

# Agenda

**Stakeholder Committee Meeting #23  
Butte Regional HCP/NCCP  
Wednesday, October 7, 2009  
11:00 am - 3:00 pm  
BCAG Conference Room**

## **Agenda Items:**

1. Introductions and Agenda Review
2. Revised Draft Chapter 2 Covered Activities (**Handout #1**)
3. Impact Assessment for Natural Communities (**Handout #2a and #2b**)
4. Impact Assessment for Activities Outside UPAs (**Handout #3**)
5. Species Habitat Conservation Objectives (**Handout #4**)
6. Newsletter for Fall 2009
7. Meeting Notes from August (revised) and September 2009 Stakeholder Meetings (**Handout #5a and #5b**)
8. USFWS/DFG/NMFS Items for Discussion
9. Action Items and Next Meeting Agenda

1     **4.3           IMPACTS ON COVERED NATURAL COMMUNITIES**

2     Implementation of the covered activities and conservation measures are expected to result  
3     in the removal of up to █ acres of the natural communities addressed by the Butte  
4     Regional HCP/NCCP, representing approximately █ percent of the current extent of  
5     these communities in the Planning Area (see Table 4-3 [to come]).

6     **4.3.1   Oak Woodland and Savanna**

7     Implementation of the covered activities and conservation measures are expected to result  
8     in the removal of up to █ acres of oak woodland and savanna, representing  
9     approximately █ percent of the current extent of oak woodland and savanna in the  
10    Planning Area (see Table 4-3 [to come]).

11    **4.3.1.1   Impacts of Covered Activities**

12    Implementation of the covered activities are expected to result in the removal of up to █  
13    acres of oak woodland and savanna, representing approximately █ percent of the current  
14    extent of oak woodland and savanna land cover in the Planning Area (see Tables 4-4 and  
15    4-5 [to come]).

16  
17    **Covered Activities within Urban Permit Areas**

18  
19    Permanent development activities within the Chico, Oroville, Palermo, Bangor, Foothill  
20    Area, Durham-Pentz/State Route 191, and Butte County Drop-Off and Recycling Facility  
21    UPAs are expected to result in the permanent loss of up to 10,688 acres of oak woodland  
22    and savanna (see Table 4-4). Up to █ acres of oak woodland and savanna adjacent to  
23    new permanent developments could be permanently degraded as wildlife habitat as a  
24    result of ongoing visual, noise, pet-related, and other disturbances associated with new  
25    permanent developments. Use of these habitat areas by native wildlife species that are  
26    sensitive to these increased levels of disturbance would be expected to diminish. This  
27    impact would be minimized with implementation of the wildland-urban interface  
28    conservation measures described in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.

29  
30    Increased levels of human activity in oak woodland and savanna adjacent to new  
31    permanent developments could increase the risk for illegal harvest of oak trees for  
32    firewood and increase the risk for wildfire. These impacts would be minimized with  
33    implementation of the wildland-urban interface conservation measures described in  
34    Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.

35  
36    Ongoing O&M activities associated with maintaining roadways and other infrastructure  
37    could temporarily affect use of up to █ acres of oak woodland and savanna by associated  
38    native wildlife species. This impact would be minimized with implementation of the  
39    avoidance and minimization measures described in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.

40  
41  
42

1  
2 **Covered Activities outside of Urban Permit Areas**  
3

4 Capital improvement projects are expected to result in the permanent and temporary loss  
5 of up to █ acres and █ acres of oak woodland and savanna, respectively (see Table 4-5  
6 [to come]). Temporary habitat impacts are expected to result from ground disturbances  
7 associated with placement of temporary construction staging areas and other  
8 construction-related facilities that temporarily remove or disturb oak woodland and  
9 savanna understory vegetation (e.g., grasses and forbs). Temporarily disturbed habitats  
10 would be restored following completion of the activity, and temporary impacts on oak  
11 woodland and savanna would be avoided and minimized with implementation of the  
12 avoidance and minimization measures described in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.  
13

14 Temporary noise and visual disturbances associated with capital improvement projects  
15 and O&M-related activities are expected to temporarily affect use of up to █ acres of  
16 oak woodland and savanna by associated native wildlife species. This impact would be  
17 minimized with implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures described  
18 in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.

19 **4.3.1.2 Impacts of HCP/NCCP Implementation**

20 [To come.]

21 **4.3.2 Grasslands (including Vernal Pools and Swale Complex)**

22 Implementation of the covered activities and conservation measures are expected to result  
23 in the removal of up to █ acres of grasslands, including vernal pools, and swale  
24 complex, representing approximately █ percent of the current extent of grassland land  
25 cover in the Planning Area (see Table 4-3 [to come]).

26 **4.3.2.1 Impacts of Covered Activities**

27 [*Note to reviewers: discussion of indirect impacts on vernal pool and vernal pool swale*  
28 *land cover types will be provided in subsequent versions of the impact assessment.*]  
29

30 Implementation of the covered activities are expected to result in the removal of up to █  
31 acres of grasslands, including vernal pools, and swale complex, representing  
32 approximately █ percent of the current extent of grassland land cover in the Planning  
33 Area (see Tables 4-4 and 4-5 [to come]).  
34

35 **Covered Activities within Urban Permit Areas**  
36

37 Permanent development activities within the Chico, Honcut, Oroville, Palermo, State  
38 Route 99, Bangor, Foothill Area, Durham-Pentz/State Route 191, and Butte County  
39 Drop-Off and Recycling Facility UPAs are expected to result in the permanent loss of up  
40 to 8,799 acres of grasslands (see Table 4-4). Up to █ acres of grasslands adjacent to new  
41 permanent developments could be permanently degraded as wildlife habitat as a result of

1 ongoing visual, noise, pet-related, and other disturbances associated with new permanent  
2 developments. Use of these habitat areas by native wildlife species that are sensitive to  
3 these increased levels of disturbance would be expected to diminish. This impact would  
4 be minimized with implementation of the wildland-urban interface conservation  
5 measures described in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.

