

MEETING NOTES

East Alameda County Conservation Strategy Steering Committee Meeting July 13, 2010

Attendees: Jeff Baker (Dublin), Jill Duerig (Zone 7), Carol Mahoney (Zone 7), Janice Stern (Pleasanton), Jim Robins, Chris Barton (EBRPD), Brad Olson (EBRPD), Liz McElligott (Alameda County), Steve Stewart (Livermore), Kim Squires (FWS), Brian Matthews (ACWMA), Terry Huff (NRCS), Liam Davis (CDFG), Marcia Grefsrud (CDFG), Brian Wines (SFRWQCB), Karen Sweet (PLCS)

1. Implementation Committee

- a. There was a collective discussion about letters received from the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) and the Alameda County Resource Conservation District (ACRCD). The group agreed to craft a response letter to CNPS. Jim Robins and Terry Huff advised that the ACRCD would not require a response letter at this time.
- b. Discussion continued from the previous meeting about the structure of the Implementation Committee and who would be part of that body.
- c. A better definition of what the Implementation Committee would actually do was discussed at the outset. It was determined that this body would essentially be an opportunity for local land use authorities and special districts to keep the strategy current and operational for whatever needs arise. The tasks would be primarily administrative. While discussions about mitigation could occur in the context of upcoming mitigation needs, no decisions about mitigation would be made by the Implementation Committee. Those decisions would still remain with the regulatory agencies. All three regulatory agencies present confirmed this.
- d. EBRPD noted that this structure has been working well for the East Contra Costa HCP/NCCP.
- e. An idea was presented to limit the Implementation Committee even further and only include the three cities and the county, which are the only jurisdictions with land use authority. Some thought this idea had merit because it would very clearly define the Implementation Committee. Others were concerned that their agencies have put a lot of funding into the process to date and had assumed they would continue to be involved in the committee charged with implementation. Since most of the funding needed for the Implementation Committee would come as in-kind staff time, the cities and the county expressed interest in keeping their local partners at the table.
- f. Finally it was determined to keep the structure as is but to make the Implementation Committee meetings open to the general public. These meetings would fit a standard structure that would include time for public comment at the end. For sensitive matters a closed session could be utilized.
- g. To better explain the duties of the Implementation Committee CDFG requested that a mission statement for the committee be created and included in the EACCS. In addition, some text will be added that defines what the committee will not do. ICF will make

these revisions and circulate the revised chapter to the Steering Committee for comment. The approved revision would then be sent out to the UAG well in advance of the public release of the document to give adequate time for review.

- h. The group also agreed that a joint annual meeting would work where members of the Technical Advisory Committee would help shape the agenda.

2. Summary of New Comments

- a. The RWQCB and Zone 7 have been reviewing and revising some language in the Streams section of the document. The RWQCB has some additional comments on the Chapter 3 revisions and committed to working with Zone 7 to finalize those changes.
- b. The RWQCB also handed out their Water Quality Objectives for Use in Designing and Implementing Projects with Impacts to Creeks or Wetlands. This could be referenced in the document and included as an appendix.
- c. RWQCB requested that the words “unfunded initiative” be removed and replaced with an introduction in Chapter 3 that explains that several of these things are unfunded but that funding will be sought and will come from a variety of sources.
- d. USFWS said they and the other regulatory agencies met with the Army Corps of Engineers to start the programmatic biological opinion process. Next step is to work out a project description. The Corps is generally on board with the concept and has agreed to move forward. CDFG will then issue a consistency determination with that programmatic BO.
- e. CDFG has some additional comments. They will get them to the group by mid-August.

3. Budget

- a. ACWMA approved additional funding to complete the strategy. They justified the additional expense because many of the partners at the table sit on their board. Zone 7 has placed the revised funding agreement with ACWMA and the budget augment with ICF on the July 21st board agenda.
- b. ICF updated the group on some research they have done on additional grant funding sources for some of the startup implementation tasks (e.g., database, data integration).

4. Schedule

- a. ICF will revise introduction to Chapter 5 and recirculate by July 16th. This will include a Mission Statement for the Implementation Committee among other revisions. They will then solicit comments for a period of time with the intent to make the revision final so we can send it back out to the UAG well in advance of the public release.
- b. August 3rd - Steering Committee will meet in person same time and place.
- c. August 16th - CDFG will have comments to Steering Committee.
- d. August 16th – August 27th – Steering Committee will address CDFG comments and ICF will incorporate any necessary changes.
- e. August 30th – Release Public Draft of EACCS.
- f. September 14th or 16th – Public meeting (depends on location availability).
- g. September 30 – Close of comment period.
- h. October – produce final draft.