

**DRAFT MINUTES of the
PLANT AND WILDLIFE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(PAWTAC)
JANUARY 3, 2011**

Members in Attendance:

Sue Britting
Elena DeLacy
Bill Frost
Ray Griffiths
Mahala Guggino
Patrick Moeszinger
Valerie Zentner

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

Members Absent:

Jim Brunello
Dan Corcoran
Jim Davies
Jeremiah Karuzas

Others in Attendance:

Kris Kiehne, SEA

The January 3, 2011 meeting was called to order by Chair Mahala Guggino at 2:03 p.m.

A. Approval of Minutes

Sue Britting moved to approve the minutes as presented. Elena DeLacy seconded the motion which passed 5-0 with one abstention.

B. Public Comments

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 three sub-items were discussed together. Jordan Postlewait reviewed the purpose of the goals and objectives statement. The intent was to respond in part to the Committee's motion of last meeting, and prior Board direction.

The following discussion points and comments on the draft were made:

- Under Elements Common to all Approaches, incorporation of the OWMP and rare plant protection strategy should be included.
- Clarification of the term "flexibility", meaning plan could be readily modified for updates determined by the General Plan.

- The wording of item 6, INRMP Preparation, should be changed to "Not in conflict" or "Consistent with" other 2004 GP policies; delete "where possible".
- Suggested that the INRMP could provide developers confidence of meeting CEQA requirements for biological resources when working with Planning Services. CEQA compliance would be assured and an EIR not required for projects if provisions of INRMP are met. Suggested that the Goals and Objectives document should state this clearly, if it is the intent of the County to meet this level of CEQA review for the INRMP.
 - Discussion by several members that an explicit statement of CEQA review of the INRMP should be included in the Goals or Purpose sections of the INRMP/GO document(s). There was further discussion of the procedural approach of writing and reviewing the INRMP, questions regarding the level of CEQA review necessary for the Plan.
 - The issue of adequacy of the CEQA review for the OWMP was raised and how similar concerns are likely to be an issue with the INRMP.
 - The INRMP process needs to identify what mitigation would be needed to fulfill CEQA requirements.
- Discussion of the "Examples of Optional Elements for Consideration" section:
 - Some of the bullet points are not optional, some are required by other elements of the GP. Suggested that the word "optional" be removed or changed
 - Suggested expanding restoration efforts to include additional habitat types, change wording "stream zone habitats" to general term.
 - Importance of providing options for the BOS to consider; show various ways to meet goals (incl. voluntary efforts, easements, etc.)
 - Suggested grouping the bullet points under the 8 elements required by the INRMP so that it doesn't appear as a laundry list.
 - Re-word heading from "Optional" Suggestions of "Various" or "Specific Components for Consideration"
 - Prioritize the bullet list
 - Link to other GP elements
 - Need to develop a method to monitor or measure program success.
- Procedural issues relating to how Phase 2 and the associated CEQA document would be prepared were also discussed. Specific points included:
 - Does County/BOS want to break the INRMP process into smaller segments so that certain components could be developed over time?
 - Plan could be developed while the CEQA analysis is being conducted.
 - As alternatives are being analyzed, components could be included in the INRMP (if Neg Dec is not chosen.)
 - County has not determined the level of CEQA analysis for the Plan.
 - Suggested that staff report to the BOS to discuss the procedural component when these goals and objectives and other final documents are presented to the BOS.
 - Scoping of plan could take place concomitantly or sequentially w/CEQA review.

- Important to show BOS that completing Phase 2 is affordable, that components could be prioritized.
- Generally the Committee agreed with the document, with changes noted and assurance that the next draft would be circulated in timely manner for review and comment prior to submitting it to the BOS. Some discussion of including ISAC comments in final, whether ISAC would see the modified document.

A motion was made by Elena DeLacy to conceptually approve the goals and objectives document as presented, with modification to be made as noted in the discussion. The revised document would be distributed to Committee members. Mahala Guggino seconded the motion which carried 7-0.

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

Rick Lind discussed the procedural issues and the scope of work. He asked how the committee thought the scope would show the Plan moving through the County for review. Would it be concurrently with CEQA or sequentially? How does the Committee envision the sequence of these elements? Additional comments from committee members included the following:

- County Counsel needs to advise regarding level of CEQA review.
- General Plan amendments invoke CEQA
- If amending the IBCs is a key component of the INRMP, that would necessitate an amendment to the General plan, which could change the level of CEQA review.
- Emphasized the importance of public involvement to gain support; needs well-publicized meetings to smooth out the process of developing the final INRMP document.

D. Committee member comments; next meeting agenda items.

No additional comments were made. The next meeting is scheduled for February 7, 2011. The meeting was adjourned at 3:07 p.m.