputted into the comment tracking sheet and will show how their comments are addressed
 - d) Alameda whipsnake (Federally & state listed species)
 - i) Karen Swaim is concerned about that the 10 acre minimum mapping unit is too large to adequately capture the Alameda whipsnake's habitat.
 - ii) Recognizing the fact that on-the-ground work will need to be done at the project level, the strategy will include a general statement that there is likely to be scrub areas, including scrubs in grasslands, where this species will likely occur.
 - iii) In addition, the strategy can have conducting detailed studies/maps for AWS as a conservation objective.
 - iv) USFWS noted that a recovery plan for AWS is being developed.
 - e) How models would be used
 - i) Gives general information about the landscape and will guide the strategy user as to what will likely be found on a site.
 - ii) Need to expressly state that the Conservation Strategy provides baseline information about where habitat is located more likely than not.
 - iii) On-the-ground work needs to be done on all project and mitigation sites. The Conservation Strategy needs to have strong language about what needs to be done in addition.
 - f) Actions
 - i) Jones & Stokes will ask Karen Swaim for a proposal for a subcontract for consideration by the Steering Committee.
 - ii) Steering Committee needs to consider technical review process for discussion at the April meeting.

- 4) Potential covered activities under EACCS
 - a) USFWS provided a proposed preliminary list of EACCS potential covered activities

- b) This list will be included in the programmatic biological opinion. In addition, this list will be incorporated into Chapter 1 to provide context.
 - c) Some activities proposed for inclusion include:
 - i) Landfills
 - ii) Preserve management areas
 - iii) Small construction
 - iv) Solar projects
 - v) Under infrastructure:
 - (1) Ancillary distribution/treatment facilities
 - (2) Wells
 - (3) Pump stations
 - (4) Flood control facilities
 - vi) Steering Committee needs to determine how mining activities (e.g. Apperson Ridge mining operation) will be addressed.
- 5) Upcoming Meetings
- a) UAG Meeting: Thursday, March 19th @ 2 pm
 - b) Steering Committee Meeting: Tuesday, April 7th @ 10 am
 - i) Discuss potential covered activities
 - ii) Discuss EACCS connection with Altamont Wind Resources HCP/NCCP effort
 - iii) Further discuss and formalize technical review process