

**MINUTES of the  
PLANT AND WILDLIFE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
(PAWTAC)  
November 1, 2010**

**Members in Attendance:**

Sue Britting  
Jim Brunello  
Bill Frost  
Todd Gardner  
Mahala Guggino  
Valerie Zentner

Suzy Melim, Caltrans  
Jordan Postlewait, SEA  
Fraser Shilling, SEA  
Bob Smart, SEA

**Others in Attendance:**

Kris Kiehne, SEA  
Jane Layton  
Rick Lind, SEA  
Peter Maurer, EDC

**Members Absent:**

Jim Davies  
Dan Corcoran  
Elena DeLacy  
Ray Griffiths  
Jeremiah Karuzas

The October 4, 2010 meeting was called to order by Chair Sue Britting at 2:08 p.m.

**A. Approval of Minutes**

As there was no quorum, the minutes were carried over to the end of the meeting.

**B. Public Comments**

There were no comments from the public.

**C. INRMP**

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

Jordan Postlewait and Peter Maurer provided an update on the status of the Indicator Species and Wildlife Movement and Corridor reports. The Board of Supervisors accepted the Indicator Species Report at their October 27 hearing.

**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**

Suzy Melim was introduced and presented an overview of the project. Design work is almost complete and is expected to go out to bid in early 2011. Funding for the project is approved and construction is set to occur next summer. Caltrans initiated the grant application based on public interest and an article in the Sacramento Bee. Questions were raised by committee members regarding future projects, additional funding sources,

and the relationship to other projects and mitigation requirements. Ms. Melim stated that this is a stand-alone project and is not mitigation for other projects' impacts. Caltrans worked with the California Department of Fish and Game on the design and location. The original idea was to do something in the Camino area. Camera monitoring is likely to occur in the future but because it is not specifically a mitigation project, there are no requirements for monitoring. Committee members suggested that coordination with other entities could occur for more comprehensive monitoring purposes to determine the success of the project.

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

Jordan Postlewait presented a power point presentation of the annotated outline for the options report. Handouts were provided with a request to complete them to provide feedback to the consultants.

Jim Brunello arrived at 2:31.

Sue Britting asked whether the project team would be identifying what the monitoring and performance measures will be for the INRMP. Fraser Shilling responded that with this phase, specific measure will not be identified, but a range of options regarding what is to be measured, and why they should be measured will be provided. The decisions will be made during Phase 2.

The SEA team reviewed the eight components of the INRMP as set forth in Policy 7.4.2.8. The details are contained in the Power Point available on line. Specific comments regarding the presentation included the following:

- Oak woodlands and special status species are not a part of the work program and there was a concern that they were being abandoned. The OWMP, Pine Hill Preserve program and INRMP will all need to be integrated.
- Use of the term Priority Conservation Area (PCA) in the INRMP might be confusing as conservation areas could differ from the PCAs of the OWMP.
- Concern that the term "critical" as it relates to deer habitat applies to endangered species act requirements.
- Prior decisions regarding acreage for oak woodlands were being over-looked.
- Reliance on existing data will not be sufficient over the life of the plan. Additional data will be necessary even for the development of Phase 2.
- If the work program is going beyond the scope of what the policy is trying to accomplish.
- If the County intends to rely on the INRMP as full mitigation for project approval, the INRMP will have to mitigate impacts to habitat fragmentation to less than significant levels, even though the GP EIR found it to be significant and unavoidable.
- Funding sources and how that applies to County mitigation program.
- Direct payments to landowners for maintaining habitat tend to result in diminishing returns because programs run out of money.

- To develop a monitoring program, the County will need to establish what the goals of the program are.
- Need to integrate this aspect of GP implementation with the 5-year review currently underway.
- Use of the Williamson Act as a vehicle to protect habitat. Concerns were expressed that contracts are temporary, funding is unstable, and how it might not meet the requirements of CEQA.
- The potential for dividing Phase 2 into two or more components if necessary.
- The need to enunciate what the various approaches to completing Phase 2 might be for Board consideration.
- The need to develop practical approaches given the budget.
- The need to establish measurable objectives to ascertain if the County is meeting its goals.
- Regulatory issues are a critical item to be addressed.
- Regulatory requirements need to be developed soon to meet mitigation measure requirements since the County is behind schedule for adoption of some measures.

A break was taken during the discussion to return to Item A, Minutes, since a quorum was present and one member needed to leave early. Peter Maurer suggested an amendment to reflect the discussion regarding scheduling meetings with the Agricultural Commission and other commissions. Valerie Zentner moved to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Mahala Guggino and the motion carried 5-0 with one abstention.

Bill Frost left the meeting at 3:45.

Responses by the consultant team and staff to some of the issues raised included:

- This exercise is not trying to determine which measures will be selected, but what the range of options will be and what will be measured and why they should be measured.
- Integration of the OWMP and rare plant issues will be integrated into the program as a part of Phase 2. Gabbro soil rare plant issues are still being resolved in a separate venue.
- The responses to the questionnaire/handout will help develop the range of options for the Board to consider at the end of Phase 1 and move into Phase 2.

**D. Committee member comments; next meeting agenda items**

Fraser Shilling announced that there is a Connectivity Conference scheduled at UC Davis on Dec. 1, 2010. There was no further business and the meeting was adjourned at 4:13 p.m.