

**CONFERENCE CALL NOTES**  
**East Alameda County Conservation Strategy**  
**Steering Committee Meeting**  
**October 5, 2010**

Attendees: Mary Lim (Zone 7), Kim Squires (FWS), Cay Goude (FWS), Liam Davis (DFG), Liz McElligott (Alameda County), Kent Reeves (RCD), Terry Huff (NRCS), Janice Stern (Pleasanton), Mark Lander (Dublin), David Zippin (ICF), Troy Rahmig (ICF), and Chris Barton (EBRPD), Brian Mathews (AC Waste Management Authority)

1. Public Comment on the Draft Conservation Strategy Document
  - a. General Overview of Comments Received
    - i. Troy emailed the comment log of the comments received to date via email.
    - ii. Approximately half of the comments were related to background information and how grazing was characterized in the document.
    - iii. Comments on site-specific parcel assessments
    - iv. Other comments related to the conservation components, such as the score sheets and mitigation rations.
    - v. Implementation – would like to see:
      1. Guarantee of funding and staff time toward implementation
      2. A mechanism for enforcement (i.e. want to see a guarantee of enforcement)
      3. Scientific review
      4. Formal adoption of the EACCS by the local jurisdictions
  - b. Formal adoption by local jurisdictions
    - i. This comment came from The Greenbelt Alliance.
    - ii. For the Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy, the Conservation Strategy was adopted by the local entities. However, no ordinances were passed. The interim ratios provided in the document were used.
      1. The participants signed either a MOU or Implementation Agreement.
      2. Developers were given the option to either use the Conservation Strategy or go a different path.
      3. Since there was a programmatic biological opinion, developers have used the Strategy.
  - c. Peer Review
    - i. California Native Plant Society – East Bay Chapter commented on the need to have a peer review of the document
    - ii. Santa Rosa Plain had peer review, which was paid for by USFWS (~\$15K).
    - iii. In order to have a peer review, need to develop a set of questions for the peer reviewers. In addition, the group would need to choose who will peer review certain sections of the document.
    - iv. The group should, as an alternative, consider peer review as part of the adaptive management of the document.

- d. Funding for Implementation
    - i. There were comments relating to having a guaranteed funding source for implementation.
    - ii. The group agreed that the document needs to acknowledge the fact that the Steering Committee members funded the development of the EACCS despite budgetary constraints the local jurisdictions faced. In addition, Steering Committee members dedicated staff time toward developing the strategy.
    - iii. The Steering Committee is committed to carrying on and following through with implementation but acknowledge that limited/lack of funding for implementation is a weakness. This will also be highlighted in the document.
  - e. Troy will be asking Steering Committee members to assist with responses to certain comments.
    - i. Alameda County Conservation Partnership will assist with addressing the grazing management related comments
    - ii. Local agencies will assist with drafting response to adoption/acceptance of EACCS to their respective Boards/Councils
  - f. The Steering Committee agreed to extend the public comment period for another two weeks until Monday, October 18th
2. Action items
- a. Troy will divide the comments into two categories: (1) document edits; and (2) comments that need Steering Committee approval. Will work on draft responses to comments received to date.
  - b. Mary to send out announcement about two week extension.
3. Upcoming Meetings
- a. Conference Call: TBD either Monday, October 25<sup>th</sup> or Tuesday, October 26<sup>th</sup> @ 10 am
  - b. Steering Committee Meeting: Tuesday, November 2 at 10 am at Zone 7