

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

**Members in Attendance:**

Elena DeLacy  
Bill Frost  
Todd Gardner  
Ray Griffiths  
Mahala Young  
Valerie Zentner

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

**Others in Attendance:**

Kris Kiehne, SEA  
Rick Lind, SEA

**Members Absent:**

Sue Britting  
Jim Brunello  
Jim Davies  
Dan Corcoran  
Jeremiah Karuzas

The October 4, 2010 meeting was called to order by Chair Bill Frost at 2:18 p.m.

**A. Approval of Minutes**

A motion was made to approve the minutes of August 5, 2010 by Valerie Zentner and seconded by Ray Griffiths. The motion was approved 6-0.

**B. Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

**C. INRMP**

**1. Status report on process of project to date**

Jordan Postlewait reviewed the schedule and provided a chart showing the work progress to date. The team is on schedule, although Task 1.c is slightly delayed getting to the Board for approval. Some extra time was built into the schedule however, and this will not impact the overall schedule. Peter Maurer reported that the Indicator Species report has been sent to the Board Clerk and is tentatively scheduled for October 19.

**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.

Valerie Zentner asked if SEA was looking at ownership patterns for future mitigation. Rick Lind responded that would likely be a component of Phase 2. Ms. Zentner stated that she would like to see development incentivized to provide wildlife movement opportunities. She also inquired as to what kind of monitoring will occur regarding these crossings. Mr. Lind indicated that would also be developed as a part of Phase 2.

Mahala Young said that she had a few minor editorial comments. Comments provided by Dan Corcoran via e-mail were distributed and would be incorporated into the final draft.

**Ray Griffiths moved to recommend that the Board of Supervisors accept the report as completion of Task 1.d, and that it be used to inform the development of the next phase of the INRMP (Phase 2). The motion was seconded by Elena DeLacy and carried 6-0.**

Mr. Griffiths asked that additional comments be forwarded to the Board. It is his hope that the Board will provide leadership to promote land owner collaboration in enhancing opportunities for wildlife movement. Bill Frost added that the County should take a proactive approach and provide a positive message about the importance of wildlife movement and protection of corridors. Ms. DeLacy stated that there are a number of existing models that can be used as examples.

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

This item was continued to the November meeting.

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

There was discussion about having BLM participate in the INRMP as they manage large tracks of land within the study area. Mr. Maurer agreed to contact Bill Haigh, Regional Manager, to see if someone from that agency would be available.

It was noted that the consultant would try to get on calendar for the Ag Commission, Planning Commission, and other bodies to present their report findings and take public input prior to submitting the recommended alternatives to the board.

The next meeting will focus on the range of alternatives (Task 2.a). The meeting was adjourned at 3:31 p.m.