

**MEETING NOTES**  
**East Alameda County Conservation Strategy**  
**Steering Committee Meeting**  
**April 7, 2009**

**Meeting Attendees**

Jill Duerig & Mary Lim - Zone 7  
Troy Rahmig – ICF Jones & Stokes  
Liz McElligott & Dominic Farinha – Alameda County  
Jim Robins – Alameda County Conservation Partnership  
Brian Mathews – Alameda County Waste Management Authority  
Steve Stewart – City of Livermore  
Janice Stern – City of Pleasanton  
Chris Barton– EBRPD  
Liam Davis – DFG  
Brian Wines - RWQCB  
Kim Squires – USFWS

- 1) Funding update: Jim Robins reported that DWR will be restarting the grant for EACCS. Timing of reinstatement is unclear at this time.
  
- 2) March 19<sup>th</sup> UAG Meeting Debrief
  - a) Preliminary Chapter 1 feedback
    - i) Recommended that the land use policies, such as Measure D and other growth boundaries, be a part of Chapter 1
      - (1) Steering Committee agreed that there can be a general discussion about land use policies in Chapter 1 but that the substantive information remain in Chapter 2
      - (2) Need to distinguish between Federal/State regulations and land use policies in Chapter 1.
      - (3) Steering Committee clarified that Chapter 1 focuses on Federal/State regulations on species and habitat that is guiding this effort. Land use provides limitations.
  - b) UAG liked receiving updates on other conservation planning efforts. We will continue to provide quick updates to UAG.
  - c) Proposed landowner workshop/open house
    - i) Troy followed up with Frick Lake property owners regarding their request to provide a presentation about their property to either the Steering Committee or the Users Advisory Group
      - (1) Troy reiterated that this process is not a forum for landowners to market their property. At the same time, this process did not preclude them from talking to the local agencies individually about potential opportunities.
    - ii) Having a landowner workshop/open house was suggested. This proposed workshop would
      - (1) Provide a forum for landowners to discuss experiences with attempts to obtain conservation easements and what is on their lands; and
      - (2) Provide a presentation/discussion about mitigation banks
        - (a) Discuss benefits, what types of banks have been approved, and requirements for mitigation banks

- iii) With regard to Chapter 4 – Implementation, Troy suggested that a subcommittee may be needed to start flushing out questions related to implementation.
      - (1) This will likely require conference calls in between meetings.
    - iv) **Action: Jim Robins will take the lead in exploring the Landowner Open House proposal.**
- 3) Activities described in Programmatic BO for EACCS
  - a) Other suggested activities
    - i) Bridges over creeks (this may be incorporated into transportation activities)
    - ii) Water utility related activities
      - (1) Ancillary distribution/treatment facilities
      - (2) Wells
      - (3) Pump stations
      - (4) Flood control facilities
      - (5) **Action: Zone 7 will provide a brief description to USFWS on these activities.**
  - b) Feedback from UAG
    - i) Concern about how EACCS would treat or not treat “ranchette” developments
    - ii) Flexibility in how activities are described in BO
      - (1) Want to see triggers of when EACCS would not apply
      - (2) There is a concern that EACCS would provide a process that would be too streamlined. Projects will still undergo review by resource agencies to ensure all impacts are adequately mitigated.
- 4) Project Update
  - a) Incorporation of wetlands
    - i) Issue: How can EACCS be used to deal with wetlands and creek impacts (i.e. mitigation for wetlands and/or creek impacts)?
    - ii) Regional Board cannot provide set ratios for wetlands and creek impacts because magnitude of impacts are site-specific
      - (1) Generally, ratios to mitigate wetlands and creek impacts are as follows (but by no means set in stone)
        - (a) 1.5 – 3 to one for creation
        - (b) 3 – 5 to one for enhancement
        - (c) 10 to one for preservation (note that preservation does not equate to no net loss)
      - (2) Regional Board requires
        - (a) No net loss
        - (b) Mitigation be in place prior to impact
        - (c) In-kind/on-site mitigation
        - (d) The more a project proponent moves away from these, the higher the ratio will be.
      - (3) Although the Regional Board website provides guidance, the Steering Committee agreed that a succinct description of how Regional Board values wetlands and creeks will be incorporated into the Conservation Strategy.
        - (a) **Action: Troy will provide and coordinate with Brian Wines on the write-up on wetland and creek mitigation guidance.**

- b) Project Schedule
    - i) Chapter 2 to Steering Committee: week of April 13<sup>th</sup>
      - (1) Comments to Mary & Troy by Friday, May 1<sup>st</sup>
    - ii) Draft Conservation Goals & Priorities: May 5 (prior to Steering Committee meeting)
    - iii) Technical Workshops
      - (1) 3 workshops broken down by land cover type as follows
        - (a) Grassland, chaparral & scrub
        - (b) Ponds, wetlands, and riparian forest
        - (c) Woodlands
      - (2) Output from workshops will help shape Chapter 3 – Conservation Strategy
      - (3) Dates: TBD but will occur in May
    - iv) Public Meeting: Thursday June 11<sup>th</sup>, 7 – 9 pm (location TBD)
      - (1) **Action: Mary will secure location.**
  - c) Intro to Chapter 2 – Environmental Setting
    - i) Sets the stage for the study area
    - ii) Land use, land cover, and open space maps will be a part of this chapter
      - (1) Discussion of land use policies are contained here
    - iii) Natural communities and focal species will be discussed, specifically ecosystem function and key areas
      - (1) There will be conservation goals for both natural communities and species
  - d) Corridor analysis for San Joaquin Kit Fox (SJKF)
    - i) Troy distributed two draft maps that show a potential path of movement for SJKF using a model.
    - ii) The model predicts movement based upon kit fox population.
    - iii) Concern that having a map that shows one corridor would send the wrong message. There can be many paths that kit fox can take other than the modeled path.
    - iv) If we include these maps in the strategy, we need to have strong disclaimers associated with these models.
- 5) Other efforts
- a) Alameda Creek Fisheries Restoration Workgroup
    - i) Have been working for at least 10 years and have slowly been making progress.
    - ii) Want to continue to monitor this effort as fisheries passage throughout Alameda County will eventually begin to open up.
  - b) NMFS Bay Area Wide Salmon Restoration Plan
    - i) NMFS will be developing a salmon restoration plan specific to the Bay Area. This plan will be developed in coordination with a stakeholder group.
    - ii) Zone 7 and Sonoma County Water Agency recently signed a Statement of Understanding with NMFS to memorialize how these two agencies will work with NMFS on developing this plan.
    - iii) Looking for other agencies to participate as stakeholders in this effort.
- 6) Upcoming Meetings
- a) UAG Meeting: Thursday, April 16<sup>th</sup> @ 2 pm
  - b) Steering Committee Meeting: Tuesday, May 5<sup>th</sup> @ 10 am

