

MEETING NOTES

**Eastern Alameda County Conservation Strategy
Steering Committee Meeting
June 3, 2008
10 am – 12 pm
Zone 7 Conference Room 150A**

Attendees:

Jill Duerig & Mary Lim - Zone 7
Troy Rahmig & David Zippin – ICF Jones & Stokes
Liz McElligott & Dominic Frieta – Alameda County
Stefan Garcia – Alameda County Congestion Management Agency
Brian Mathews – Alameda County Waste Management Authority
Eric Brown, Steve Stewart, and Susan Frost – City of Livermore
Janice Stern – City of Pleasanton
Chris Barton – EBRPD
Karen Sweet & Terry Huff – NRCS/ACRCD Partnership
Cay Goude & Kim Squires – USFWS
Scott Wilson, Liam Davis & Marcia Grefsrud - DFG

- 1) Potential Biological Opinion for EACCS
 - a) There was a question about timing for having a programmatic biological opinion at the completion of EACCS.
 - b) In order to get a programmatic BO, USFWS has to engage Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).
 - c) USACE will need to evaluate the programmatic BO globally and how it would interrelate with their programs, such as the 404 program.
 - d) The issue will be how much USACE will extend their jurisdiction considering the EACCS includes mainly upland habitat.
 - i) Federal highway projects can be the nexus for a Section 7.
 - ii) What is covered and how it's described in the conservation strategy will be critical.
 - e) With regards to consistency determinations from DFG, where there are overlaps between ESA and CESA species, DFG can base the consistency determination on the programmatic BO.
 - f) In order to facilitate the programmatic BO, we need to start engaging USACE during Phase 2.
 - i) USFWS will send an information email with background material to USACE in order to give them a heads up about the EACCS.

- 2) Debrief of May 15th UAG Meeting
 - a) At the UAG, there were concerns that landowners were not a part of the Steering Committee (SC). The concern was that the SC was going to be making decisions that impact landowners.
 - b) There was a concern that areas that were supposed to be left undeveloped because of the biological resources the area provided will be developed. The UAG member referenced

that this occurred in the Oakland Hills and was concerned that this would occur in the Tassajara area.

- c) Another landowner wanted to ensure that benefits of the EACCS to landowners be highlighted.
- d) Colleen Dhaoui expressed concern that there was not enough landowner representation and has volunteered to head up a landowner group.
 - i) Sharon Burnham, Tri-Valley Conservancy, agreed to assist with mailings to landowners.
 - ii) ACRC/ NRCS Partnership have scheduled a general information meeting to update landowners about the EACCS. This is scheduled for Tuesday, June 10th at the Martinelli Center. This meeting is strictly for landowners.
 - (1) The goals of this meeting will be to:
 - (a) Provide an update on the Phase 1 work;
 - (b) Solicit input about landowner concerns about the EACCS; and
 - (c) Discuss at what level they want to or can be involved (i.e. be on a working group).

3) Admin Subcommittee Report

- a) This subcommittee met on May 9th to discuss the project budget and the CalFed grant.
- b) After discussing the budget and determining which areas would be “in-kind” contributions, the cost-share for each funding partner was determined to be \$38,125.
- c) This cost-share may go down if we find there are areas that can be cost-shared via in-kind services.
- d) USFWS may be able to provide a cost-share for the Watershed Adventures Program.
- e) The funding agreement is currently being revised. The details about how the CalFed grant will be reimbursed still need to be ironed out with ACRC/CD.
 - i) Therefore, to facilitate and not have a lag between Phase 1 and Phase 2, the funding agreement will assume that there are no grant funds. The funding partners will be billed in proportion to what their respective agencies have approved.
 - ii) Once the grant details have been worked out, the funding agreement will be amended and the reimbursement will be such that the cost-share will end up being equal shares.

