

**DRAFT MINUTES of the
EI DORADO COUNTY
INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN
STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ISAC)
January 6, 2011**

Members in Attendance:

Jamie Beutler
Bill Center
Danny Marquis
Kathye Russell
Cindy Shaffer
John Zentner

Kim Beal
Dave Bolster
Francesca Loftis

Others Present

Rick Lind, SEA
Peter Maurer, EDC
Jordan Postlewait, SEA
Fraser Shilling, SEA
Bob Smart, SEA

Members Absent

Cris Alarcon

Chair John Zentner called the December 2, 2010 meeting to order at 1:07 p.m. with four members present.

A. Approval of Minutes

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Bill Center, seconded by Jamie Beutler. The motion carried 6-0.

B. Public Comment

There were no comments from the public.

C. INRMP

- 1. Status report on process of project to date**
- 2. Draft Goals and Objectives for Phase II - INRMP Preparation (Attached)**
- 3. Integration of Goals and Objectives with Draft INRMP Implementation Options Report**

These items were discussed concurrently. Jordan Postlewait provided an overview of the draft goals and objectives document. The intent is that there is a clear indication of the goals and the CEQA implications of what is intended with Phase II. Cindy Shaffer asked if this document was intended to be presented to the Board of Supervisors. Peter Maurer responded that the document is intended to meet the Board's direction to provide a two or three page summary document regarding the purpose and next steps to the INRMP. Mr. Postlewait continued by clarifying that whatever is provided as options to the Board will not change the finding in the General Plan EIR that the original impacts to habitat loss and fragmentation were found to be significant and unavoidable.

Kathye Russell suggested that the document should include language from the General Plan. Mr. Postlewait stated that the plan is to follow the General Plan direction via the 8 components listed in Policy 7.4.2.8. John Zentner suggested that language be added to show that the listed components are mandatory. Jamie Beutler stated that the committee should make recommendations to the Board regarding priorities for the optional elements contained in the last list of bulleted items on the draft memo.

There was a lengthy discussion of CEQA implications and effects of preparing an EIR for Phase II. Fraser Shilling described the trade-offs between development impacts and the level of mitigation as a balance sheet. Bill Center expressed concern that a balance sheet approach addresses profit and loss or gain and loss. He asked what level of significant and unavoidable impact is acceptable. He compared it to traffic impacts, and how Measure Y has defined what the threshold is. There is no bright line established for habitat loss and fragmentation. He stated that fragmentation is important because it cannot be mitigated by paying a fee as is done with the OWMP. Mr. Shilling stated that the County will need to adopt goals that are both pragmatic and targeted. Development applicants need certainty.

Mr. Center asked if there is guidance in the General Plan EIR. The Board needs to be intentional and logical in deciding where to build. He declared that past sins have created problems that cannot be solved with fees on new development. Mr. Shilling suggested that it is possible to establish quantitative thresholds. El Dorado County has an advantage over other jurisdictions because we are actively working on a program.

Ms. Shaffer expressed a concern that other agency requirements (i.e. Department of Fish and Game or Army Corps of Engineers) will result in another bite of the apple, even if the County's program is intended to fully mitigate cumulative impacts for projects. Mr. Center indicated that trying to solve all agency issues bring us closer to doing an HCP/NCCP. He suggested what the County needs to do is compare important habitat areas and identified growth areas of the General Plan, and identify where the conflict areas are. Then the committees and staff can work on developing a plan that addresses those concerns, providing connectivity and permeability, while allowing the development to proceed. The INRMP should be a combination of carrot and stick. The County will need to look at on-site protection strategies with new development, but should have a menu of measures that will protect wildlife.

Mr. Zentner reminded the committee that it needs to consider small land owners, and not just think about larger development projects. He asked how the INRMP will affect ministerial permits. Mr. Shilling responded that stewardship provisions in the plan are critical to addressing small landowner concerns. Mr. Zentner agreed that the conflict areas need to be mapped and identify what is truly important. Mr. Center stated that there will be a range of importance. Ms. Beutler suggested that the consultant should present to the committees what areas they consider important as a place to start. There should be a prioritization. Mr. Center stated that the intersection of high quality habitat and areas with high development potential are the critical areas that need to be considered

politically. He also expressed concern that agency coordination needs to be a component for consideration with all government actions. There needs to be a review process so that each agency knows what the impacts are of other's actions and a rational engineering process to accommodate growth while considering biological needs.

John Zentner moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that the first step in Phase II is to prioritize important habitat areas and overlay that onto development areas to identify conflict areas. Kathye Russell seconded the motion, and proposed an amendment that the consultants provide a rationalization of why the identified wildlife areas are important. The motion maker accepted the amendment. The amended motion carried 5-1.

Bill Center moved to support the draft goals and objectives document in concept as recognizing the opinion of the committee while recognizing that specific implementation measures to be developed in Phase II may change as the process evolves. Jamie Beutler seconded the motion which carried 4-2.

On the motion, Ms. Russell expressed concerns about specific components of the document. She stated that on-site mitigation for projects is a problem. Mr. Center responded that he does like off-site mitigation.

4. Introduction to Draft Scope of Work for Phase II – INRMP Preparation

This item was continued to the February ISAC meeting.

E. Committee member comments; next meeting agenda items.

The committee asked staff to let Supervisor Nutting know that his appointee, Cris Alarcon has not been attending the meetings and to consider appointing an alternate.

The committee asked that the next meeting include a discussion of how the advisory committees will be involved in the consultant selection process and finalizing the scope of work for Phase II. The next meeting is scheduled for February 3, 2011.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.