

CONFERENCE CALL NOTES
East Alameda County Conservation Strategy
Steering Committee Meeting
December 14, 2010

Attendees: Vincent Griego (USFWS), Liz McElligott (Alameda County), Brad Olson/Chris Barton (EBRPD), Brian Mathews (Alameda County Waste Management Authority), Kristi Bascom (City of Dublin), Terry Huff (NRCS), Steve Stewart (City of Livermore), Brian Wines (RWQCB), Mary Lim (Zone 7), Troy Rahmig (ICF)

1. Comments on the revised text are due to Troy by COB, Friday, December 17th.
2. The Public EACCS "Final" document will be put into production next week.
 - a. Each jurisdiction will get a bound hard copy of the document, a searchable pdf, a print-ready copy, and the document in Word.
 - b. The responses to comments matrix will also be on the cd.
 - c. The final document and responses to comments will be posted on the website.
 - d. Expect the final document by the end of the year.
3. GIS Data and Past Presentations
 - a. Each jurisdiction will get all GIS data and all presentations (in PowerPoint format) on a separate CD or DVD.
4. Presentation for Respective Boards/Councils
 - a. The City of Livermore revised the EACCS community meeting presentation and tailored it to the Altamont Landfill Open Space Committee. The City will send it to the rest of the Steering Committee for their use when presenting the EACCS document for approval/adoption/acceptance by their respective Councils/Boards.
5. Ratios
 - a. The City of Livermore previously expressed concern that the scoring/ranking sheets do not give enough credit for finding higher quality mitigation sites when the habitat quality of the impact site is so poor. The City was looking for insight from the resource agencies on why mitigation ratios start at a 3:1.
 - b. The mitigation ratios in the EACCS document started off lower but were increased to reflect the current minimum mitigation ratios used today for projects.
 - c. Vincent will check back with Cay and Ryan at USFWS about the City's concerns.
 - d. Regional Board's comments regarding sites that appear "degraded."
 - i. "Degraded" is often more of an aesthetic perspective than an actual assessment of habitat quality. Many wetlands that look "trashed" from a human perspective still provide habitat for plants and animals.
 - ii. Even if a wetland/creek is genuinely degraded, degraded habitats can usually be rehabilitated. Functional wetlands/creeks depend on the proper combination of geography and hydrology. Usually, a degraded wetland/creek still has some (or at least most) of the geography and hydrology that created the wetland/creek. Therefore, it is much easier (in most cases) to restore a degraded wetland/creek than to try to create a new wetland/creek where no such feature had existed before. When a

"degraded" wetland is paved over, that opportunity for fairly low risk restoration is foreclosed.

- iii. Many degraded wetlands/creeks are degraded as a result of land stewardship (e.g., over-grazing, uncontrolled waste disposal/storage, poor management of urban runoff, etc.). Degradation is often the consequence of actions taken by the current or former property owners. Requiring less mitigation for such a degraded habitat has the unfortunate effect of rewarding poor stewardship. Mitigation should be based on the highest functioning of the impact site, if that site had been well managed.
 - e. It was also noted that the lower the ratio, the less benefit a species will receive.
 - f. For now, the scoring/ranking sheets will stay as is. However, the Implementation Committee should review these sheets and revise them accordingly.
6. In January, Mary will send an email out setting up the first meeting of the Implementation Committee to keep the process moving after the EACCS document has been finalized.