4) Phase 1 Work Progress

- a) Discuss land use classification table
 - i) There will be three tables and associated maps that will assist in the gap analysis task. These include: land use, land cover, and focal species.
 - ii) Purpose of land use table and map
 - (1) Map what land use is occurring
 - (2) Find opportunities to pair up land use and conservation
 - iii) Land use categories were based upon current general plans
 - iv) Open space areas within the urban growth boundaries will be precluded from conservation as they are likely zoned as development
 - (1) With some exceptions, like Springtown area
 - (2) Camp Parks area will likely be called out as a key area
 - v) Rural residential will be eliminated

- (1) Rural Density Residential (Alameda County ECAP; Livermore and Pleasanton) and Estate Residential (Dublin) will be moved up to Urban
- (2) Rural Residential classification in the Dublin General Plan will be moved to Agriculture/Rangelands
- vi) Agriculture and Rangelands categories will be combined into one
 - (1) Vineyards and orchards would fall within this category. The land cover map will call these items out specifically.
- vii) Large parcel landfills should have a notation stating that these areas should not be targeted for conservation as there are plans to expand in the future.
- viii) The “local and community parks” reference in the Parks/Open Space/Reserves definition will be deleted and moved to the Urban category.
- ix) Hillside Conservation (in Livermore under Parks/Open Space/Reserves) areas are not public and mostly steep slopes. This will be moved to the Ag/Rangeland category.
- x) The Parks/Open Space/Reserve definition will need to be expanded and will include Resource Management and Water Management Lands.
- xi) There was a question about whether there is dataset available that delineates natural v. managed streams in the area. Zone 7 will look.
- xii) The title of the table will be revised to show that the information contained reflect the existing land use categories within East Alameda County, which has been collated into general categories for use in developing a map for the EACCS.
- xiii) The group suggested that a separate map or layer that reflects planning boundaries for specific areas would be helpful (i.e. South Livermore Plan Specific Plan area).
- b) Figure 2-4 – Decision Tree to classify open space on the Protected Lands map and nomenclature
 - i) There will be a separate map for open space, which will be used for the gap analysis
 - ii) Open space as it pertains to the conservation easement is considered to be public ownership and easement that provide permanent protection
 - (1) Want to identify areas already protected
 - (2) Public lands that are not currently “protected” can potentially receive credit for enhancement
 - iii) Williamson Act areas are not considered “permanent” and does not preclude future conservation for ecological benefit
 - (1) Will be mapped separately
 - iv) Agreed upon Working Title: **Open Space (Public Lands & Private Easements)**
 - (1) Private easements = permanent easements for conservation or agriculture protection
 - v) Other recommendations include:
 - (1) Stating purpose or how the criteria will be used at the top
 - (2) List examples for each type of open space to provide context
 - (3) Clarify whether the question “Is the land managed as open space and does it provide some ecological value?” really one question or two separate questions to determine whether the area is either Type 3 or 4.
- c) Draft land cover map
 - i) ICF Jones & Stokes will be completing this map this week for internal review
 - ii) A draft to the SC is anticipated to be ready in a couple of weeks
- d) Recommended approach on Steelhead

- i) Steelhead will be added to the focal species list but in a limited way.
 - ii) There is a lot of information already available and ongoing work toward restoration of the species in the area, such as the Alameda Creek Steelhead Restoration Workgroup efforts. The EACCS will make reference to efforts such as, but not limited to, determining appropriate flow regime ranges and fish barrier removal projects.
 - iii) Land use related efforts, such as the C.3 hydromodification requirements, RWQCB/SWRCB Streams and Wetlands Policy, etc, will also be referenced as these land use requirements are more applicable to EACCS.
 - iv) EACCS should help the municipalities address fish through guidance on various existing recommendations for protection of riparian corridors and stream habitat such as: NMFS/DFG guidelines for culverts and crossing, sediment control guidance, and guidance on buffers, etc. This would provide planning staff with direction and guidance for ensuring that projects meet accepted criteria and support conservation (where possible).
 - (1) This would allow EACCS to compliment the existing efforts such and provide conservation support on a parallel track. In the future when more fish are in the system, projects that trigger a NMFS consultation should benefit from this guidance.
- 5) Phase 2 and 3
- a) Zone 7 will be taking the ICF Jones & Stokes contract for Phase 2 & 3 to their Board of Directors for approval at the June 18th meeting.
 - b) The goal is to give the Notice to Proceed by July 1st so long as the funding agreement is fully executed.
- 6) Due to lack of new work products that would be ready for UAG review, the June 12th meeting has been cancelled.
- a) The next UAG Meeting: July 10, 2008, 2 pm @ City of Dublin's Regional Meeting Room.
- 7) Next Steering Committee Meeting Date: **July 1, 2008 @ 10 am**
- a) Future Steering Committee meetings have been scheduled for the first Tuesday of every month