

**MINUTES of the
EI DORADO COUNTY
INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN
STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ISAC)
October 7, 2010**

Members in Attendance:

Jamie Beutler*
Bill Center*
Francesca Loftis
Kathye Russell
Cindy Shaffer
John Zentner

Others Present

Kris Kiehne, SEA
Rick Lind, SEA
Peter Maurer, EDC
Janelle Nolan, RBI for EDCWA
Jordan Postlewait, SEA
Fraser Shilling, SEA
Bob Smart, SEA

Members Absent

Cris Alarcon
Kim Beal
Dave Bolster
Danny Marquis

* Arrived late.

Chair John Zentner called the October 7, 2010 meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. with four members present. Janelle Nolan, representing the County Water Agency was introduced. Jamie Buetler arrived at 1:08.

A. Approval of Minutes

Since no quorum was available, this item was trailed to later in the meeting.

B. Public Comment

There were no comments from the public.

C. INRMP

1. Status report on process of project to date

Jordan Postlewait provided a status report. The project is presently on track as set forth in the timelines of the contract.

2. Recommendation on Administrative Draft Wildlife Movement and Corridors Report

Fraser Shilling reviewed the revised draft document using a power point presentation to summarize. The presentation focused on the changes made and findings from the analysis. There were five primary points to be made:

1. There is likely to be a significant need for north-south connectivity in the INRMP study area to meet the needs of target/indicator species as well as biodiversity in general.
2. There is likely to be a barrier effect of Highway 50 and other roadways in the INRMP area.
3. There are existing crossings of Highway 50 that could be improved to provide crossing opportunities for certain animals that can access the crossings.
4. Additional safe crossings are needed for wildlife across county roads and state highways. There are feasible retrofits and new construction alternatives to accomplish this.
5. There are zones along Highway 50 where crossing possibilities should be increased and other areas where existing crossings could be enhanced.

Jamie Beutler asked how the IBCs and corridors are related. Mr. Shilling responded that would be addressed in Phase 2. Cindy Shaffer pointed out that the IBC is intended to be more of a regulatory tool while the INRMP is a program of acquisition (land or easements) to offset impacts

Bill Center arrived at 1:20.

John Zentner suggested that birds make up a number of the 316 species in the study area, and they are not impacted by roads. He felt that the report gave the impression that all species were equally impacted. Ms. Shaffer asked if there are any species that don't require movement. Mr. Shilling responded that there are no known studies that show a one-directional movement. All species need to move to some degree and are impacted by division of habitat. He stated that the focus is on the Highway 50 corridor, not just the road. Many species will avoid roads and more heavily developed areas.

Ms. Shaffer stated that the INRMP is intended to be a landscape level program, and the committee needs to avoid focus on impacts to individuals. The General Plan EIR found that the impact to wildlife habitat was significant and unavoidable even after mitigation and the INRMP needs to identify what is feasible and reasonable, not fully eliminate the impact. Ms. Beutler agreed that it needs to be balanced.

Mr. Zentner observed that some of the crossings of Highway 50 are in the City of Placerville and that the INRMP cannot address those. The consultants concurred. Other crossing issues were discussed including combining pedestrian access with wildlife needs at Camino, and potential federal funding under the Transportation Enhancement and other programs.

Bill Center expressed concern about the median barrier that has been constructed from Placerville to Pollock Pines, and appears to be being installed with the HOV lane construction at the western end of the study area. He stated that this issue needs to be addressed in the design stage. He also expressed concern about other major roads, such as Green Valley and Lotus Roads. The less that is done by the County and Caltrans in the design and construction the more mitigation requirements will fall on private land

owners at crossing points. Rick Lind indicated that a discussion of issues and options regarding this concern could be included in the Alternatives report. Other issues discussed were cost-effectiveness of different options and that discussing the downside of funneling wildlife be added to the report. Mr. Zentner suggested that the word “terrestrial” be added to the last sentence of the first paragraph on Page 16.

Francesca Loftis moved to recommend that the Board of Supervisors accept the report with the recommended edits discussed previously, as satisfying the requirements of Task 1.d. The motion was seconded by Jamie Beutler and carried 6-0.

Cindy Shaffer added that she is concerned about absolute statements in the report. The discussion this day identified much more variability. Highway 50 is already an existing barrier and the County needs to make the best of a bad situation while still moving forward with its General Plan. The County does not have the ability to re-create unrestricted wildlife movement. Mr. Shilling replied that there should be less fixation on Highway 50. Other road improvements can also create barriers to wildlife movement. These issues should be addressed in the next phase and a solution-oriented approach developed. Mr. Center suggested that the County is still in the evaluation phase. This report identifies that some areas are stressed, others less so. A question that should be posed is how should DOT interact with the INRMP to avoid future conflicts with capital improvement projects. A process should be developed to include early notification and awareness of wildlife movement requirements.

3. Discussion of Alternative Approaches to Phase II of the INRMP

This item was deferred to the November meeting.

The minutes of September 2, 2010 were moved for approval by Francesca Loftis, seconded by Jamie Beutler, and approved 6-0.

D. Committee member comments; next meeting agenda items.

There were no additional member comments. The meeting was adjourned at 3:12 p.m.