6  
7 Increased levels of human activity in grasslands adjacent to new permanent developments  
8 could increase the risk for temporary loss of grassland habitats to wildfire. This impact  
9 would be minimized with implementation of the wildland-urban interface conservation  
10 measures described in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.

11  
12 Noise and visual disturbances associated with ongoing O&M activities associated with  
13 maintaining roadways and other infrastructure could temporarily affect use of up to █  
14 acres of grassland by associated native wildlife species. This impact would be minimized  
15 with implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures described in Chapter 5,  
16 *Conservation Strategy*.

#### 17 **Covered Activities outside of Urban Permit Areas**

18  
19  
20 Capital improvement projects are expected to result in the permanent and temporary loss  
21 of up to █ acres and █ acres of grassland, respectively (see Table 4-5 [to come]).  
22 Temporary habitat impacts are expected to result from ground disturbances associated  
23 with placement of temporary construction staging areas and other construction-related  
24 facilities that temporarily remove or disturb grasses and forbs. Temporarily disturbed  
25 habitats would be restored following completion of the activity, and temporary impacts  
26 on grassland would be avoided and minimized with implementation of the avoidance and  
27 minimization measures described in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.

28  
29 Temporary noise and visual disturbances associated with capital improvement projects  
30 and O&M-related activities are expected to temporarily affect use of up to █ acres of  
31 oak woodland and savanna by associated native wildlife species. This impact would be  
32 minimized with implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures described  
33 in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.

#### 34 **4.3.2.2 Impacts of HCP/NCCP Implementation**

35 [To come.]

#### 36 **4.3.3 Riparian**

37 Implementation of the covered activities and conservation measures are expected to result  
38 in the removal of up to █ acres of riparian land cover types, representing approximately  
39 █ percent of the current extent of riparian land cover in the Planning Area (see Table 4-3  
40 [to come]).

41

1 **4.3.3.1 Impacts of Covered Activities**

2 Implementation of the covered activities are expected to result in the removal of up to █  
3 acres of riparian land cover types, representing approximately █ percent of the current  
4 extent of riparian land cover in the Planning Area (see Tables 4-4 and 4-5 [to come]).  
5

6 **Covered Activities within Urban Permit Areas**

7  
8 Permanent development activities within the Chico, Durham, Oroville, Palermo, Bangor,  
9 Foothill Area, Durham-Pentz/State Route 191, and Butte County Drop-Off and Recycling  
10 Facility UPAs are expected to result in the permanent loss of up to 631 acres of riparian  
11 land cover types (see Table 4-4). Up to █ acres of riparian land cover adjacent to new  
12 permanent developments could be permanently degraded as wildlife habitat as a result of  
13 ongoing visual, noise, pet-related, and other disturbances associated with new permanent  
14 developments. Use of these habitat areas by native wildlife species that are sensitive to  
15 these increased levels of disturbance would be expected to diminish. This impact would  
16 be minimized with implementation of the wildland-urban interface conservation  
17 measures described in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.  
18

19 **Covered Activities outside of Urban Permit Areas**

20  
21 Capital improvement projects are expected to result in the permanent loss of up to █  
22 acres of riparian land cover (see Table 4-5 [to come]). Temporary habitat impacts that  
23 could result from implementing the covered activities (e.g., placement of temporary  
24 construction staging areas and other construction-related facilities) would be avoided  
25 with implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures described in Chapter 5,  
26 *Conservation Strategy*.  
27

28 Temporary noise and visual disturbances associated with capital improvement projects  
29 and O&M-related activities are expected to temporarily affect use of up to █ acres of  
30 riparian vegetation by associated native wildlife species. This impact would be  
31 minimized with implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures described  
32 in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.  
33

34 **4.3.3.2 Impacts of HCP/NCCP Implementation**

35 [To come.]

36 **4.3.4 Wetlands**

37 Implementation of the covered activities and conservation measures are expected to result  
38 in the removal of up to █ acres of wetlands, representing approximately █ percent of  
39 the current extent of wetlands in the Planning Area (see Table 4-3 [to come]).  
40  
41

1 **4.3.4.1 Impacts of Covered Activities**

2 Implementation of the covered activities are expected to result in the removal of up to [redacted]  
3 acres of wetlands, representing approximately [redacted] percent of the current extent of  
4 wetlands in the Planning Area (see Tables 4-4 and 4-5 [to come]).  
5

6 **Covered Activities within Urban Permit Areas**

7  
8 Permanent development activities within the Chico, Oroville, Palermo, and Bangor UPAs  
9 are expected to result in the permanent loss of up to 68 acres of emergent wetland (see  
10 Table 4-4). Covered activities will not result in impacts on managed wetlands. Up to [redacted]  
11 acres of emergent wetlands adjacent to new permanent developments could be  
12 permanently degraded as wildlife habitat as a result of ongoing visual, noise, pet-related,  
13 and other disturbances associated with new permanent developments. Use of these  
14 habitat areas by native wildlife species that are sensitive to these increased levels of  
15 disturbance would be expected to diminish. This impact would be minimized with  
16 implementation of the wildland-urban interface conservation measures described in  
17 Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.  
18

19 Wetlands could be permanently degraded as a result of increased urban runoff from  
20 permanent developments that discharge into patches of wetland habitat. Wetlands could  
21 also be degraded as a result of construction-related ground disturbing activities that  
22 increase sediment and the potential for accidental discharges of pollutants into runoff  
23 entering wetlands. These permanent and temporary impacts on wetlands are expected to  
24 have minor local effects on the function of affected wetland communities that would be  
25 avoided and minimized with implementation of the best management practices,  
26 avoidance and minimization measures, and the wildland-urban interface conservation  
27 measures described in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.  
28

