

Francesca Loftis stated that she wants a consultant who is not afraid to say what they feel is professionally appropriate, not necessarily politically correct. She wants to see hard facts. Cindy Shaffer said the difficulty with this project is that it's not like a construction project where a contractor is given a set of plans and told to build it. They need to understand the County's objectives with this project, and work with the County to develop the plans. Jamie Beutler suggested that the committee review each of the proposals.

Mr. Marinaccio reiterated he felt that the consultants did not respond to the RFP with regard to developing the methodology. Ms. Loftis felt that the proposal is not where that should be done. That would be asking too much at this time. Cris Alarcon stated that he believes that is exactly where the details need to be specifically spelled out. He asked if the contract can be modified. Peter Maurer responded that to a degree it can be, but minor modifications and clarifications cannot be wholesale revisions. Bill Center stated that the discussion needed to focus on how the political process will be incorporated into an iterative process to get to the result that the County wants.

Mr. Marinaccio stated that we were led into this circular argument when PAWTAC refused to select indicator species as directed by the Board. Mr. Center responded that that was not PAWTAC's responsibility. There needs to be substantive discussion between the consultant and both committees and the methodology developed based on that discussion and iterative process. Mr. Marinaccio then asked if any of the proposals were specific enough to accept, are contracting laws flexible enough to modify the proposal later, or should we redo the RFP. Mr. Zentner referred to a section of the RFP and stated that it did not ask for a specific methodology. Ms. Beutler suggested that selecting a consultant was like selecting a doctor. One would not tell them how to do the operation. Mr. Alarcon carried the analogy further saying it was more like the conversation between the doctor and the insurance company, who would demand to know the specific procedure. He expects that the consultant will demonstrate scientifically whether there is a need for a north-south corridor. He is concerned that after paying for this contract, we will need to go back for more without getting the initial questions answered. He wanted to make sure that the north-south corridor issue is addressed in the selection process, but ultimately it is staff's recommendation to the Board.

Mr. Marinaccio suggested that ISAC wait for PAWTAC's input. Ms. Loftis stated that she would reject a proposal that identified a specific methodology. Mr. Marinaccio and Mr. Alarcon disagreed, stating that is the purpose of using a scientific method for developing the program. Ms. Loftis suggested that there could be many different methods to approach the issue, and that many are being used throughout the state at this time. Mr. Center suggested that there is a need for scientific exploration on how we approach the north-south issue. Does the proposal build in an iterative process utilizing the advisory committees?

Mr. Marinaccio moved to request PAWTAC to review the proposals prior to their meeting on July 14 and staff to bring back their input at the next ISAC meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Alarcon. Ms. Shaffer expressed concerns about timing. Mr. Alarcon stated he felt it would not slow down the process. Mr. Marinaccio asked Mr. Maurer to inquire of County Counsel the degree of flexibility the County has on modifying the proposals. The motion failed on a 3-3 vote with one abstention.

Ms. Shaffer then moved that staff proceed with making the recommendation to the Board of Supervisors but to identify the top three firms that would be acceptable, providing flexibility to the Board in making the selection. Mr. Center seconded the motion which passed 6-0 with one abstention.

D.2 Discussion of terms used in General Plan policies

John Zentner read a portion of the RFP related to defining the terms in question. Peter Maurer described how staff thought the process would be, with the Board ultimately deciding on the definitions. Art Marinaccio asked if the County needs the consultant to be a part of this discussion. The County could define the terms before it moves forward with the contract. The terms are right out of the General Plan and relate back to Policy 7.4.1.6. The question is how these terms affect the INRMP. Cris Alarcon stated that the consultant's role is to facilitate the discussion, not to define the terms for the County.

Bill Center stated that ISAC continues to devolve into discussing scientific issues even though this committee is a political committee. Every issue will have both scientific and political components. He would expect to utilize the consultant to provide expert opinions on the issues. What the committees need is substantive discussion that brings results, to turn the different opinions of ISAC members into clear direction. Mr. Marinaccio stated that the committee needs to discuss what it is trying to accomplish. He felt that it was not to address endangered species so much but to address other important habitat. The County needs to decide what is important habitat, and that the role of ISAC is to help staff and the consultant accomplish that task. Francesca Loftis stated that she wants to make sure that other species don't become endangered. Cindy Shaffer stated that at the end the plan is supposed to identify important habitats and the committees should assist in making that determination.

Mr. Center said that the County needs to look at lands in Community Regions and Rural Centers and identify where there is land in Rural Regions with similar habitat that can be protected. Ms. Loftis stated that we need to look at watersheds, including those in the Community Regions. Mr. Center suggested that the County and its consultant go with the point of view of looking at gross quantities of different habitats first, then have scientists tell us what is functional, then look at the arrangement of habitats, no net loss provisions, and other strategies. He volunteered to develop a list of questions for discussion at the next meeting with the intent to focus the discussion, clarify the issues, and which will lead to direction for the consultant.

E. Comments/Next Meeting

No additional comments were provided from members. The next meeting is scheduled for August 6, 2009. Agenda items are an update on the consultant selection and review of the questions provided by Bill Center and any others provided by members.

Meeting adjourned at 11:16 a.m.