

**SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION of the  
EI DORADO COUNTY  
INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN  
STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ISAC)  
April 1, 2010**

**Members in Attendance:**

Art Marinaccio  
Kathye Russell  
Cindy Shaffer  
John Zentner

Robert Smart, SEA  
Peter Maurer, EDC  
Beverly Savage, EDC

**Others in Attendance:**

Kris Kiehne, SEA  
Ethan Koenigs  
Jordan Postlewait, SEA  
Rick Lind, SEA  
Fraser Shilling, Ph.D., SEA

**Members Absent:**

Cris Alarcon  
Kimberly Beal  
Jamie Beutler  
David Bolster  
Bill Center  
Francesca Loftis

Chair John Zentner called the April 1, 2010 meeting to order at 1:10 PM. There was no quorum to conduct Committee business. It was decided that members present would discuss agenda items

**A. Approval of Minutes**

There was no quorum to approve minutes.

**B. Public Comment**

There was no comment from the public.

**C. INRMP**

**C.1. Discussion of March 16, 2010 Board of Supervisors meeting and direction on definitions**

Peter Maurer updated the Committee on outcome of the recommendation to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) to approve key term definitions. After discussion, the BOS approved

a motion clarifying that the word "define" in the SEA scope of work means "to create a map."

Art Marinaccio feels that the BOS's intent is for the map to be submitted along with significant discussion on how it was derived. He does not feel that the BOS will accept the proposed map as showing large expanses of native vegetation.

## **C.2. Review and discuss revised important habitat map showing large expanses of native vegetation**

Jordan Postlewait presented on behalf of the SEA team. The previous map showing large expanses of native vegetation used road density data to indicate disturbance. The revised map uses a combination of road density and parcel use to indicate disturbance. Native vegetation layers are then added to arrive at a map depicting large expanses of native vegetation. Mr. Postlewait referred to a chart, "Figure 1, Phase I INRMP 'Large Expanses' Mapping Process." Disturbance is defined as road density above  $3\text{km}/\text{km}^2$ . Some small patches of native vegetation appear on the map since small areas may be important habitat for small species.

Chair Zentner asked for clarification regarding the criteria used for determining if a parcel is developed or undeveloped. For instance, is a 240-acre parcel with one house considered developed or undeveloped? Mr. Postlewait replied that the parcel would be considered undeveloped, referring to Table 5, Road Weighting Scheme for Density Analysis, pages 15 to 16, Revised Administrative Draft Habitat Inventory and Mapping Report. Mr. Marinaccio noted that discussions in previous meetings referred to parcels of 10 acres and above as undeveloped, whereas the current chart defines parcels as 2.5 acres and larger as undeveloped.

Mr. Marinaccio noted that in some instances using roads to indicate disturbance is not valid. For instance, some sections of South Shingle Road, west of Latrobe Road present no disturbance to wildlife. Chair Zentner agreed and raised Omo Ranch Road as another example of a road that presented little or no disturbance. Chair Zentner suggested that instead of rating all roads as disturbance level 1 that some roads be rated as disturbance level .5.

Kathye Russell observed that the map does not consider General Plan land designation. Existing use only is considered. Chair Zentner replied that the issue of General Plan land designation versus existing land use had been discussed at the March meeting.

Cindy Shaffer asked how the map has changed since it was first introduced in January. For instance, in the January map, disturbance was defined as road density above .15 acres. Dr. Shilling replied that the January maps were generated to illustrate examples of the methodology to be used. The current  $3\text{km}/\text{km}^2$  has scientific justification.

Mr. Marinaccio asked the title of the map, stating the map does not show large expanses of native vegetation under the definition in the General Plan. Rather, he continued, the map illustrates areas of less disturbance. Dr. Shilling asked Mr. Marinaccio for his opinion on the definition of the General Plan map. Mr. Marinaccio replied that the General Plan defines large expanses of native vegetation as areas we want to protect versus areas that currently exist. Rick Lind asked Mr. Marinaccio if he had a recommendation regarding a title for the map under discussion. Mr. Marinaccio suggested "less-developed lands available for habitat." Mr. Maurer pointed out that the current process is to inventory lands available for preservation. Conservation will be the end result.

Ms. Shaffer feels one problem with the map is that approximately 59 percent of the study area is included in large expanses of native vegetation. This is similar to where the process began in Oak Woodlands but the BOS reduced the size of the protected areas. Mr. Lind replied that this current phase of the INRMP is to identify existing large expanses of native vegetation. Deciding which of these areas to protect will be part of INRMP Phase II. SEA will make recommendations at the end of this process for areas to protect under Phase II.

Including use code data on the map was suggested. Staff interjected that utility corridors do not have use codes and use codes are not part of the GIS data. Mr. Maurer added that use codes are assigned for tax purposes. If the parcel is not taxable, it may not have a use code.

There was discussion again that certain County roads do not represent disturbance to species. Examples raised including portions of Mosquito, Latrobe, Indian Diggings, Omo Ranch, Rock Creek, Wentworth Springs, Happy Valley and Volcanoville roads. Mr. Lind invited Committee members to provide feedback regarding roads that do not represent fragmentation.

