

**MINUTES of the
EI DORADO COUNTY
INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN
STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ISAC)
December 2, 2010**

Members in Attendance:

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

Dave Bolster

Others Present

Kris Kiehne, SEA
Ethan Koenigs, SEA
Jane Layton
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 December 2, 2010 meeting to order at 1:07 p.m. with four members present.

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. Meeting Rules – Discussion and possible change to rules regarding what constitutes a quorum to conduct business as the ISAC

This item was also trailed to later in the meeting.

D. INRMP

1. Status report on process of project to date

Jordan Postlewait provided a status report and noted that the Wildlife Movement and Corridor Report was scheduled to be presented to the Board of Supervisors on December 7, 2010.

2. Presentation of, discussion and committee input on Administrative draft of the INRMP Implementation Options Report (Task 2.a)

With use of a power point presentation, Jordan Postlewait began review of the process to complete the report.

Danny Marquis arrived at 1:10. Bill Center arrived at 1:12. Their arrival constituted a quorum and business could be conducted.

Mr. Postlewait reviewed some of the new provisions that were added since review of first draft of the report. These included expanding the planning process and mitigation assistance sections, and identifying data collection and performance monitoring. Kris Kiehne then reviewed what other agencies are doing to meet wildlife habitat objectives. Most are relying on the HCP/NCCP process, although there are several non-HCP programs under way. The purpose of this review was to look at what other agencies are doing and see if there is any component of those programs that would work for El Dorado County. SEA compared the goals, contents, funding and other components and discussed how multi-jurisdictional areas coordinate. Francesca Loftis asked why the City of Placerville was not more directly involved. Discussion ensued on how other agencies could be more involved as we proceed with Phase 2.

Bill Center brought up the concern that the passage of Proposition 26 will make it more difficult for the County to simply enact a fee program to satisfy the mitigation requirements for projects. This could also make it more difficult for development projects to mitigate the effects of their projects. It was recognized that off-site mitigation is not possible without development fees. There was a great deal of discussion on this issue, including how the INRMP is intended to be applied to projects. Is it intended to be programmatic and look at the larger scale of development in the county or provide a framework for mitigating individual project impacts; will general plan amendments be required to implement the plan and to what degree are those amendments anticipated? The committee also discussed the relationships and differences between the INRMP and HCPs. Non-HCP programs reviewed include the Tuolumne County Conservation Handbook and the Sonoma County Agricultural Protection and Open Space District program.

Jamie Beutler arrived at 1:45.

Ethan Koenigs discussed Appendix B of the draft report and reviewed some of the approaches that could be used. He stated that components from different approaches could be combined and a hybrid program developed. John Zentner noted that there were no incentive programs identified in the draft. A discussion of incentives was held and there was general concurrence that incentives should be a component of the program.

Fraser Shilling then reviewed Appendix C, the strategy for developing the scope of work for Phase 2 of the INRMP. He noted that there are different ways to prioritize the programs. It could be based on geography, funding availability, or technical/procedural requirements. Implementation needs to be integrated into all other aspects of development and permitting, and General Plan implementation. Responsibility for on-going efforts also needs to be identified.

Rick Lind distributed a copy of a letter sent to the Board members, along with the attachment titled “Guidelines for Phase II – INRMP Preparation”. He stated that he expected feedback from the Board and those comments would be included in the final draft of the report.

The committee then returned to Item A, minutes. It was moved by Kathye Russell, seconded by Jamie Beutler, to approve the minutes as provided in the agenda packet. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Committee member comments; next meeting agenda items.

Peter Maurer stated he was having difficulty finding a time to hold a joint meeting, and stated some members of PAWTAC were not interested in holding a joint meeting.

The issue of a quorum (Agenda Item C) was then discussed. It was noted that only seven members regularly attend. John Zentner proposed that the number of members that constitute a quorum be reduced to five. It was suggested that instead of changing the rules, that alternates be selected. John Zentner moved that staff contact the Board to suggest that alternates be appointed. The motion was seconded by Bill Center and carried unanimously. Staff was also requested to contact Cris Alarcon to determine if he is still interested in serving on the committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.