29 **Covered Activities outside of Urban Permit Areas**

30  
31 Capital improvement projects are expected to result in the permanent loss of up to [redacted]  
32 acres of emergent wetland (see Table 4-5 [to come]). Temporary habitat impacts that  
33 could result from implementing the covered activities (e.g., placement of temporary  
34 construction staging areas and other construction-related facilities) would be avoided  
35 with implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures described in Chapter 5,  
36 *Conservation Strategy*. Potential impacts on wetlands associated with increased  
37 sedimentation and the potential for accidental discharges of pollutants into runoff  
38 entering wetlands are the same as described for covered activities in UPAs and would be  
39 avoided and minimized with implementation of the best management practices,  
40 avoidance and minimization measures, and the wildland-urban interface conservation  
41 measures described in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.  
42

43 Temporary noise and visual disturbances associated with capital improvement projects  
44 and O&M-related activities are expected to temporarily affect use of up to [redacted] acres of

1 wetlands by associated native wildlife species. This impact would be minimized with  
2 implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures described in Chapter 5,  
3 *Conservation Strategy*.

#### 4 **4.3.4.2 Impacts of HCP/NCCP Implementation**

5 [To come.]

#### 6 **4.3.5 Aquatic**

7 Implementation of the covered activities and conservation measures are expected to  
8 remove or isolate █ stock ponds as habitat for covered species and other native wildlife,  
9 representing █ percent of stock ponds currently present in the Planning Area (see Table  
10 4-3 [to come]). Covered activities and conservation measures are not expected to result  
11 in the removal of open water and major canal land cover types.

##### 12 **4.3.5.1 Impacts of Covered Activities**

13 Implementation of the covered activities are expected to remove or isolate █ stock ponds  
14 as habitat for covered species and other native wildlife, representing █ percent of stock  
15 ponds currently present in the Planning Area (see Table 4-3 [to come]).

#### 17 **Covered Activities within Urban Permit Areas**

18  
19 Permanent development activities within the Chico, Oroville, Gridley-Biggs, Nelson,  
20 Oroville, Bangor, Foothill Area, Durham-Pentz Road/SR 191, and Butte County Drop-  
21 Off and Recycling UPAs will not result in the permanent loss of open water and major  
22 canal aquatic land cover types. Operation of equipment in water courses necessary to  
23 implement the covered activities could impact aquatic vegetation and stream channel  
24 structure (e.g., disturbance of channel beds and banks). These potential impacts would be  
25 avoided and minimized with implementation of the avoidance and minimization  
26 measures described in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*. Permanent development  
27 activities may result in the loss of up to 49 stock ponds (see Table 4-4). Impacts on stock  
28 ponds that support habitat for covered amphibians and reptiles, however, will be avoided  
29 and minimized with implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures  
30 described in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.

31  
32 Up to █ miles of open water along water courses and canals adjacent to new permanent  
33 developments could be permanently degraded as wildlife habitat as a result of ongoing  
34 visual, noise, pet-related, and other disturbances associated with new permanent  
35 developments. Use of these habitat areas by native wildlife species that are sensitive to  
36 these increased levels of disturbance would be expected to diminish. This impact would  
37 be minimized with implementation of the wildland-urban interface conservation  
38 measures described in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.

39  
40 Water quality in these aquatic habitats could be permanently degraded as a result of  
41 increased urban runoff from permanent developments that discharge into waterways.

1 Water quality could also be temporarily degraded as a result of construction-related  
2 ground disturbing activities that increase sediment and the potential for accidental  
3 discharges of pollutants into runoff entering waterways. Permanent and temporary  
4 impacts on water quality are expected to have minor local effects on the function of  
5 affected aquatic communities (e.g., production of phytoplankton, zooplankton, and  
6 macro-invertebrates) that would be avoided and minimized with implementation of the  
7 best management practices, avoidance and minimization measures, and the wildland-  
8 urban interface conservation measures described in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.

## 10 Covered Activities outside of Urban Permit Areas

12 Capital improvement projects are not expected to result in the permanent loss of aquatic  
13 land cover types (see Table 4-5 [to come]). Temporary impacts associated with bridge  
14 replacement projects could result in temporary degradation of █ miles of stream  
15 channels associated with increased sedimentation, ground vibration, and in-channel  
16 construction-related disturbances. These impacts would be avoided and minimized with  
17 implementation of the best management practices and avoidance and minimization  
18 measures described in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*. Capitol improvement projects  
19 located away from aquatic habitats could impact aquatic communities with temporary  
20 increases in sedimentation. With implementation of the best management practices and  
21 avoidance and minimization measures described in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*,  
22 during these capitol improvement projects, however, these activities are not expected to  
23 measurably affect the function of aquatic communities as habitat for covered and other  
24 native species.

### 25 4.3.5.2 Impacts of HCP/NCCP Implementation

26 [To come.]

## 27 4.3.6 Agriculture

28 Implementation of the covered activities and conservation measures are expected to result  
29 in the removal of up to █ acres of agricultural land cover types, representing  
30 approximately █ percent of the current extent of agricultural land cover in the Planning  
31 Area (see Table 4-3 [to come]).

### 32 4.3.6.1 Impacts of Covered Activities

33 Implementation of the covered activities are expected to result in the removal of up to █  
34 acres of agricultural land cover types, representing approximately █ percent of the  
35 current extent of agricultural land cover in the Planning Area (see Tables 4-4 and 4-5 [to  
36 come]).