### **C.3. Request Committee position on the revised Administrative Draft Habitat Inventory and Mapping Report**

Mr. Postlewait presented on behalf of the SEA team. The Committee was asked to provide comments now and/or to Mr. Maurer via e-mail. The Administrative Draft Habitat Inventory and Mapping Report was disseminated. Mr. Postlewait invited Committee discussion and input.

At the PAWTAC meeting, rainbow trout was recommended as a good indicator species. The rainbow trout requires cool water, is well studied, widely distributed and predatory. Mr. Marinaccio does not agree with this suggestion. Staff and Committee discussion

ensued regarding riparian habitats and location of rainbow trout in the study area. Some members of ISAC supported rainbow trout as an indicator species.

Ms. Shaffer commented that the list of special status wildlife and plants (pages 6 - 7) is expanded and includes species that are listed in the CNDDDB but do not meet any other selection criteria, such as inclusion in the General Plan Draft EIR. Mr. Koenigs agreed, replying that the list found in the Draft EIR was included and updated with new species identified by the sources. Ms. Shaffer questioned the appropriateness of adding these species. Since there is no confirmation of the existence of these species in the study area, we would be identifying occurrence of possible habitats. Chair Zentner seconded Ms. Shaffer's concern. Mr. Marinaccio asked if any extra work would need to be done to protect these additional species. If the species are protected under other regulatory schemes, he feels the BOS will not approve spending additional funds to protect.

Chair Zentner suggested a footnote be included to explain why species not included in the Draft EIR were added to the report. It was also suggested that information be included regarding those species that appeared in the Draft EIR but were not listed here. Ms. Shaffer feels that species not listed in the Draft EIR and not listed in the state or federal special status lists should not be included in this report, even if they are listed in the CNDDDB. Ms. Shaffer further noted the addition of a handful of plant species identified by CNPS as requiring more information. Mr. Marinaccio suggested a footnote to explain these inclusions as well.

Chair Zentner referred to Table 4 on page 13 and asked for clarification of the table. Mr. Koenigs replied that classifications were assigned by the County and weighting was assigned to the classes.

Ms. Shaffer directed discussion toward section 2.3 Wetland and Riparian Habitats, asking if Army Corps of Engineers data regarding ephemeral streams would be used. Dr. Schilling replied that the Army Corps data will be analyzed once it is released. Ms. Shaffer referred to the map and noted that the buffer size appears to have been exaggerated. Ms. Shaffer commented that buffers are being discussed as part of the Zoning Ordinance update. She feels that only the resource, without the buffer, should be mapped at this point.

Ms. Russell noted that there was discussion about excluding from large expanses of native vegetation those properties that were likely to be developed. How was the determination made? Staff responded that the criteria used was not if a project had been approved for the parcel but, rather, if the parcel had been developed.

Kathye Russell concurred with Ms. Shaffer's comments regarding riparian buffers.

#### **C.4. Review and discuss working draft of Indicator Species Report**

This item was presented by Dr. Schilling on behalf of the SEA team. Working Draft Indicator Species in the INRMP Report was disseminated. Committee members were asked for their input, specifically regarding selection criteria and species/species group suggestions based on the criteria. A PowerPoint presentation with four species examples was reviewed.

Mr. Marinaccio raised the issue of which plants to include in the list of indicator species. He feels that grasses will need to be addressed at some point adding that there are not enough native grasses in existence to study. Mr. Marinaccio feels that serpentine grasses will not be accepted by the BOS since a consultant was hired to specifically study them in the Pine Hill Preserve. The BOS will not want two consultants to study serpentine grasses. Staff noted that there is overlap between the two studies, with the INRMP extending beyond just species of special concern.

Dr. Schilling referred back to the presentation, concluding that plants need to be included in the indicator species. Each selected species must meet some of the criteria. The mixture of species must collectively meet all criteria.

Mr. Marinaccio raised his primary point regarding species selection: data on distribution must be available for the species. He expressed concern that if a species is selected for which we do not have conclusive data, we would be encouraging conditions for its survival in the event the species occurs. Mr. Marinaccio feels that resources should be expended on species we know exist in the study area. Dr. Shilling noted this concern and will keep it in mind as a species selection criteria.

Dr. Shilling asked the group for suggestions of species. Ms. Russell asked if there was a target number of species for the indicator species group? Dr. Shilling replied that the number of species would vary by location. For the study area, approximately 30 species would represent the habitats.

Mr. Marinaccio feels two primary questions will be raised by the BOS: (1) What species will inform the BOS regarding their decision on a north-south corridor? (2) What species will inform SEA's suggestions regarding corridor width for riparian setbacks?

Dr. Schilling asked for input within one week from the meeting date. PAWTAC suggested listing rainbow trout. Meadow vole was also suggested. Ms. Schaeffer felt that larger mammals should be included. Black bear, coyote and mountain lion were suggested. Band-tailed pigeon was suggested. Their numbers appear to be on the increase, especially in the spring.

Mr. Marinaccio stated that when it is suggested a species is sensitive to fragmentation, there needs to be data from studies to support the statement. The metric of the studies needs to be analyzed.

Mr. Lind explained that the next step in this process will be presentation of an Administrative Draft for discussion and recommendation at the next meeting. This item will go to the BOS after Habitat Inventory and Mapping Report.

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

The next meeting will be May 6, 1:00 PM. The meeting adjourned at 3:20 PM.