

**MEETING NOTES**  
**East Alameda County Conservation Strategy**  
**Steering Committee Meeting**  
**June 2, 2009**

**Meeting Attendees**

Liz McElligott – Alameda County

Karen Sweet – Alameda County Resource Conservation District

Jim Robins – Alameda County Conservation Partnership

Brian Mathews – Alameda County Waste Management Authority

Steve Stewart & Eric Brown – City of Livermore

Marcia Grefsrud – DFG

Chris Barton– EBRPD

David Zippin & Troy Rahmig – ICF Jones & Stokes

Brian Wines - RWQCB

Cay Goude & Kim Squires – USFWS

Jill Duerig & Mary Lim - Zone 7

- 1) Discussion on deliverables & expectations of EACCS and conservation goals and objectives
  - a) Concern that the draft conservation goals and objectives are putting the cart before the horse because it focuses heavily on mitigation ratios as opposed to what the overall conservation goals are for the focal species.
    - i) Need to know what the species needs in order to determine the conservation needs
      - (1) Will require follow up with species experts; Troy is already following up with Steve Bozien (EBRPD), Karen Swaim, Leslie Koenig and Jeff Alvarez.
      - (2) This information will provide a nexus with the mitigation ratios
    - ii) Local agencies on the steering committee is looking at mitigation ratios
    - iii) UAG is looking at the end goal for conservation
  - b) EACCS is primarily regulatory but has secondary benefits
    - i) Local agencies and USFWS/DFG will use the conservation strategy to facilitate permitting
    - ii) EACCS can also provide framework priorities for conservation efforts that are not tied to project mitigation
      - (1) EACCS is not meant to be comprehensive but focused strictly on species
      - (2) Other conservation groups can use the strategy as a support tool for their programs and for seeking grants; these groups can build upon the conservation strategy to meet their goals.
      - (3) Implementation tools include
        - (a) Local ordinance or adopted plans
        - (b) Programmatic BO w/USACE
        - (c) PLCS
        - (d) Project permits
        - (e) EBRPD
        - (f) Other conservation groups
    - iii) See attached Framework chart, which illustrates the building blocks that make up the strategy and the outputs of the strategy
      - (1) Ratio priorities will be used by project proponents
      - (2) Framework priorities will support conservation efforts independent of project mitigation

- (a) Note that local municipalities can use the conservation strategy to support/meet their respective open space/conservation goals
  - c) What the conservation strategy is trying to do
    - i) Direct conservation/open space/preserves to certain areas
      - (1) In this area, we have more conservation opportunities than mitigation, alone, can pay for. The conservation strategy will focus the mitigation dollars first to the priority areas.
      - (2) Important to note that project mitigation will take care of a portion of the conservation needs for this area; it will be up to other conservation groups and programs to take care of the rest
    - ii) Outline conservation needs and the actual effects
    - iii) Streamline permitting
      - (1) Mitigation ratios for species in order to provide consistency and certainty
  - d) Prioritization of conservation priority areas
    - i) Need to establish linkage with surrounding conservation plan areas
      - (1) The area between East Contra Costa County and San Joaquin County is a key area for conservation
    - ii) Have all the building blocks to develop the conservation priority map
      - (1) Looking at the upland goals, which are numeric targets, as well as species needs to identify conservation gaps
      - (2) Will rank priority areas as either medium – high – highest or numeric ranking
  - e) How mitigation ratios were determined in Santa Rosa
    - i) Determined where conservation should occur and calculated preserve sizes (4000 acres)
    - ii) Estimate of anticipated impacts within city limits (2000 acres)
    - iii) From these two factors, a two to one ratio for CTS was derived.
  - f) Deliverables (i.e. what the conservation strategy will entail)
    - i) Priority map
    - ii) Linkage needs
    - iii) Identification of special sites
      - (1) Unique resources (e.g. Springtown preserve)
      - (2) Pinch points (e.g. I-580)
    - iv) Mitigation ratios
    - v) Standardized avoidance/minimization tools
    - vi) Implementation
      - (1) See attached EACCS Implementation Process Chart
  - g) How the Regional Board and USACE could use the Conservation Strategy in their respective permitting processes
    - i) Regional Board reiterated that they cannot agree to set mitigation ratios. Their permits provide reasonable ranges.
    - ii) The Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy stated that Regional Board and USACE requirements still need to be satisfied and should not be in conflict with the Conservation Strategy.
    - iii) The Regional Board and USACE permits would build upon and be consistent with the Conservation Strategy.
- 2) June 11<sup>th</sup> Community Meeting Agenda
- a) Open House: 7 – 7:30 pm
  - b) Welcome and Introduction (Mary)
    - i) Mary will facilitate meeting

- c) Presentation: Project Introduction (Troy)
- d) Benefits of UAG
  - i) Steering Committee perspective
    - (1) Steve Stewart, City of Livermore
    - (2) Liz McElligott, Alameda County
  - ii) Agency perspective
    - (1) Liam Davis, CDFG
    - (2) Kim Squires, USFWS
  - iii) UAG perspective
    - (1) Allison Batteate, landowner (proposed)
    - (2) Representative from conservation or environmental groups
- 3) Concerns Received Regarding EACCS Process
  - a) Troy provided a response to Colleen Dhaoui's email. No formal comment letter has been received.
  - b) CNPS met with Liz McElligott to discuss their concerns about the EACCS process. Their concerns included:
    - i) Not enough public participation
    - ii) Steering committee not transparent or responsive
      - (1) Complained that the Steering Committee provided no response to their formal letter
    - iii) Lack of scientific integrity
    - iv) Stated that the process was flawed and it would be better to do nothing at all
  - c) Note that Troy followed up with CNPS on which plants we proposed to include; however, CNPS have not yet responded. In addition, CNPS did not attend any of the technical workshops (this could have been due to scheduling conflicts).
  - d) Cay suggested that USFWS and DFG meet with CNPS to discuss their concerns.
  - e) In addition, the Steering Committee agreed that transparency and public involvement be included in the FAQ. Mary will distribute latest FAQ for review & comment.
  - f) Action items
    - i) Revise FAQ to include
      - (1) Why the steering committee is involved
      - (2) How information is shared
      - (3) Scientific review process
- 4) Upcoming Meetings
  - a) Community Meeting: Thursday, June 11<sup>th</sup>, 7 – 9 pm at Dublin's Regional Meeting Room
  - b) UAG Meeting: Thursday, June 18<sup>th</sup> @ 2 pm
  - c) Steering Committee Meeting: Tuesday, July 7<sup>th</sup> @ 10 am
    - i) Debrief of Community Meeting & UAG Meeting
    - ii) Project update & Schedule
    - iii) Discuss draft conservation goals & objectives
    - iv) Map designation between agriculture lands and rangelands