

**MINUTES
EL DORADO COUNTY
INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN
STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ISAC)**

June 4, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT:	John Zentner	Kathye Russell
	Bill Center	Francesca Loftis
	Art Marinaccio	Jamie Beutler
	Cris Alarcon	
OTHERS PRESENT:	Peter Maurer	El Dorado County
	Monique Wilber	El Dorado County
	Paula Frantz	El Dorado County

The June 4, 2009 meeting was called to order by staff Peter Maurer at 9:05 a.m.

A. Correspondence:

None

B. Minutes:

The agenda and informal meeting minutes from the meeting of May 7, 2009 were distributed. The agenda was reviewed and there were no comments on the prior meeting minutes.

C. Public Matters:

There were no public comments. Minutes, agendas, and handouts are posted on the El Dorado County (EDC) ISAC webpage in accordance to the Brown Act at: <http://www.edcgov.us/Planning/ISAC.html>.

D.1. INRMP Request for Proposals (RFP) Update.

Peter Maurer provided ISAC with an update on the INRMP RFP. The RFP closes next Friday, June 11, 2009. Questions were posed by consultants, the results of which will be posted by Friday, June 5, 2009, on the EDC Procurement and Contracts webpage. Members asked staff to find out how soon the selection committee will get the proposals from Procurement and Contracts.¹ ISAC and PAWTAC members will have the opportunity to review the proposals at

¹ Monique Wilber contacted Procurement and Contracts on June 4, 2009, and was told that Planning Services will get the proposals the same day. The RFP closes Wednesday, June 10. The opening of the proposals is at 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, June 11, and it is a public opening, which means that any interested person may attend the opening. Procurement and Contracts will review the proposals for responsiveness concurrently with the selection committee.

Development Services, on a date to be announced. Due to the lead time for the selection committee to review and rank, for ISAC and PAWTAC review, for ISAC and PAWTAC meetings/recommendations, and the three-week calendaring for Board meetings, it is likely to go the Board in mid-July to end of July.

Art Marinaccio expressed that there are technical issues that need to get taken care of right away, such as what species to study. Some species have a certain timeframe that they need to be studied in (i.e., gabbro soil rare plants in spring). There needs to be something on a checklist to think about and expedite. In response to a question regarding the gabbro soils rare plants, Monique Wilber stated that the INRMP would not be addressing endangered species because the gabbro soils rare plants are being addressed by the County separately. Whatever is worked out with Department of Fish and Game and the US Fish and Wildlife Service will need to be integrated into the INRMP.

Kathy Russell asked staff what the timeframe is to complete the INRMP. Peter Maurer responded that his estimate for these types of studies is generally multi-year undertakings, so he would guess about 18 months as this is a limited scope.

D.2. Committee to discuss conducting of formal meetings and the rules of formal committee meetings.

Francesca Loftis asked how and when the agendas are being posted. Monique Wilber responded that they are being posted on the ISAC webpage, and for the last two months, they have been posted two weeks in advance of the meeting. Ms. Loftis stated that the agendas need to be posted physically for people who don't have access to the internet. Mr. Maurer responded that they can be posted in the Development Services lobby as well from now on.

Bill Center said that we are a formal committee with standing meetings. We are already subject to the Brown Act. What processes do we want?

A discussion ensued amongst the members over frustration with majority/minority opinions. Bill Center expressed that generally minority reports are accepted by a committee. Input for actions on motions is agendaized. He is uncomfortable with putting staff in the position of decoding what and why people made their choices and votes. Kathy Russell said that she is seeking a process to allow minority opinions and have those opinions brought before the Board. Art Marinaccio said that he thinks that when the consultant is hired, that the minority opinion members possibly get together and write a report on their own.

Paula Frantz, County Counsel, stated that ISAC was formally created and is a legislative body subject to the Brown Act. She cautioned that if members meet to write minority reports that could be violating the Brown Act. Be cautious of "back-rooming," such as having some members with minority opinions go off together to write a report. ISAC could charge a sub-committee to write a minority report, however. When actions are taken and there is a minority opinion, the minority could request that the minutes reflect, in a couple of sentences, the dissenting opinion. In addition, the Brown Act allows anyone, including the public, to tape record meetings (at their own expense).

Another option for a minority report is that a member of a minority opinion can make a motion. It's there and stated, even if it does fail.

Bill Center made a motion and Art Marinaccio seconded for the following regarding quorum and action: Six members make a quorum. Affirmative action is a majority of those present but a minimum of 5. The motion passed with a unanimous vote of 6-0.

Ms. Frantz suggested that the best idea to make sure motions are recorded correctly is to pause and actually write the motion down to ensure that the most important points are accurately reflected.

Members discussed public comment. Paula Frantz offered that three minutes is generally accepted as a minimum length of time to allow speakers. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors allow a speaker 5 minutes if they are representing a group.

Francesca Loftis made a motion to allow individual public commenters three minutes of speaking time, and speakers representing a group five minutes of speaking time. The motion passed with a unanimous vote of 6-0.

Ms. Frantz advised, regarding agendas, that urgent items can be added to the agenda if necessary without the proper notice – however, urgency is not likely to happen in an advisory group capacity.

Members discussed basic operating principles – for instance, if a speaker or a member brings materials for distribution, must they provide them 72 hours in advance, and enough copies for all present. A decision was not reached.

D.3. Discussion of the Brown Act.

Paula Frantz counseled ISAC not to create serial meetings. ISAC members cannot go to each Supervisor and tell them what the other Supervisors have said and whose votes they have. You have the individual right as a committee member or member of the public to tell them what you want, and lobby them, but you can't share what was said with the next Supervisor. If they ask questions of you, it could lead to Brown Act violations. One-way communication is safest to avoid violating the Brown Act.

Emails can violate the Brown Act if emails are sent to a quorum or to the whole group – members must be careful of this. Sending an email to the whole group to suggest an agenda item is fine – just don't explain why you want it on the agenda, or who agrees with you that it should be on the agenda. Avoid influencing other members outside of noticed meetings.

No action was required or taken.

D.4. Discussion to appoint a Chair and a Vice-Chair.

Members discussed Chair and Vice-Chair positions. Members decided to continue the nominations for these positions to the next meeting. Staff Peter Maurer will continue to facilitate meetings for the time being.

D.5. Discussion to appoint a Recording Secretary.

Peter Maurer advised that the County is able to provide a staff member to take meeting minutes, so appointing a Recording Secretary is not necessary. Members concurred. No action was taken.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:08 a.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, July 2, 2008.**