SUMMARY of DISCUSSION of the
PLANT AND WILDLIFE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(PAWTAC)
May 6, 2010

Members in Attendance:
Sue Britting
Dan Corcoran
Jim Davies
Elena DeLacy

Members Absent:
Jim Brunello
Bill Frost
Todd Gardner
Ray Griffiths
Jeremiah Karuzas
Craig Thomas
Mahala Young
Valerie Zentner

Others in Attendance:
Rick Lind, SEA
Jordan Postlewait, SEA
Ethan Koenigs, SEA
Robert Smart, SEA
Peter Maurer, EDC
Beverly Savage, EDC

The May 6, 2010, meeting was called to order by Chair Elena DeLacy at 9:19 AM. There was no quorum to conduct committee business. It was decided that members would discuss agenda items.

A. Approval of Minutes

There was no quorum to approve Minutes. After discussion, members present agreed that when there is no quorum, the term "Minutes" should not be used for the notes of committee discussion. The document shall be entitled "Summary of Discussion" and shall not be agendized for approval. Rather, the Summary of Discussion will be e-mailed to members in attendance who may submit revisions to Peter Maurer or Beverly Savage.

B. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

C. INRMP

Jordan Postlewait, SEA, presented an INRMP schedule update. Two of the four main components of the Scope of Work appear on the Agenda for May: Habitat Inventory Report and Map and Indicator Species Report. The team will present a progress update to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) along with these reports possibly on May 25 or June

8. Since there has not been a quorum at the past two meetings, the SEA team will proceed without formal PAWTAC input. Individual comments may be submitted to the BOS.

C. 1. Discussion of Administrative Draft Indicator Species Report

(The Agenda was reordered with Indicator Species Report discussion moved before Habitat Inventory Report.) Frasier Schilling, Ph.D., SEA, led the discussion.

The following comments and discussion points were provided:

- Suggested that a numbering scheme legend be included for Table 2.
- Citizen monitoring of species occurs. This data could be useful.
- There was a question regarding why the Administrative Draft Report contained Section 9.0, Monitoring Considerations, when monitoring is part of Phase 2. The SEA team explained the purpose of the section was to address the perception that all monitoring will be costly. Some species will be expensive to monitor; some will be inexpensive to monitor. Recommendations will be made in Phase 1 regarding activities to occur in Phase 2.
- A Committee member commented that it will be difficult to make recommendations for monitoring until after the species have been selected.
- It was suggested that a step, defining monitoring framework, needs to occur after species selection and before species monitoring. During this step, decisions would be made regarding the questions to be answered through monitoring efforts. An example of a possible question is: How much change should trigger concern in a particular species?
- When selecting indicator species, cost to monitor should be a selection criteria.
- Cost to monitor should be considered but the primary selection criteria should be based on ecology. We should be careful not to limit the list to only those species that we can afford to monitor.
- Not all affects of fragmentation are loss of movement. Genetic fragmentation can occur due to loss of connectivity.
- Species with legs require connectivity but other species need to move as well, for instance birds and pollen.
- North-south corridor connectivity is not the only movement issue. Later connections between habitats, such as grasslands connected by riparian corridors should also be studied.

C.2. Discussion of Administrative Draft Habitat Inventory Report and Map

Ethan Koenigs, SEA, led the discussion. Revisions were made to the maps based on input from the committees. Unpaved or less travelled roads were highlighted in yellow. Conifer and hardwood trees were combined. Chaparral categories have been combined. Data is still separated in the database. Other data sources were included to show special-

status species, including CRLF data on the red-legged frog and USFWS vernal pool data. Regulatory and administrative boundaries are also included, such as Pine Hill Preserve, USFWS Gabbro-endemic plan recovery area, Oak Woodland Management Plan, Priority Conservation Areas and others.

The following comments and discussion points were provided:

- Rattlesnake Bar Road and the southern stretch of Highway 49 are considered by one Committee member to create little disturbance.
- A suggestion was made that speed limit and slope data also be used to indicate disturbance to legged species.
- SEA staff noted that the map of large expanses is not intended to address movement or connectivity.
- Request was made that footnotes include reference to date the data was accessed.
- It was suggested that an appendix to page four explain that gabbro soils were integrated with other vegetation types for chaparral communities and list the suite of species representing the different habitat types. A note should be made that bedstraw appears in gabbro and serpentine soil types.
- Suggested that a column be added to Table 2, page 6, listing the percentage of the representation in the total County study area so that the habitat type could be compared with the large expanses.
- Additional methodology is needed to explain the values assigned to different parcel sizes. Explain why the parcels were ranked as they were and if there was a biological basis for ranking.
- Opinion expressed that weighting road density as well as parcel data to indicate density is double counting disturbance.

Ethan Koenigs, SEA, presented maps that were requested by a member of ISAC, Jim Brunello. The maps show large expanses of native vegetation along with PCA's, IBC's and other designated natural resource areas. As requested, these maps will be available at staff's presentation to the BOS.

The following comments and discussion points were provided:

- An observation was made that some open spaces are missing from this map. Peter Maurer explained that newly-acquired lands may not appear.
- Elena DeLacy will send map data from her organization.
- There was discussion regarding whether the map should be publicized. Suggestion was made that the item be agendized for the next meeting and Mr. Brunello be asked his intent for requesting the maps.
- The map as presented may be too detailed for public display. Suggested that a simplified map be prepared for BOS presentation.

D. Committee member comments; next meeting agenda items

Next meeting will be June 3.

- Elena DeLacy will not be able to attend.
- Membership needs to be updated.
- Members were appointed by the BOS. A recommendation would need to be made to the BOS to appoint new members, based on lack of participation by certain current members.
- Committee participation will be agendized for the June 3 meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 11:33 AM.