

**MINUTES of the
PLANT AND WILDLIFE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(PAWTAC)
July 14, 2009**

Members in Attendance:

Jim Brunello
Dan Corcoran
Jim Davies
Todd Gardner
Ray Griffiths
Jeremiah Karuzas
Valerie Zentner

Peter Maurer, staff
Beverly Savage, staff

Members Absent:

Sue Britting
Alan Ehgott
Bill Frost
Jim Gibson
Dan Hinrichs
Craig Thomas
Mahala Young

Others in Attendance:

Art Marinaccio
Jordan Postlewait

A. Call to Order and Adoption of Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 9:15 a.m. by staff facilitator, Peter Maurer. There was no quorum to conduct Committee business. Those present agreed to conduct a general discussion of Committee business.

B. Meeting Date and Time

Members present suggested regular meetings of PAWTAC be rescheduled to the third Thursday of the month at 8:30 a.m. in Conference Room A. Mr. Maurer will notify membership by e-mail.

C. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

This item was tabled as there was no quorum.

D. 1. INRMP Proposals

Mr. Maurer stated that staff has completed its review of the proposals. Six firms submitted proposals. Of those, three proposals met staff requirements. The next step will be for staff to work with County Purchasing Division to develop the contract. The contract will then be submitted to the Board of Supervisors for approval. Before making a decision regarding the recommendation of a contractor to submit to the Board, staff would appreciate feedback from the Committee. Ms. Zentner asked if one firm stood out "head and shoulders" above the others. Mr. Maurer replied that none of the three stood out significantly. Mr. Karuzas asked what criteria was used by staff in its evaluation. Mr. Maurer explained that staff employed a weighted-ranking evaluation system that considered each firm's stated experience in similar types of plans and the firm's local knowledge.

Mr. Brunello felt that a discussion on methodology was important. Also, staff should consider who within each organization would perform the actual work on the biological studies. Mr. Brunello recommended adding Planning Partners to the list of the firms under consideration, based on their understanding of the framework.

Mr. Davies added that the Committee should focus their evaluation and comments of the proposals on the plant and wildlife issues. Mr. Karuzas agreed and added that the local climate should be considered as well.

Mr. Gardner noted that some firms stressed their political backgrounds in their proposal. Mr. Gardner felt that this background was not germane to the scope of work. Mr. Davies noted that the firm who is selected must be able to translate their biological study to the general public. Mr. Gardner felt that the Committee might help to bridge this gap and clarify the technical information. Mr. Marinaccio did not see that any of the firms included the task of clarifying the technical information in their proposal. Mr. Davies felt that in order to clarify the technical information, the metric would need to be defined. Ms. Zentner felt that this was part of the gap analysis. Mr. Brunello feels an analysis of the focal species would be the first step, followed by the formulation of a plan, which may not work with Indicator Species Methodology. Mr. Marinaccio pointed out that a political decision needs to be made between these phases.

Mr. Karuzas noted that Dudek's proposal lists tasks 2.1 through 2.4. Are there that many tasks? Mr. Maurer responded that there were a number of subtasks identified by Dudek. Mr. Brunello suggested the number of subtasks identified justifies Dudek's higher bid and feels that the amount of work to be performed should be weighted in the bid analysis. Mr. Davies felt that Dudek provided a "worst-case-scenario" and asked if it would be possible to partially award the contract and add other tasks as needed. Mr. Maurer responded that he would need to discuss the issue with the Purchasing Division.

Mr. Maurer will send the ranking criteria and the proposals to Committee members and asks for comment by Friday, July 10. Committee members are requested to evaluate plant and wildlife issues in the proposals but do not have to limit their comments to these topics.

D.2. Discussion of Definitions

Mr. Maurer introduced discussion regarding definitions of "important habitat," "large expanses of native vegetation," and other terms. Should the Committee draft definitions and present them to the Board of Supervisors for approval? Mr. Gardner feels this should be the contractor's first step when hired. Mr. Marinaccio added that terms in the INRMP can be modified, if necessary, to arrive at the proper biological result. Mr. Brunello agreed and feels that we should not get caught up in the language. More important, in Mr. Brunello's opinion, is to map the areas. Mr. Karuzas feels the primary initial task of the consultant should be to define terms. Mr. Brunello feels the consultant will need help from the Committee who, because of members' backgrounds, is better suited to define terms. Ms. Zentner asked if definition of terms would arise in the Oak Woodlands litigation. Mr. Maurer feels this is not a focus of the litigation. The consensus of those present was to table discussion of definitions until the consultant is on board.

Mr. Marinaccio asked if fees have been collected yet under the Oak Woodlands plan? Mr. Maurer is working on the Annual Report and estimated that approximately \$40,000 has been collected. Mr. Marinaccio feels that the PAWTAC Committee is the proper venue to make decisions regarding the purchase of a habitat. Mr. Gardner asked if the General Plan defines the process for purchasing property. Ms. Zentner stated that the process will be addressed in the INRMP. Mr. Maurer will share the Annual Report with ISAC and PAWTAC members. Mr. Gardner added that now may be a good time to purchase, since land prices are low.

E. Committee member comments; next meeting agenda items.

Mr. Maurer will schedule a meeting in August if the need arises. Otherwise, the next meeting will be September 17 at 8:30 a.m.

The meeting adjourned at 10:43 a.m.