## 38 Covered Activities within Urban Permit Areas

40 Permanent development activities within the Chico, Durham, Gridley-Biggs, Nelson,  
41 Oroville, Palermo, State Route 99, Bangor, Foothill Area, Durham-Pentz/State Route



1 191, and Butte County Drop-Off and Recycling Facility UPAs are expected to result in  
2 the permanent loss of up to 6,693 acres of agricultural lands, of which 3,851 acres are  
3 comprised of vineyards, orchards, and eucalyptus groves that do not support habitat for  
4 covered species (see Table 4-4). Up to [ ] acres of agricultural lands adjacent to new  
5 permanent developments could be permanently degraded as wildlife habitat as a result of  
6 ongoing visual, noise, pet-related, and other disturbances associated with new permanent  
7 developments. Use of these habitat areas by native wildlife species that are sensitive to  
8 these increased levels of disturbance would be expected to diminish. This impact would  
9 be minimized with implementation of the wildland-urban interface conservation  
10 measures described in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.

11  
12 Ongoing O&M activities associated with maintaining roadways and other infrastructure  
13 could temporarily affect use of up to [ ] acres of agricultural lands by associated native  
14 wildlife species as a result of noise and visual disturbances. This impact would be  
15 minimized with implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures described  
16 in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.

#### 17 18 **Covered Activities outside of Urban Permit Areas**

19  
20 Capital improvement projects are expected to result in the permanent and temporary loss  
21 of up to [ ] acres and [ ] acres of agricultural lands, respectively (see Table 4-5 [to  
22 come]). Temporary habitat impacts are expected to result from ground disturbances  
23 associated with placement of temporary construction staging areas and other  
24 construction-related facilities that temporarily remove or disturb grasses and forbs.  
25 Temporarily disturbed habitats would be restored as agricultural land following  
26 completion of the activity, and temporary impacts on agricultural lands would be avoided  
27 and minimized with implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures  
28 described in Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*.

29  
30 Temporary noise and visual disturbances associated with capital improvement projects  
31 and O&M-related activities are expected to temporarily affect use of up to [ ] acres of  
32 agricultural land by associated native wildlife species. This impact would be minimized  
33 with implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures described in Chapter 5,  
34 *Conservation Strategy*.

#### 35 36 **4.3.6.2 Impacts of HCP/NCCP Implementation**

37 [To come.]  
38

#### 39 **4.3.7 Other Communities**

40 A total of [ ] acres of chaparral, conifer-dominated forest, and dredger tailings could be  
41 removed as a result of covered activities and conservation measures (see Tables 4-4 and  
42 4-5 [to come]). Impacts of covered activities and conservation measures on these

- 1 communities will be assessed in the Butte Regional HCP/NCCP Environmental Impact
- 2 Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS).
- 3

DRAFT

**Table 4-4. Impacts of Permanent Development Activities within Urban Permit Areas (UPAs) on Natural Communities by Conservation Acquisition Zone (CAZ)**

[*Note to Reviewers: This table represents a raw summary of natural community impacts derived using GIS by overlaying the covered activity footprints with the natural community data layer. Consequently, the impact values displayed in this table overestimate impacts on some natural communities (e.g., covered activities will not remove open water in stream channels as indicated in this table). Subsequent versions of this table will be corrected to account for such mechanical errors and to indicate the actual estimated impacts with application of avoidance and minimization measures that will be included in Chapter 5, Conservation Strategy (e.g., if the conservation strategy includes measures to avoid removal of cottonwood-willow forest, no impacts on this community would be indicated in the table).*]

Natural Communities/Land Cover Types	Total Existing	Extent of Natural Communities Removed in UPAs by CAZ (in acres unless otherwise noted in this table) <sup>1</sup>																				Total Removed	Percent Remaining
		Chico	Chico	Chico WTP	Dayton	Durham	Gridley-Biggs	Gridley WTP	Honcut	Nelson	Nord	Oroville	Oroville	Palmer	Richvale	State Route-99	State Route-99	Bangor	Foothill Area	DP Rd/SR 191	DOR Facility		
		Cascades	No Orchard	No Orchard	No Orchard	No Orchard	So Orchard	So Orchard	Sierras	Basin	No Orchard	Sierras	So Orchard	Sierras	Basin	Cascades	No Orchard	Sierras	Sierras	Cascades	Cascades		
<b><i>Oak Woodland and Savanna</i></b>																							
Blue Oak Savanna	10,580	596	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	518	0	2	0	0	0	50	44	58	146	1,414	87	
Blue Oak Woodland	34,705	1,311	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,140	0	13	0	0	0	509	0	185	111	3,269	91	
Interior Live Oak Woodland	2,382	253	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	27	507	79	
Mixed Oak Woodland	44,893	918	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,145	0	0	0	0	0	334	1,040	37	24	5,497	88	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>92,560</b>	<b>3,078</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,022</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>895</b>	<b>1,085</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>10,688</b>	<b>88</b>	
<b><i>Grassland (including vernal pools and swale complex)</i></b>																							
Grassland	68,667	1,314	148	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4,272	2	47	0	38	95	132	86	165	590	6,891	90	
Grassland with Vernal Swale Complex	33,668	403	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,279	0	0	0	53	9	0	0	5	127	1,875	94	
Vernal Pool	425	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	96	
Altered Vernal Pool	248	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	93	

