

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

October 15, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jamie Beutler Art Marinaccio
 Kathye Russell Francesca Loftis
 John Zentner

MEMBERS ABSENT: Cris Alarcon Kim Beal
 David Bolster Bill Center
 Cindy Shaffer

OTHERS PRESENT: Peter Maurer Jordan Postlewait
 Beverly Savage

The October 15 meeting was called to order by John Zentner at 9:15 a.m. A quorum of six members was not present to conduct Committee business. Members present agreed to discuss agenda items.

A. Approval of Minutes

No quorum to approve. Item continued to December 3, at which time the minutes of June 4 and July 9 will be submitted for approval.

B. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

C. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair:

No quorum to elect. Item continued to December 3.

**D.1. Discussion of INRMP proposal questions for Board of Supervisors meeting
 on October 26, 2009**

Art Marinaccio stated it was important for the Committee to develop specific questions that will test the consultants understanding of the project. Francesca Loftis feels it will be difficult to develop specific questions prior to hearing the presentations of the consultants. Peter Maurer suggested that the approach could be to elicit information that was not addressed in the presentations.

Kathye Russell would like to hear each consulting firm discuss what El Dorado County is actually asking them to do, in light of the fact that a Habitat Conservation Plan has not been requested. For clarity there should be some discussion about why EDC is not doing an HCP vs. what consultants are being asked to do. Ms. Loftis would like to see a consultant selected who will address issues of fact and science, who possesses the courage and expertise to present the final product without fear of political ramifications on future contracts. Mr. Marinaccio characterized the task of the consultant as accurately addressing issues of fact and science and communicating them so that decisions can be made.

Ms. Russell suggested that the BOS might want to hear some discussion by consultants about costs for the ultimate project based on the reduction of funds available from the county or the development community. Jamie Beutler feels that the consultant must create the best plan and not focus on the cost to implement the plan. Ms. Loftis feels that cost issues should be addressed in the next phase, not in phase one. Mr. Marinaccio stated that the County should not back itself into a corner by not considering cost. If a recommendation is approved that turns out to be cost prohibitive, a lawsuit could result. Mr. Maurer pointed out that the first phase, as mandated by the General Plan, is to gather information and define what is to be protected. The appropriate approach may be to conduct phase one of the INRMP, as put forth in the RFP. Once this work is complete, the County will have the scientific basis to move forward to the next phase. Mr. Marinaccio reiterated that the INRMP needs to be something that can be realistically implemented by the County. Ms. Loftis added that the consultant cannot be afraid of telling us the truth. The consultant will be tasked with defining what needs to be done in the INRMP. Implementing these findings will be political. Mr. Marinaccio again expressed that a consultant cannot be dispatched to create just any program. Parameters must be in place.

John Zenter feels that the Committee's job is to keep the consultant on track. The function of ISAC is political, while PAWTAC retains purview over scientific issues. Mr. Zenter continued that the best result of the process could be to determine that the north-south corridor is not as important as the east-west corridor. Species travel east-west. Everyone worries about the Highway 50 corridor but the problem may lie elsewhere. Mr. Maurer noted that the consultant will suggest an indicator species whose habitat needs represent the needs of other species occupying the same habitat. Are there questions we can ask of the potential consultants that will help us achieve this result? Ms. Loftis noted that since there is no quorum for the meeting, questions cannot be approved. Members can, as individuals, introduce themselves as members of the ISAC and comment on the presentations.

E. Committee member comments; next meeting agenda items

Mr. Maurer pointed out that the next meeting of the ISAC would normally be scheduled for November 5. However, a signed contract with the consultant will not be executed by this time. The next meeting will, therefore, be scheduled for December 3.

Mr. Zentner suggested that the next meeting be a kick-off meeting to include ISAC, PAWTAC and the contractor. Those present agreed with the suggestion.

Mr. Zentner adjourned the meeting at 10:02 a.m.