

INRMP PAWTAC & ISAC Joint Meeting
August 27, 2008

RFP Comments

a. Identify Important Habitat

- Resolve conflicts between Pine Hill Plants and larger biological areas. Include previously existing bio reports done for development projects incorporated into INRMP. Develop mechanism for a process for present and future bio reports to be mapped.
- Identify where bio surveys have been done and nothing has been found – where things aren't (Rare, Threatened, Endangered Species)
- Are we missing things that haven't been covered. Are oaks mapped correctly; clear identification.
- Definitions to be included; what are source of definitions. Assumption that State has definition of "Important Habitat."
- How old are the studies/maps? Is there something newer?
- Assumption that this is to deal with county-wide, global issues, but projects will need to deal with special status species on a project-by-project basis.
- List of what maps will be included – soils that support special status plants, etc. List of what has already been mapped.
- List of special status species from DFG database is old; work with DFG on data
- Use spatial data, not point data.
- How do state/federal lands interrelate with what INRMP is trying to do? What state/federal lands rules apply to their lands?
- Explore linkages between habitats. Landscapes are connected. Explore literature. Develop criteria for inventory; modeling – identify under different criteria effects on habitat/species.
- How do lands under federal/state ownership protect special status species (Policy 7.4.1.5)?
- Are we in conflict with state or federal plans? Make sure we are tied into it.
- Comprehensive study at the beginning before completing other steps. Fragmentation and connectivity issues.

- What connectivity is and isn't. What corridors are important or not. Substantial evidence in record regarding riparian, highway 50 barrier, Weber Creek.
- Different species have different needs in connectivity and corridors; what species to address connectivity issue on; not feasible for connectivity on every species. Committee and Board support on species chosen. Different scale species (some species miles, some feet). Scaled analysis – larger moving species, smaller local species.
- Large expanse of native vegetation – large expanse is different for oak trees than for Stebbin's morning glory. Is it trying to address special status needs, or? Scaled approach.
- Approach matrix on connectivity and special status species so that it is dynamic – not a snapshot, but a moving picture, updated on a consistent basis. Don't lock in decisions or processes that can't be changed over time.
- Term special status species comes from a table in the GP EIR.
- There needs to be an adaptive management component. Consultants develop an appropriate list after consulting with experts. CEQA mitigations and protections are driving this.
- Integrating into a plan both general habitat and habitat for special status species.
- Process – consultant identifies species, bring back to committees in early part of process for review, then to Board.
- Table that identifies species that share habitat – biological criteria – whether habitat addresses future species.
- Get a consultant separately to help define RFP.
- What are economic costs of managing land – how much it costs and how does it get paid for?
- Don't duplicate processes occurring on state oversight or federal lands.
- Adaptive management – update on a regular basis – include mechanisms for doing that. Perpetuities?

b. Habitat Protection Strategy

- “Meeting CEQA measures” constrains. There can be voluntary measures by people as well. Sort out regulatory context items from voluntary measures.
- We’re implementing policy decisions; more than CEQA measures. There is a regulatory component to this.
- Impacts of climate change and what will happen to the waterways. Will it have an impact on waterways? What could happen as snowpack decreases?
- Opportunity for conservation strategy; this is what bullet B is. How does this tie into a project-by-project basis? What are we trying to accomplish with this on a project-by-project basis?
- Areas identified as “Important” go through discretionary review and do project-by-project studies.
- Financing needs to be a component of a Habitat Protection Strategy. What choices and alternatives are out there and “battle-tested” out in state as to what a real habitat protection strategy is?
- What is currently successful in this county? Fire safety plans; management of forest lands. Prop 40 funding.
- There has been progress in wildlife crossings and roadways in the past 4-6 years. Check recent studies on what works and doesn’t; develop toolbox for use on projects. Things that don’t work can be clearly identified. Not just in U.S. but European studies (they are ahead of us). It also incorporates the corridor issue.
- Cooperative strategy. Look at successful projects; timbering, grazing, Delta rice farmers, etc. Win-win for different groups.
- Different ways of thinking of how to get conservation to happen, such as economic incentives. Develop some ideas that could work, such as carbon credits, various tools for use in toolbox.
- Detailed inventory of all publicly owned lands (conservation easements, etc.) then overlay on parcel map.
- BMPs in place for Ag Districts that don’t affect habitats. Such as leaving riparian areas as habitat corridors. Is effective in protecting habitat areas – don’t have to have acquisition strategy to set aside those lands in perpetuity. Ag landowners have a significant amount of their land in natural habitat. Study to identify those lands and recognize them as natural habitats.