Natural Communities/Land Cover Types	Total Existing	Extent of Natural Communities Removed in UPAs by CAZ (in acres unless otherwise noted in this table) <sup>1</sup>																				Total Removed	Percent Remaining
		Chico	Chico	Chico WTP	Dayton	Durham	Gridley-Biggs	Gridley WTP	Honcut	Nelson	Nord	Oroville	Oroville	Palmero	Richvale	State Route-99	State Route-99	Bangor	Foothill Area	DP Rd/SR 191	DOR Facility		
		Cascades	No Orchard	No Orchard	No Orchard	No Orchard	So Orchard	So Orchard	Sierras	Basin	No Orchard	Sierras	So Orchard	Sierras	Basin	Cascades	No Orchard	Sierras	Sierras	Cascades	Cascades		
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>103,007</b>	<b>1,720</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,579</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>8,799</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>Riparian</b>																							
Cottonwood Willow Riparian Forest	7,613	60	115	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	154	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	6	0	347	95
Herbaceous Riparian River Bar	1,658	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	99
Valley Oak Riparian Forest	4,328	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	3	164	96
Willow Scrub	2,991	7	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	74	0	2	0	0	0	11	6	1	0	104	97
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>16,590</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>631</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Wetland</b>																							
Emergent Wetland	4,458	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	68	98
Managed Seasonal Wetland	2,052	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Managed Wetland	25,486	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>31,996</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Aquatic</b>																							
Open Water	8,307	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

Natural Communities/Land Cover Types	Total Existing	Extent of Natural Communities Removed in UPAs by CAZ (in acres unless otherwise noted in this table) <sup>1</sup>																				Total Removed	Percent Remaining	
		Chico	Chico	Chico WTP	Dayton	Durham	Gridley-Biggs	Gridley WTP	Honcut	Nelson	Nord	Oroville	Oroville	Palmero	Richvale	State Route-99	State Route-99	Bangor	Foothill Area	DP Rd/SR 191	DOR Facility			
		Cascades	No Orchard	No Orchard	No Orchard	No Orchard	So Orchard	So Orchard	Sierras	Basin	No Orchard	Sierras	So Orchard	Sierras	Basin	Cascades	No Orchard	Sierras	Sierras	Cascades	Cascades			
Major Canal	1,897	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>10,204</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>100</i>	
Stock Pond (no. of ponds)	458	8	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	2	49	89	
<b>Agriculture</b>																								
Rice	120,281	42	0	0	0	0	984	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,047	99	
Irrigated Cropland	20,437	130	33	0	0	0	1,379	0	0	0	0	121	0	57	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1,723	92	
Irrigated Pasture	1,159	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	94	
Orchard/Vineyard	108,557	520	561	0	0	320	1,385	0	0	0	0	883	58	85	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	3,844	96	
Non-Native Woodland	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	86	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>250,482</b>	<b>692</b>	<b>594</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>3,748</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,073</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6,693</b>	<b>97</b>	
<i>Subtotal Natural Communities</i>	<i>504,839</i>	<i>5,641</i>	<i>866</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>324</i>	<i>3,753</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>12,165</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>217</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>92</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>1,089</i>	<i>1,188</i>	<i>466</i>	<i>1,028</i>	<i>27,015</i>	<i>95</i>	
<b>Other Communities</b>																								
Chaparral	8,317	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	2	0	387	95	
Conifer Dominated Forest	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	9	40	
Dredger Tailings	8,652	400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	486	10	0	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	924	89	

Natural Communities/Land Cover Types	Total Existing	Extent of Natural Communities Removed in UPAs by CAZ (in acres unless otherwise noted in this table) <sup>1</sup>																				Total Removed	Percent Remaining
		Chico	Chico	Chico WTP	Dayton	Durham	Gridley-Biggs	Gridley WTP	Honcut	Nelson	Nord	Oroville	Oroville	Palmero	Richvale	State Route-99	State Route-99	Bangor	Foothill Area	DP Rd/SR 191	DOR Facility		
		Cascades	No Orchard	No Orchard	No Orchard	No Orchard	So Orchard	So Orchard	Sierras	Basin	No Orchard	Sierras	So Orchard	Sierras	Basin	Cascades	No Orchard	Sierras	Sierras	Cascades	Cascades		
<i>Subtotal Other Communities</i>	16,983	492	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	648	10	0	0	0	0	28	140	2	0	1,320	92
<b>Total</b>	<b>521,823</b>	<b>6,133</b>	<b>866</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>3,753</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12,813</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>1,117</b>	<b>1,327</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>1,028</b>	<b>28,335</b>	<b>95</b>

<sup>1</sup> UPA and CAZ abbreviations:  
 Chico WTP = Chico Wastewater Treatment Plant  
 Gridley WTP = Gridley Wastewater Treatment Plant  
 DP Rd/SR 191 = Durham-Pentz Rd/SR 191  
 DOR Facility = Butte County Drop-Off and Recycling Facility  
 No Orchard = Northern Orchards  
 So Orchard = Southern Orchards



## **Meeting Summary**

Butte Regional HCP/NCCP

Stakeholder Committee Meeting

August 5, 2009, 11:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

BCAG Conference Room

Stakeholder Committee Attendees

Jeff Mott (CSU Chico)	Pat Kelly (Sierra Club)
Richard Price (Butte Co. Ag. Comm.)	Colleen Cecil (BC Farm Bureau)
Suellen Rowlison (CNPS)	Virginia Getz (Ducks Unlimited)
Pia Sevelius (Butte Co. Res. Cons. District)	

### **Resource Agencies Attendees**

Nina Bicknese (USFWS)

Jennifer Marr (DFG)

### **Steering Committee and Staff Attendees**

Jane Dolan (BCAG/ Supervisor)

Pete Rawlings (SAIC)

Jon Clark (BCAG)

Monica Hood (SAIC)

Chris Devine (BCAG)

### **Interested Public Attendees**

Riley Swift (Restoration Resources)

Carol Perkins (Butte Environmental Council)

Greg McKenzie (Dove Ridge)

Trish Ladd (Gallaway Consulting)

Jamison Watts (No. Cal. Regional Land Trust)

### **Associated Documents/Handouts**

Agenda packet including:

