

MEETING NOTES
East Alameda County Conservation Strategy
Steering Committee Meeting
November 3, 2009

Attendees

Liz McElligott – Alameda County
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
Liam Davis & Marcia Grefsrud – DFG
Chris Barton - EBRPD
David Zippin & Troy Rahmig – ICF Jones & Stokes
Brian Wines - RWQCB
Cay Goude & Kim Squires – USFWS
Mary Lim - Zone 7

- 1) Draft Conservation Goals and Objectives
 - a) UAG comments
 - i) A UAG member expressed concern that the goals were too broad and lofty that it rendered the goals meaningless. It was suggested that levels of populations that ensure long term viability should be defined.
 - (1) Hesitant to provide set number of acres that need to conserved.
 - (2) USFWS wants stronger language and some measurable goals where appropriate.
 - ii) Suggestion of toning down the language
 - b) Clarify the use of the word “protection.”
 - c) Translocation
 - i) This was identified in the Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy. There was a question whether this will be considered in EACCS.
 - ii) Translocation may be okay where there is genetic information.
 - iii) EACCS needs to be very specific as to when translocation can be used. Need to develop guidelines for source site and a separate set of guidelines for the receiver site.
 - iv) Translocation is would be in addition to required mitigation and is an option to increase species population.
 - d) The revised draft conservation goals and objectives will be sent out with tracked changes on it.
- 2) Revised Mitigation Guidance Scoring and Avoidance and Minimization Measure Tables
 - a) The mitigation scoring tables for each focal species will be used to assess the both the impact and mitigation sites.
 - i) A correction factor is proposed to refine the mitigation needed for impacts.
 - ii) Correction factor = impact site score/mitigation site score
 - iii) The correction factor would be applied to the number of mitigation acres determined by the mitigation ratios shown in Table 3-1.
 - (1) If the impact site has a higher value than the mitigation site, then more acres will be needed to adequately mitigate for the impact.

- (2) If the mitigation site has a higher value than the impact site, then less acres will be required.
 - b) If more than one species is impacted, which is the likely case, the impact and mitigation sites should be valued for each species separately. Need to have an accounting for each species. As a result, a project proponent will need to buy based on the highest valued species. Note that, the remaining acres cannot be banked for the other species.
 - c) What about situations where a project proponent impacts upland habitat and finds an ideal breeding site as mitigation?
 - i) USFWS stated that in the Bay Area, they collapse breeding and upland together.
 - d) Need to account for mitigation parcels that provide habitat connectivity.
 - e) Note out whether the species are federally and/or state-listed or special status for CEQA.
 - f) The Steering Committee agreed to distribute these tables to the UAG along with example projects to help illustrate how these tables will be used.
 - g) Action: Provide initial comments by November 30th.
- 3) Update on Implementation Chapter
- a) Troy will work with Jim Robins to write the Implementation Chapter over the next month.
- 4) Upcoming Meetings
- a) UAG Meeting: Thursday, November 19th @ 2 pm in Dublin's Regional Meeting Room
 - b) Steering Committee Meeting: Tuesday, December 1st