

**MINUTES of the  
EI DORADO COUNTY  
INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN  
STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ISAC)  
November 4, 2010**

**Members in Attendance:**

Jamie Beutler  
Bill Center  
Kathye Russell  
Cindy Shaffer  
John Zentner  
Danny Marquis

Dave Bolster  
Francesca Loftis

**Others Present**

Kris Kiehne, SEA  
Rick Lind, SEA  
Peter Maurer, EDC  
Jordan Postlewait, SEA  
Fraser Shilling, SEA  
Bob Smart, SEA

**Members Absent**

Cris Alarcon  
Kim Beal

Chair John Zentner called the November 4, 2010 meeting to order at 1:12 p.m. with four members present. He requested that an item be placed on the December agenda to consider redefining what constitutes a quorum of the committee.

**A. Approval of Minutes**

Since no quorum was available, this item was trailed to later in the meeting.

**B. Public Comment**

There were no comments from the public.

**C. INRMP**

**1. Status report on process of project to date**

Jordan Postlewait provided a status report. The Board of Supervisors accepted the Indicator Species report, but expressed concerns about the length of time it took to get the report from committee to Board.

**2. Introduction of and discussion by Suzanne Melim, Caltrans, of the proposed wildlife under-crossing between Greenstone Road and El Dorado Road interchanges on Highway 50**

Ms. Melim was not present so no discussion occurred. Peter Maurer indicated that he would post the information presented at the PAWTAC meeting on the INRMP web site.

**3. Presentation and committee input on the annotated outline for the INRMP Implementation Options Report (Task 2.a)**

Jordan Postlewait provided a power point presentation to review the potential options for completing the INRMP. He stated that developing options is a challenge given the specificity of the language of Policy 7.4.2.8. He requested clarification on what additional data sources could be used to develop these options. The relative costs shown in the presentation were in comparison to each option. There was no monetary value applied to any of them. SEA is requesting input regarding the filtering of the options and identifying what are the most critical components that need to be addressed.

Discussion ensued regarding the costs. Comments included the need to consider costs other than the actual expenditures by the County, but political costs, economic development costs, lost opportunities, and social costs, along with the initial staff costs and long term budgetary costs of managing any subsequent program. A balance needs to be found. Another way to look at it is absolute costs (i.e. costs of acquisition of conservation easements) versus soft costs. There is a need to consider the effectiveness of the program and its costs and the ability to adjust to economic times.

Danny Marquis arrived at 2:47. A quorum was then present so that the committee could conduct business.

A question raised was what are the expectations for the INRMP. Will it satisfy CEQA for development projects that impact wildlife habitat? Other items discussed were the need to prioritize acquisitions and programs. What will get the most for limited costs? Will it be the highest quality habitat, or the most acreage per dollar spent? Mr. Postlewait responded that SEA does not have the answers at this time, but the scope of this assignment is to identify the options along with the potential consequences of different actions or decisions.

SEA staff asked that the questionnaires regarding options be completed and returned to Peter Maurer by November 10.

The committee returned to Item 2, minutes as there was then a quorum. Bill Center moved to approve the minutes. Cindy Shaffer seconded the motion. It carried 6-0.

Cindy Shaffer suggested that ISAC hold a joint meeting with PAWTAC to discuss the options report. John Zentner felt that January would be the best time to do that. There was general concurrence and staff was asked to try to schedule that as soon as possible.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:12 p.m.