1. In-Progress Draft Butte Regional HCP/NCCP Impact Assessment
2. Impact Assessment – Capital Improvement Project Example
3. Indirect Effects Analysis Example
4. Acronyms/Glossary
5. Covered Activities – Admin. Draft Chapter
6. Revised Meeting Notes from June 2009 Stakeholder Meeting and Meeting Notes from July 2009 Stakeholder Meeting

### **Meeting Agenda:**

1. Introductions
2. Impact Assessment – Admin. Draft Chapter
3. Impact Assessment – Capital Improvement Project Example
4. Indirect Effects Analysis Example

## HANDOUT #5a

5. Acronyms/Glossary
6. Covered Activities – Admin. Draft Chapter
7. Revised Meeting Notes from June 2009 Stakeholder Meeting and Meeting Notes from July 2009 Stakeholder Meeting
8. Action Items and Next Meetings

### Handout 1a, In-Progress Draft Butte Regional HCP/NCCP Impact Assessment

It was identified that Handout 1a is to be taken in the context of the document as a whole which is under development. The chapter has been updated to include some of the comments received and the additions and updates that have been included were identified.

The overall approach to impact assessment was discussed including the use of the weighted averages in the assessment of impacts for which specific locations are not identified (page 3 of handout).

The origin and definition of the term Impact Mechanisms was explained; includes the pieces of a particular action that may have an impact, e.g., during construction, the operation of the construction equipment would be the impact mechanism while the impact would be noise, ground disturbance, etc. There was also a discussion of the process of ‘deconstructing actions’ into separate ‘elements’ to conduct an ESA impact analysis in a Biological Opinion. Exposure analysis was also discussed. It was suggested that general terminology issues could be addressed in the document glossary. It was also suggested that the terminology used in the Plan be consistent with the terminology that will be used by the Service in their ESA species impact analysis and in the ITP.

An example from the impact assessment chapter was discussed (tricolored blackbird). General organization and approach of the section was described within this example. Discussion included how the assessment is structured and what is anticipated to be included in the completed chapter. It was suggested to try to avoid overall repetition in the text where possible.

A concern was raised that permanent disturbance may constitute a permanent impact for some species – such as disturbance for breeding birds – and it was asked whether this impact would be teased out. Within the UPAs these effects would be considered permanent. Outside the UPAs, they would be temporary for non-development activities (e.g., pipeline construction).

Foraging habitat impacts were discussed and the expected level of impact for temporary disturbance areas during construction. Discussed the anticipation of requiring avoidance and minimization measures.

An example of impacts on a species for which there is no habitat species model was discussed.

The issue of direct mortality was raised. It was indicated that it should be called out as a potential impact, then identify the minimization measures, then indicate it will not occur.

Avoidance and minimization measures would deal with issues such as finding a bird colony when a project is planned to begin and requiring the postponement of the project to avoid/minimize impacts.

There was discussion of suggestions to revise the organization of the chapter structure with new headers and to reflect that there are three types of projects and three phases to each – construction, operations and maintenance.



## HANDOUT #5a

The difference between federal and state protection of fully protected species was discussed. Differences in federal and state definitions of take were also discussed.

An example of the impact assessment for a plant species was provided. Discussed permanent degradation and disturbance. The need for clarification on the definition of degradation and disturbance as being used in the chapter was discussed. Increased foot traffic may cause decreased function of the habitat for some plant species, for example. The issue of permanent degradation or disturbance being equated to permanent loss was discussed. It was indicated that a plant species may still persist on the site but there will be ongoing disturbance (such as ongoing foot traffic) as opposed to physical degradation of the habitat (such as a change in hydrology). It was indicated that it could be a permanent loss if the species does not come back. The possibility of the species coming back but in reduced abundance was also discussed.

It was asked if there will there be a requirement for preconstruction surveys – yes part of avoidance and minimization measures.

The plant example included a discussion of “no-take” species under the Plan and the discussion included ~~of~~ the concept that covered activities will avoid ~~direct-all~~ impacts ~~on individuals within~~ ~~the~~to known occurrences ~~and newly discovered occurrences~~ until ~~a-the~~ total number of ~~occurrences~~ ~~occurrences are~~ protected ~~reached a certain level~~, i.e., when you reach that level then ~~an amount of~~ take would be allowed to occur. This concept was used in the East Contra Costa HCP/NCCP as well.

More clarification on vernal pool species approach to impact assessment was discussed. Also, Butte County Meadowfoam will be looked at more closely as we go forward (omitted in this set of handouts in terms of impacts).

### Handouts 2a and 2b (Impact Examples)

An example of the impact assessment for a capital improvement project was provided and discussed. Graphics show location of project (Handouts 2a and 2b).

A concern regarding staging areas and borrow areas was voiced, i.e., that they are often significant and not adequately addressed in the impact assessment. Long corridors also may result in relocation of utilities and impacts should be considered as well. Could say that staging and borrow areas need to be in areas where there will be no impact. Overall assumptions for the impact analysis will be reviewed and clarified.

The question of how to quantify how many acres, etc. the capital projects will entail was asked. The approach thus far of obtaining the covered activities information was described and overall assumptions for the impact analysis will be reviewed and clarified. It was also asked what happens if a project not identified now is proposed later. It was explained that because there will be a take limit set for the Plan, new projects would have to potentially displace another project’s take or not be covered by the Plan.

The need to clarify the definition of a direct ~~and indirect~~ impact and to ~~distinguish between~~ ~~clear on~~ them was discussed.

### Handouts 3a and 3b (Indirect Effects Analysis Example)

These handouts demonstrate the ~~permanent~~ disturbance area due to a higher level of human activity and how the indirect impacts would be calculated. The question of how it was determined to use the area of 1,300 feet for the disturbance area was asked. It was explained that

## **HANDOUT #5a**

these areas would be developed based on DFG guidelines and would be included in the species accounts and model descriptions.

