

MEETING NOTES
East Alameda County Conservation Strategy
Steering Committee Meeting
December 1, 2009

Attendees

John Hemiup – Alameda County Congestion Management Agency
Jim Robins – Alameda County Conservation Partnership
Brian Mathews – Alameda County Waste Management Authority
Mark Lander – City of Dublin
Steve Stewart – City of Livermore
Janice Stern & Allison Ryan – City of Pleasanton
Liam Davis & Marcia Grefsrud – DFG
Chris Barton - EBRPD
Troy Rahmig – ICF Jones & Stokes
Brian Wines - RWQCB
Cay Goude & Kim Squires – USFWS
Mary Lim - Zone 7

1. Additional Comments on the Conservation Goals & Objectives
 - a. Need to clearly delineate mitigation projects vs. conservation projects that are not tied to mitigation
 - b. Goal 8 – Stronger language for protection of headwaters. Suggest incorporating/referencing the Regional Board’s proposed riparian protection policy.
 - c. Goal 10 – Add language to state that improvements must be consistent with the geomorphic stability of the channel.
 - d. Delete “building a hatchery” under Conservation Action 3 under Goal 21 (for Steelhead).
2. Mitigation Scoring System
 - a. Baseline conditions will be at the point when the Conservation Strategy was approved.
 - b. Livermore, Pleasanton and Dublin will be updating their aerial photos in March. They will be using infrared and will be covering all of East County. The updated aerials would provide the baseline conditions.
 - c. Mitigation site scoring does not include enhancement/creation/restoration in order to boost mitigation site value.
 - i. Will need to have flexibility in the scoring that considers this but should be limited to tangible areas and species.
 - ii. The language will have a narrative that states enhancement/creation/restoration would be negotiated with USFWS/DFG.
 - d. The mitigation scoring table for burrowing owls should factor in the # of nesting pairs.
 - e. Troy suggested taking out the correction factor since the mitigation site value should be equal to value of the impact site.
 - f. Operating Mitigation Banks
 - i. The proposed scoring and ratios would require higher ratios for projects not located near the operating mitigation banks.
 - g. Table 3-1
 - i. Rename the “Restoration” columns to “Preservation with Restoration”

- ii. Want more emphasis on and incentivize restoration. Preservation may not be enough to meet the Conservation Goals and Objectives.
 - iii. There was a suggestion to add a new column that provides mitigation ratios for projects that mitigate outside the study area.
 - h. Figure 3-1 Conservation Zones
 - i. Need to note that CZ-6, 7, and 10 are not in the SF Bay Regional Board's jurisdiction.
 - ii. Map the unique resources (e.g. Springtown preserve). If impacts are within these unique resources, then mitigation must occur within the same area.
 - iii. Each conservation zone will have its own write-up and any unique resources contained within these zones.
 - iv. Need to consider if more detailed maps for each conservation zone will be required.
- 3. Implementation – Oversight and Governance
 - a. Coordination
 - i. The Steering Committee suggested having quarterly meetings for at least the first year to track how each agency is using the Conservation Strategy and iron out any kinks.
 - ii. It was suggested that the coordinator position should be rotated amongst the agencies.
 - b. Provide annual updates to the public on the website.
- 4. Schedule
 - a. Draft Chapter 3 and preliminary draft Chapter 4 will be available for Steering Committee review by December 21st.
 - i. These chapters will be discussed at the next Steering Committee meeting.
 - b. Steering Committee Meeting: January 5, 2010 @ 10 am
 - c. UAG Meeting: January 21, 2010 @ 2 pm, Location: TBD