

MEETING NOTES
East Alameda County Conservation Strategy
Steering Committee Meeting
August 4, 2009

Attendees

Liz McElligott – Alameda County
Jim Robins – Alameda County Conservation Partnership
Brian Mathews – Alameda County Waste Management Authority
Mark Lander – City of Dublin
Janice Stern & Alison Ryan – City of Pleasanton
Marcia Grefsrud – DFG
Chris Barton – EBRPD
Troy Rahmig – ICF Jones & Stokes
Brian Wines - RWQCB
Kim Squires – USFWS
Mary Lim - Zone 7

- 1) Announcement: Karen Sweet is no longer with the Alameda County Resource Conservation District.
 - a) Jim Robins will continue to be the representative for the Alameda County Conservation Partnership.

- 2) Debrief of July 21st Landowner Workshop
 - a) This workshop provided a broad brush overview on what conservation tools are available to landowners.
 - b) EACCS was one of the topics discussed at this workshop but was not the main focus of the workshop.
 - c) Concerns expressed about EACCS
 - i) Landowner feedback hasn't been addressed/integrated in the document.
 - (1) Note that the comment matrix will be posted on the project website. This matrix will show how comments were addressed.
 - ii) Priority should be on protecting as much grassland as possible.
 - iii) Lack of trust between landowners and fed/state permitting agencies. Landowners do not oppose the endangered species regulations but have been concerned about the length of time it takes to get permitting/conservation easements worked out.
 - iv) Landowners prefer to have a management plan for their entire parcel as opposed to having piecemeal conservation on their land.
 - d) Outreach concerns: Want to educate the new generations about working landscapes to encourage them to continue preserving these landscapes in the future. The Rangeland Coalition noted that they will address this issue.
 - e) Jim R. will email the landowners that attending this workshop to see who would be interested in getting email alerts regarding the EACCS effort.

- 3) Draft goals and objectives
 - a) Based on comments received at the last Steering Committee meeting, the structure of the goals and objectives has been revised.
 - i) The landscape level goals and objectives are meant to be high level and broad brush.

- ii) The natural communities and species levels are nested within the landscape level goals/objectives.
 - iii) These goals/objectives are meant to be applied to areas that are meant to be conserved. These are not meant to supersede local land use policies.
 - iv) When appropriate, measurable goals will be incorporated. However, it is not required for a Conservation Strategy (unlike with an HCP/NCCP).
 - v) Most terms, like “semi-natural habitat” were defined in the glossary. However, there are terms (e.g. “large enough”) that will vary depending upon what is being conserved.
 - b) Important note: These goals and objectives are meant to be guidance for local agencies. It will be up to the local agencies to reconcile any potential conflicts with local ordinances. In addition, it will be up to the respective agencies’ policymakers to revise current policies as they deem appropriate.
 - c) Comments:
 - i) For conservation actions that require applicant to provide information on land cover in order to update EACCS maps, want to provide as much guidance as to the type of information needed. Landowners need to know what needs to be done in order to get conservation easements on their land.
 - ii) Replace “river” with either “riverine” or “stream” since there are no rivers within the study area.
 - iii) Include identifiers with the conservation actions. For objectives that have more than one conservation action, need to know if a project proponent needs to do all actions or just the majority.
 - (1) Note that the programmatic biological opinion will define what actions need to be taken.
 - iv) Language needs to be revised so it does not appear to look like an HCP/NCCP.
 - d) Actions
 - i) Refine goals and objectives based on comments and release full set of goals and objectives to the Steering Committee for review. This is estimated to take a couple of weeks to complete all goals/objectives for all focal species.
 - (1) As the goals/objectives are drafted, they will be vetted through the species experts.
 - ii) Introduce the overall structure of the biological goals and objectives to the UAG at its next meeting.
- 4) Data request from CNPS
- a) CNPS requested the shape files for the vegetation layer in order to facilitate their review of Chapter 2.
 - b) There were no objections to this request.
- 5) Implementation Subcommittee
- a) Jim R., Brian M., Steve S. and Troy will be on this committee. Jim will likely be the chair for this subcommittee.
 - b) Other individuals (i.e. UAG members and landowners) will be solicited to participate in this subcommittee.
 - c) There will likely be 6 meetings over the next three months.
 - d) The document outline for Chapter 4 will provide guidance to this subcommittee. This subcommittee will help draft Chapter 4.

- 6) Project Schedule
 - a) The draft document will be substantially complete by the end of the year. Therefore, the 60-day public review would occur at the beginning of 2010.
 - b) The second public/community meeting will be scheduled at the start of the 60-day public review period.
 - c) We anticipate 3 more UAG meetings before the 60-day public review period of full draft document occurs. These meetings will be held on: August 20th, October 15th and November 19th.
 - d) Although we are currently behind schedule, we still have enough left in the budget to complete the document.

- 7) Upcoming Meetings
 - a) August 20th - UAG Meeting Agenda
 - i) Debrief of July & August Steering Committee Meetings
 - ii) Debrief of July 21st Landowner Workshop
 - iii) Receive & summarize comments to Chapter 2
 - iv) Introduction to the structure of the Draft Biological Goals and Objectives
 - v) Update on project schedule
 - b) Steering Committee Meeting: Tuesday, September 1st