### **Glossary and Acronyms Section**

An updated Glossary and Acronyms section was provided. The need to clarify terms unique to the HCP (such as “baseline”) vs. CEQA was discussed.

The question of whether acronyms will be used in any instances for the covered species at any point in the text was asked – not likely with the exception of possibly for conservation measure nomenclature for certain species.

The definition of various terms was discussed and more clarification requested, e.g., take, no-take, harm, etc. It was noted that because the various agencies vary in their definitions of terms such as take more clarification is needed. Additionally, it was suggested that for no-take species it may be valuable where you have a fully protected species that is also a no-take species to indicate this and distinguish. It was requested to add fully protected species to the glossary. New handout was provided which includes definitions of take, etc. and will be incorporated into the glossary (see attached).

It was requested to add operations and maintenance (O&M) to the glossary.

It was requested to check the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) citations in the glossary for accuracy.

### **Covered Activities Administrative Draft Chapter**

An overview of updates to the chapter was provided including new information on Caltrans activities, Western Canal Water District (WCWD) activities (it was indicated that it is likely WCWD will be a permittee), and additional detail on various other activities.

It was requested to add additional detail such as for maintenance activities. It was also discussed how to handle lack of specificity about various activities such as pipeline maintenance and vegetation management - may need to make assumptions about activities or obtain more detail. An exercise of determining what information is needed and list of assumptions will be completed going forward.

The Neal Road Recycling and Waste Facility UPA and facility were discussed.

### **General Discussion**

A request from the group was made to obtain meeting handouts earlier for future meetings. A request from the group was also made to get a timeline on the project at the next meeting.

The group was asked to provide any additional comments in the next week or so to incorporate into the next iteration of chapters.

There was a request to have others participate in the next steering committee meeting scheduled in September.

### **Meeting Notes from June 3, 2009 (revised) and July 1, 2009**

- Meetings notes from June 3, 2009 (revised) and July 1, 2009 were approved.

### **Upcoming Workshops/Meetings**

## **HANDOUT #5a**

- The next Stakeholder meeting will be held on September 2, 2009 from 11:00 to 3:00 pm, at BCAG.

**HANDOUT #5B**

**Meeting #22 Summary**

Butte Regional HCP/NCCP

Stakeholder Committee Meeting

September 2, 2009, 11:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

BCAG Conference Room

**Stakeholder Committee Attendees**

Scott McNall (CSU Chico)	Pat Kelly (Sierra Club)
Richard Price (Butte Co. Ag. Comm.)	Carolyn Brown (Caltrans)
Suellen Rowlison (CNPS)	Jeff Swindle (Caltrans District 3)
Pia Sevelius (Butte Co. Res. Cons. District)	Virginia Getz (Ducks Unlimited)
Mary Watters (Sierra Club)	Robin Huffman (Butte Environmental Council)

**Resource Agencies Attendees**

Nina Bicknese (USFWS)

Jennifer Marr (DFG)

Eric Tattersall (USFWS)

**Steering Committee and Staff Attendees**

Jane Dolan (BCAG/ Supervisor)

Pete Rawlings (SAIC)

Jon Clark (BCAG)

Monica Hood (SAIC)

Chris Devine (BCAG)

Paul Cylinder (SAIC)

**Interested Public Attendees**

Rob Capriola (Westervelt Ecological)

Greg McKenzie (Dove Ridge)

Riley Swift (Restoration Resources)

**Associated Documents/Handouts**

Agenda packet including:

1. In-Progress Draft Butte Regional HCP/NCCP Impact Assessment Chapter
2. Draft Glossary
3. Meeting Notes from August 2009

Additional handouts including:

1. Draft Figure 2.3 (Specific Transportation Facilities Construction Projects Occurring Outside Urban Permit Areas)
2. Draft Assumptions/Method Table

## **HANDOUT #5B**

3. Draft Table 4-8 (Estimated Extent of Covered Species Habitats Removed by Covered Activities and Butte Regional HCP/NCCP Conservation Measures Outside of Urban Permit Areas)
4. Schedule

### **Meeting Agenda:**

1. Introductions
2. Review Updated Schedule
3. Covered Activities Chapter Update
4. Impact Assessment – Outside UPA Effects, Indirect Effects, Critical Habitat, and Glossary (Handout #2a and #2b)
5. Meeting Notes from August 2009 Stakeholder Meeting (Handout #3)
- 5.5 Q&A for Wildlife Agencies (15 minutes) (added agenda item)
6. Action Items and Next Meeting

### **Document and Schedule Update**

An updated schedule was provided (handout). It was asked when the Conservation Strategy chapter would be provided to the group. It was indicated that the updated Covered Activities chapter would be completed for the next meeting and portions of the Conservation Strategy would be provided. The first Administrative Draft is expected later in 2010 and following will be the second Administrative Draft and then the Public Draft. Comments can be provided by the group at any time.

An update on the status of the Covered Activities chapter was provided. More comments from the planners are being provided, and Public Works (City and County) will be reviewing and providing input as well that will be integrated. On September 18<sup>th</sup> the group will receive the revised chapter. It was asked if the chapter will be nearly final at that point. It will include the WCWD covered activities and Caltrans activities as well. The planners, etc. are confirming what activities should and should not be including in the chapter and what they are authorized to do/not do. More information on vegetation management activities will be included as well.

Public Works will also be reviewing Figure 2.3 (handout) which depicts specific transportation facilities construction projects occurring outside the Urban Permit Areas including Caltrans projects. This figure was discussed and a minor label correction was requested. It was asked if a map showing the other Covered Activities outside the UPAs can be provided – yes for the pipeline projects, for example, and other projects for which the location is known.

### **Handout 2a and Draft Table 4-8**

Handout 2a and the Draft Table 4-8 were discussed. The chapter has been updated this with new information and addresses impacts to fish habitat, includes an assessment of critical habitat, and includes footprint effects of transportation projects shown on Figure 2.3. The methodology used will be discussed.

