

**MINUTES of the  
PLANT AND WILDLIFE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
(PAWTAC)  
March 4, 2010**

**Members in Attendance:**

Sue Britting  
Jim Davies  
Dan Corcoran  
Elena DeLacy  
Todd Gardner  
Jeremiah Karuzas  
Craig Thomas  
Mahala Young  
Valerie Zentner

Rick Lind, SEA  
Art Marinaccio  
Jordan Postlewait, SEA  
Fraser Shilling, SEA  
Robert Smart, SEA  
Peter Maurer, EDC  
Beverly Savage, EDC

**Others in Attendance:**

Kris Kiehne, SEA

**Members Absent:**

Jim Brunello  
Bill Frost  
Ray Griffiths

The March 4, 2010, meeting was called to order by Chair Dan Corcoran at 9:04 AM.

**A. Approval of Minutes**

Peter Maurer explained that a different format was followed for the February 4, 2010, Minutes and asked for the Committee's feedback. The new suggested format features a bulleted summary of discussion. Sue Britting spoke in favor of the revised format. Valerie Zentner concurred.

**Motion: Ms. Britting moved, seconded by Elena DeLacy, and unanimously carried to approve the February 4, 2010, meeting minutes and to adopt the bulleted summary format for future meetings.**

**B. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**C. INRMP**

Jordan Postlewait presented an overview of discussion topics for the meeting. A handout, "Focus Points for Upcoming ISAC/PAWTAC Meetings," was distributed. Items on the handout, which had changed since the last distribution, appear in italic.

Mr. Postlewait explained that 30 minutes of the day's meeting would be devoted to discussion of the Administrative Draft Habitat Inventory Report and Map. The bulk of the day's discussion will be devoted to Indicator vs. Focal Species and indicator species criteria for selection. The

meeting will follow a workshop format for this main topic. The remainder of the meeting will be devoted to guiding principles and protocol for meetings.

### **C. 1. Review and discuss Administrative Draft INRMP Habitat Inventory Map Update and Report**

Mr. Postlewait presented on behalf of the SEA team. He asked Committee members to review the Administrative Draft, provide comments today at the meeting or submit via e-mail to Mr. Maurer. The next step for the SEA team will be to incorporate comments from both committees into a report which will be submitted to the BOS and then made available for public review and comment.

Mr. Postlewait referred to the Administrative Draft. Subtask 1.b of the Phase 1 INRMP Scope of Work identifies five elements to be updated and mapped: (1) Habitats that support special-status species; (2) Aquatic environments including lakes, streams, and rivers; (3) Wetland and riparian habitats; (4) Important habitat for migratory deer herds; and, (5) Large expanses of native vegetation. Key definitions developed as Subtask 1.a and pending approval by the BOS, guided the data to be shown on the maps. Data sources are highlighted in the Administrative Draft. Sources considered but not used are listed for informational purposes but are not highlighted. No field verification of data was conducted.

The following comments and discussion points were provided on the proposed "Administrative Draft – Habitat Inventory and Mapping Report," dated February 24, 2010:

#### Map 1, "Habitats that support special-status species"

- A request was made for SEA staff to provide source information from which the CNDBB, USFS Critical Habitat and Pine Hill Preserve Data were derived;
- Species listed in the General Plan EIR and occurring at elevations below 4,000 were mapped;
- The General Plan requires the maps be updated every five years;
- Suggested that aquatic habitats listed by the Fish and Wildlife Service be included in the map;
- Soil data, serpentine rock outcrops, red-legged frog core areas, and gabbro soil boundaries are data sets that are readily available to the public and should be mapped;
- A dissenting opinion was expressed that mapping additional data might result in casting a very wide net that could include mapping of possibly-occurring species in addition to actually-occurring species;

#### Map 2, "Aquatic environments including lakes, streams, and rivers" and

#### Map 3, "Wetland and riparian habitats"

- The data utilized is from the USGS. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is in the process of compiling a large-scale aquatic resource inventory that includes El Dorado County.

This data, which will include ephemeral streams, will be mapped when complete, most likely during INRMP Phase II;

- Noted that USGS data includes man-made structures such as wastewater treatment plants. SEA should make certain to exclude this data.

Map 4, "Important habitat for migratory deer herds"

- Data used in the map is the best available and is from the CDFG, produced in the 1970's;

Map 5, "Large expanses of native vegetation"

- The current map displays level of disturbance. CalVeg data will be overlaid to show large expanses by vegetation type;
- Discussion regarding whether land use/zoning and planned land use should be included on the map;
- Suggestion was made that existing land-use designations could be one possible overlay to the map and future land use a second overlay;
- Concern expressed that mapping current and future land use might result in the original intent of the map being lost and the focus of the map changing;
- It was requested that the record reflect: INRMP Phase I focuses on definitions. The topic of future entitlements and future mitigation programs are the focus of INRMP Phase II.

**C. 2. Discussion of indicator vs. focal species and**

**C. 3. Review and discuss proposed criteria and approach for selection indicator species**

Dr. Schilling presented on behalf of the SEA team. An overhead presentation displayed definitions of both terms and selection criteria. Dr. Schilling asked for Committee feedback on the topics.

The following comments and discussion points were provided:

- Neither term was used in the General Plan. Indicator species is the term used most often in agency-related planning;
- Monitoring of the species is not required or anticipated;
- Suggestion that a healthy, vibrant species should be selected;
- The selection should also consider function – what are we protecting and how are we protecting it;
- Although full-scale monitoring of the species may not occur, some form of status update must occur to measure the impacts of mitigation and fulfill CEQA obligations;
- Suggestion that indicator species implies management. Therefore, focal species is more appropriate;
- The April meeting will include consensus and recommendation regarding the appropriate term;
- A motion to recommend species monitoring may be made at that the April meeting;
- Opinion was expressed that the BOS never intended to monitor species;

- Opinion was expressed that when lands are designated for conservation, some form of management must occur. Management is, therefore, implied;
- The intent of selecting a suite of species is to restore areas that have been affected by fragmentation;
- Foxes and bobcats are affected by fragmentation but can adapt to disturbance. Their adaptability may make them unsuitable for selection;
- Species take greater risks under a great deal of disturbance. Sightings can increase when their numbers are actually declining;
- Suggestion a species should be selected that has been lost or is at risk;
- Discussion regarding whether the red-legged frog should be selected. Noted that the species occurs only in two small areas of the County;
- The INRMP focuses on present conditions. It is difficult not to consider the future when looking at conservation;
- A species should be selected that is being monitored by other agencies so that data is available;
- Assemblage of factors provides the best picture regarding the health of a species and its environment, i.e. shading of stream, size of dispersal, etc;
- SEA will send the overhead presentation to Mr. Maurer who will forward it to the Committee;
- Suggestion that Committee members reread General Plan sections relating to special status species in order to gain a better understanding of the intent of indicator species and to select the appropriate term;
- An Administrative Draft on this topic will be presented at the April meeting.

#### **C. 4. Re-visit guiding principles and adopted protocol for review of work products**

Rick Lind presented this item on behalf of the SEA team. He suggested that a procedure for hearing public comment on agenda items be documented. The Committee discussed options for public comment.

**Motion: Ms. Britting moved, seconded by Ms. DeLacy, and unanimously approved that a subitem be added to each agenda item, "Public Comment, three minutes."**

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

Mr. Maurer answered in response to a question that the Key Definitions will be considered by the BOS on March 16.

The next meeting will be April 1 at 9:00 AM.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 AM.