

## Meeting Summary

Butte Regional HCP/NCCP  
Stakeholder Committee Meeting  
June 4, 2008, 11:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.  
BCAG Conference Room

### Stakeholder Committee Attendees

Jeff Mott (for Scott McNall) (CSU Chico/Citizens Advisor )	Phil Johnson (Altacal Audubon)
Richard Price (Butte County Ag. Commission)	Colleen Aguilar (BC Farm Bureau)
Virginia Getz (Ducks Unlimited)	Jeff Swindle (Caltrans)
Alexis Vertolli (for Pia Sevellius) (Butte Co. RCD)	Jason Bougie (Building Industry Association, Chico)
Ted Trimble (Western Canal Water Dist)	

### Resource Agencies Attendees

Jennifer Hogan (DGF)	Nina Bicknese (USFWS)
----------------------	-----------------------

### Steering Committee and Staff Attendees

Jane Dolan (BCAG/ Supervisor)	Paul Cylinder (SAIC)
Jon Clark (BCAG)	Jim Estep (SAIC) (Phone)
Chris Devine (BCAG)	Holly Wilson (SAIC)

### Interested Public Attendees

Jamison Watts (Northern Ca Regional Land Trust)	Nathan Key (NRCS)
--	-------------------

### Associated Documents/Handouts:

1. Agenda packet including Stakeholder Committee member list, Existing protected land categories, Conservation Strategy—Biological goals and objectives, Spatial requirements of cover species and planning species, and Meeting Notes from May 7, 2008
2. Additional Handout: Existing Protected Lands

3. Additional Handout: Biological Goals and Objectives for Remaining Non-Listed Plants
4. Additional Handout: Revised Draft: Conservation Preserve Design Spatial Criteria for Covered Reptiles, Amphibians, Fish, and Invertebrates

**Action Items and Key Recommendations:**

- SAIC will send out Power Point presentation
- Committee accepted the use of the 3 tiered categories for existing protected lands
- The next Stakeholder meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 9, 2008, 11:00 am-3:00 pm, at BCAG.

**Meeting Agenda:**

- Stakeholder Committee meeting attendance and protocol
- Existing protected land categories
- Conservation Strategy—Biological goals and objectives
- Spatial requirements of covered species and planning species
- Next newsletter content
- Update on General Plan process
- Meeting Notes from May 7, 2008
- Action Items and Next Meeting

**Stakeholder Committee meeting attendance and protocol:**

- Jane Dolan suggested Stakeholder committee members to speak with other members to encourage their attendance
- Members were reminded to get items to Chris Devine at least 10 days before meeting if they wanted them to be considered for the upcoming agenda

**Existing protected land categories:**

- Paul Cylinder presented handout and attachment to explain the different categories of protected lands. Discussed the levels (3 tiered approach) for Butte HCP/NCCP. Described the different land management/use categories, discussed whether or not these uses are compatible with ecological goals.
- Nathan Keys said easement holders identified as “RCD” are not RCD but rather NRCS and that these are permanent.
- Clarification of land uses/easements were discussed

- Jeff Mott said that Chico State has easement property, he will send Holly the map and information, especially on the Butte Creek preserve. These lands may not be in the planning area.
- Jamison Watts (NCRLT) said they have 13 easements and will send GIS data to SAIC to determine if any are not currently in the data base.
- Paul Cylinder clarified the definitions levels of protect categories on the flow chart. He discussed how these categories will be used with the development of conservation measures.

### **Conservation Strategy—Biological goals and objectives:**

- Paul Cylinder gave a short presentation – “Biological Goals and Objectives: Overview”. This summarized the 5-Point Policy of the Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service; explained biological goals, biological objectives, conservation measures, performance criteria, goals and objectives at each ecological scale. Ecological criteria contributed to the boundary determinations for the conservation acquisition zones (CAZ), but simple artificial boundaries (e.g., roads, property lines) were used to make for ease of plan implementation. Spatial requirements were described from the scientific literature to ensure that covered species habitat needs are addressed by the HCP/NCCP. The preliminary nature of biological goals and objectives presented was discussed along with the development, contributors, and style of the document.
- Discussion on how the general plans will be affected by species specifics, such as meadowfoam and giant garter snake, and how these species will be major drivers in developing the conservation strategy.
- There was a discussion on the role of the independent science advisors. They are an advisory group to the process. The Stakeholder and Steering Committees and the permit applicants (cities and County) will make the ultimate decision on species to be included in the HCP/NCCP and approaches to conservation.
- Discussion on ultimate requirements for the federal HCP vs. the California NCCP. HCP goals must meet a minimum of avoiding jeopardy and minimizing and mitigating impacts, while NCCP goals must meet a minimum of conserving species (i.e., contributing to recovery) and natural communities. The Stakeholder Committee can identify their own goals beyond these minimums, such as our addition of species of local concern. The Butte HCP/NCCP will be tailored to Butte’s specific situation.
- Discussion on the influence of the general plan process and how it affects the HCP/NCCP. Importance of general plan information to assess impacts on species and natural communities.
- Administrative drafts of the Conservation Strategy and Impact Analysis chapters are anticipated to be completed by fall.

- Discussion of conservation acquisition zones (CAZ) and urban permit areas (UPA) and how this geographic information will be used in the conservation strategy.
- Discussion of Biological Goals and Objectives. Comments included: Some objectives need to be more clearly measurable. Some objectives should provide more locational specificity. Discussion of the potential consequences of climate change and expected upslope movement of oak woodlands and how these affects might be addressed in the HCP/NCCP. Qualify oak regeneration as natural regeneration only. The “blanks” left in the objectives for specific acreage and percentage numbers will be determined as the conservation measures are developed and specific amounts can be quantified through the analytical process of developing the conservation strategy. Discussion of conservation measures and adaptive management and how they are developed.
- SAIC to bring revised Biological Goals and Objectives to next Stakeholder Committee meeting.

### **Spatial requirements of covered species and planning species:**

- Discussion of how spatial requirements of covered species and planning species were developed and how these will be used to help develop conservation measures. Insufficient time remained to fully discuss, so this item will be brought back at next meeting.

### **Next newsletter content:**

- Chris Devine discussed general content to be in July newsletter, asked for ideas, quotes, etc. Draft newsletter to be developed by next meeting.

### **Update On General Plan Processes:**

- Chris Devine presented information on the various General Plan updates and expected completion dates for draft land use maps

### **Meeting Notes from May 7, 2008:**

- Meeting notes from May 7, 2008 were accepted.

### **Upcoming Workshops/Meetings:**

- The next Stakeholder meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 9, 2008, 11:00 am to 3:00 pm, at BCAG.