Discussed tracked changes in section 4.1 of the chapter – moved some text to glossary.  
Discussed added sections – “Estimates of Take within UPAs” and “Estimates of Take Outside of the UPAs”.

## **HANDOUT #5B**

The Draft Assumptions/Method table handout was discussed and the group was reminded of the question asked at the prior meeting regarding what assumptions were being used in the analysis. A table in the chapter will be populated with what those assumptions are drawn from the handout. For example, the assumption for the footprint of certain projects will be identified. The assumptions table is a work in progress. The gridlines will be added to the assumptions table for ease of reading.

Section 4.4.1 of the chapter was discussed including added text and placeholder text for O&M activities for pending information. Activities such as maintaining trailheads were discussed – such activities could occur in different habitat types than the habitat types that occur in the development footprints and this will be assessed. Activities in Bidwell Park area is one example which was discussed.

There was a discussion regarding the assessment of impacts on designated critical habitat. The method/process used to determine the existing state of primary constituent elements (PCEs) in a given area was also discussed.

Certain text was asked to be clarified regarding critical habitat, etc. in the chapter.

Impacts on designated critical habitat for an example fish species were discussed (Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon).

A clarification question was asked regarding the discussion of UPAs: There has been flexibility on the types of activities that would occur and references made to authorizing up to a certain limit but where the activities would occur is not pinned down, correct? Answer - there is a cap for the level of impacts and we identify where future development is anticipated based on the General Plans but we want to maintain flexibility and not limit those areas as the only areas covered in the UPAs. We want to let applicants decide where the development will occur and the limit is the impact allowed. Example - if the cap is reached by City activities and the County has a project and needs take authorization, no more take would be allowed.

Table 4-8 was discussed – this table relates to Figure 2.3 that shows the locations of specific projects outside the UPAs. It was indicated that additional information such as details on sewer pipelines, etc. is being obtained and is not yet on the table or figure. Relative to the UPAs, however, a very small effect is anticipated to be associated with these activities. Fish impacts are not included at this time in the table. It was pointed out that the impacts shown in the table reflect a straight GIS spatial exercise – some information on table may differ from the text – in the text it may state the impacts will be avoided but the table may reflect 100% loss of all known occurrences of a species but the Plan will not allow that to occur.

### **Glossary**

Updates to the Glossary were discussed; the Glossary will be an iterative process. Regarding the definition of No Take Species, it will be added that it is only direct mortality of the species that is not allowed and not removal of habitat that is unoccupied. Removal of unoccupied habitat could occur.

It was requested to add adverse modification as well as primary constituent elements (PCEs) to the Glossary – these will be added. It was indicated that the more terms we can define now the easier Plan implementation will be; Glossary and definition of terms is a very important part of process.

## **HANDOUT #5B**

### **Additional General Discussion**

New research on the California Black Rail that was published and released this week was discussed and the need to follow-up for the species model. In addition, a status change for the American Peregrine Falcon was discussed – DFG has recommended delisting the species and F&G Commission may have passed this – would it remain a covered species then? May need to keep it as a covered species if there is a period following delisting over which the species will continue to receive CESA protections.

There was also a discussion regarding changes in the legal status of covered species once the Plan is implemented.

It was asked if there would be monitoring for species or habitat or both. Answer - there will be both and monitoring will be ongoing. The monitoring process and plan and adaptive management plan were discussed.

The issue of State park funding was raised and whether or not any of the NCCPs were including State park lands as part of the analyzed habitat for covered species and degree to which that could be expanded with MOAs, etc. in order to keep those lands from being sold. An e-mail request will be sent to have this followed-up on. The question of whether or not there is a list being generated that will identify all park closures. At the end of October a reassessment will be done. A revaluation will be completed and then Stage 2 may be the possible sale of land.

### **Meeting Notes from August 5, 2009**

- USFWS submitted comments to the meetings notes from August 5, 2009.

### **Wildlife Agency Q&A**

The organization of the Impacts Chapter was discussed; i.e., the idea/suggestion of organizing it by component of the Covered Activities – e.g., Operations & Maintenance, etc. It was indicated that the chapter reflects that the discussion has been organized to show impacts inside UPAs and outside UPAs.

The need to discuss some of the wording in the text and modify as needed was discussed.

Additional topics discussed included adverse modification of designated critical habitat, impacts to recovery areas, and vernal pool recovery plans.

Regarding Handout 2a and the added information inside and outside of the UPAs, there was discussion of progress to be made on including the numbers indicating acres of impact, for example.

There was a discussion of the various types of impacts - permanent, temporary and degradation – and that it would be helpful to have these broken up in a table. It was indicated that temporary impacts would be minor.

Clarification was requested about how it would be handled when we know there will be permanent impacts inside a UPA with a cap on the level of impacts, and it isn't known where this would occur - how will this be included in the impacts table? It was asked how habitat impacts would be calculated. The level of planned future development has been identified and that is how the footprint impacts have been generated, but in order to allow flexibility to the cities and County, an established level of take is set that can not be exceeded.

## **HANDOUT #5B**

The issue of potential harassment and harm associated with cats and dogs and the impacts on birds was discussed. It was indicated that the analysis will look at development and include a setback of a certain distance and would account for noise, pets, etc. The assumptions for how wide that setback zone will be will be included in the description of the methods.

The broader vision of several HCPs being planned in the State was discussed and what occurs when proposed HCPs overlap. It was indicated that the conservation strategies should complement adjoining HCPs and generally there is coordination. The Kit fox example was described.

The PG&E Operations & Maintenance HCP was discussed.

### **Upcoming Workshops/Meetings**

- The next Stakeholder meeting will be held on October 7, 2009 from 11:00 to 3:00 pm, at BCAG.