- Direct consultant to identify and determine roles organizations play that conserve.
- Ask the consultant to develop recommendations for prioritizing the most significant/important areas for conservations from among the Important Habitat inventory. Where will county direct funds that are collected and where will those funds be directed at in priority order? Maybe higher priority to links that connect already protected lands.
- Loop monitoring into habitat strategy. Which strategies in literature have most efficacy and most bang for the buck? Build in appropriate feedback loops. Not done when plan adopted. Monitoring is critical.
- Put Best Practices list that works in situations – would be a good toolbox.

c. Mitigation Assistance

- “Important Habitats” – adaptive management – if the purpose of this section is impacts based on “a”, which is adaptive and changes – how is the mitigation done? Clearly articulated and disseminated to the public, who will have to pay fees or do the 2:1 mitigation. The map could change, how will the public know?
- A list of species, and their habitats, could clearly identify “important habitat.”
- Consult with agencies and coordinate mitigation.
- What is the role of a qualified land trust?
- Discretionary projects have to do their own CEQA, so there should be no conflicts.
- This section includes the word “incentives.” Voluntary, less punitive, allows people to comply.
- Having mitigation options. Acquisitions are not fundamental piece. Alternatives and options. Recognize where mitigation has occurred onsite.
- Could be mitigation bank, conservation banks. Project proponent has a menu/choice.
- Realistic solutions such as in urban areas; mitigation assistance fund could obtain something in priority areas. Protection/avoidance should be tools that can be used. Range of impacts; range of mitigations. Not one size fits all.
- Scale and scope, BMPs, things that are battle-tested.

- Develop a toolbox of things that can be used to retain the values. Protect habitat, not just mitigate projects. Strategy for values not already protected – recognize what is already protected.
 - Different levels of protection – for federal lands, etc., in mapping.
 - Plan is effective because we know county; not plan that will be trumped.
- d. Habitat Acquisition
- Under CO-M, we've already adopted an Initial Map, we can start acquiring. What do County and advisory groups think is appropriate for prioritization of acquisitions? Is it red-legged frog habitat, oaks, rare plants? Develop a point system?
 - We have rare plants and oaks funding programs. Rare plant acquisition coordinates with state/federal agencies and that's where that funding goes.
 - Better to have a county process to identify priority – better for county citizens and Board to decide, not consultant.
 - Economic impact of habitat acquisition to surrounding areas. If you are a landowner with an IBC or IH designation, could affect property value. Ripple effect. Potential impact of degrading property values. Needs economic analysis, everyone needs to be treated appropriately and fairly.
 - Functional transfer of density – TDR. Implicit onsite, clustering of a project. Is it a mechanism for transferring density and/or economic windfall? Including parcels where density was not recognized in GP.
 - PAR software evaluates true cost of acquiring and managing land in perpetuity.
- e. Habitat Management
- Opportunities to transfer lands to BLM or FS. Might be more practical than county to manage lands.
 - Baseline on population, acreages, quality of habitat. Don't punish landowners who have done work on their land and have invested in their land.
 - Develop carrying capacity for whatever you are trying to manage.
 - Setting up separate group to discuss management strategy.

- Consultants can provide different options of what can be done. What is management? Can be achieved through conservation easement language, there is oversight there. Cost different things. Can have some kind of oversight group. Consultant needs to identify options, infrastructure to support options, and costs of those options.
- Management and Monitoring go hand in hand. What is economically viable way of doing this?
- Some lands already managed such as in Timber Harvest Zones.
- This section is for lands that have been acquired through the INRMP. Global monitoring is in section “a”.
- Look at OWMP. Management of PCAs is well written, and tools are in toolbox. Marrying some of that language and don’t reinvent the wheel.
- Management side, we already have regulatory constraints. INRMP is like offsite mitigation. You’re protecting resources in other areas due to areas affected by development.

f. Monitoring

g. Public Participation

h. Funding

i. IBC

j. Incorporation of OWMP and Rare Plants into INRMP

- Incorporate BOS issues/decisions/deferrals of continuation of OWMP into INRMP
- Incorporate Policy 7.4.4.5

k. How will development projects conform to the INRMP?