

## Meeting #29 Summary

Butte Regional Conservation Plan (BRCP)

Stakeholder Committee Meeting

June 2, 2010, 11:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

BCAG Conference Room

### Stakeholder Committee Attendees

Colleen Cecil (Butte Co. Farm Bureau)

Suellen Rowilson (CNPS)

Richard Price (Butte Co. Ag. Comm.)

Jeff Swindle (CALTRANS Dist. 3)

Robin Huffman (Butte Environmental Council)

### Resource Agencies Attendees

Nina Bicknese (USFWS)

Jenny Marr (DFG)

### Steering Committee and Staff Attendees

Jane Dolan (BCAG/ Supervisor)

Juan Pablo Galván (SAIC)

Chris Devine (BCAG)

Pete Rawlings (SAIC)

Jon Clark (BCAG)

### Interested Public Attendees

Lana Adler (Gallaway Consulting)

Gregg McKenzie (Restoration Resources)

Caroline Burkett (Butte Creek Canyon  
Coalition)

Jamison Watts (Northern California Regional  
Land Trust)

Robert Capriola (Westervelt Ecological)

### Associated Documents/Handouts

Agenda packet including:

1. Draft Monitoring Plan (Handout #1)
2. Meeting Notes from May 2010 Stakeholder Meeting (Handout #2)

### Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions and Agenda Review
2. Draft Monitoring Plan (Handout #1)
3. Meeting Notes from May 2010 Stakeholder Meeting (Handout #2)
4. USFWS/DFG/NMFS Items for Discussion
5. Action Items and Next Meeting Agenda

## Introductions and Agenda Review

An updated general schedule for the BRCP was introduced. BRCP public workshops have been scheduled and will occur in the Fall.

A question was raised if it would be appropriate to establish an economics subcommittee of the Stakeholder Committee to develop BRCP implementation costs. Chris Devine indicated it was a possibility if there was interest on behalf of the committee. EPS, the firm contracted by SAIC to develop implementation costs has a great deal of experience developing HCP/NCCP implementation costs as well as experience with costing projects within Butte County in particular. Several questions were raised regarding how cost estimates will be developed and what data would be used. EPS is gathering cost implementation data for recent local restoration projects and this information will be provided in draft Chapter 8, *Implementation Costs and Funding Sources*. The Stakeholder Committee indicated that it might be desirable to have EPS present an overview of implementation costing methods and draft cost estimates at a future meeting.

BCAG indicated that preparation of the summer newsletter is almost complete and will be distributed shortly to the Stakeholder Committee electronically. The focus of this newsletter is on the BRCP Conservation Strategy. This is the fifth BRCP newsletter, all of which are posted on the BRCP website.

The quarterly meeting of the CNPS would be held at Butte College on Sunday and associated events were open to all that may be interested. Information is available on the CNPS website.

## Draft Monitoring Plan (Handout #1)

SAIC overviewed the draft monitoring plan section of Chapter 5, *Conservation Strategy*. The purpose and goals of the monitoring plan and its relationship to the adaptive management plan were described. The monitoring plan establishes the framework for monitoring, describing the plan monitoring requirements and components. Specific monitoring plans for monitoring various elements of BRCP implementation will be developed by the Implementing Entity (IE) prior to implementation of conservation actions as described in the draft plan. It was commented that the Implementing Entity would need to develop pre-construction survey monitoring protocols and that such protocols could be developed now. It was commented that the draft chapter was written as guidance to activity after the permit is issued, but that protocols could be developed before permits are issued. It was suggested that the plan should be coordinated with the Corps of Engineers regarding recent changes to their vernal pool monitoring standards.

It was requested that the draft monitoring plan be revised to specify the types of monitoring required for each of the covered activities. It was noted that the IE and permittees would be responsible for informing developers and others implementing covered activities as to what their monitoring obligations would be for their specific activities. The IE would be responsible for monitoring ecological parameters on BRCP conservation lands (protected, enhanced, and

restored) and the specific variables to be monitored would depend on site-specific ecological conditions and conservation objectives.

It was suggested that the monitoring plan be revised to clarify how the effectiveness of the BRCP preserve design in achieving goals and objectives will be monitored. More emphasis on demonstrating that the assumptions of the conservation strategy are being met would add greatly to the chapter. It was commented that this sort of information may be nested under the sections on system monitoring even though numbers could change. System monitoring would provide the information to determine if conservation actions are working and capture large scale changes in communities over time. It was suggested that the plan also be revised to clearly indicate what monitoring is required for each aspect of BRCP implementation and monitoring that may be implemented at the discretion of the IE.

It was commented that the 5-year monitoring timeframe for system monitoring was selected because it sets a specific interval at which monitoring would occur and it was consistent with timeframes adopted for other programs for these types of monitoring. USFWS suggested that citing Atkinson 2004 could enhance the monitoring plan and support its scientific basis. It was commented that a critical component of a monitoring plan in an HCP is that monitoring must be done to demonstrate that biological goals and objectives are being met. So trend analysis every five years should be done to demonstrate that goals and objectives are being met. It was commented that this tie-in between monitoring and goals and objectives is not readily clear in the current plan form. Methods for establishing these linkages in the monitoring plan were discussed. USFWS suggested that the format and content of the draft Santa Clara County HCP would be a good model for structuring the BRCP monitoring plan.

USFWS distributed two handouts on the Five Point Policy for HCPs, which includes a description of HCP monitoring requirements, to the Stakeholder Committee and it was agreed that electronic copies would be distributed to the Stakeholder Committee and placed on the BRCP website. The monitoring elements of the Five Point Policy were discussed. It was commented that adding a section on the specific policies requiring monitoring of the BRCP may be useful, including some sections of the Five Point Policy and other regulations. It was noted that annual implementing reports should include how much take of covered species occurred, cost and financial data, and a schedule of dates for which survey and monitoring reports would be submitted to agencies and to whom, including mailing addresses, they would be submitted. An annual monitoring report from the Wildlife Heritage Foundation was distributed as an example of what a monitoring report may look like for the BRCP.

There was discussion about moving the research activities described in the draft monitoring plan to the description of covered activities in BRCP Chapter 4 and to the adaptive management plan section of the Conservation Strategy. It was agreed that the role of research in BRCP implementation, whether described in the context of monitoring, adaptive management, and/or as a covered activity, needs to be described in the BRCP.

Compliance and effectiveness monitoring were discussed including how they are related. A question was raised if system monitoring would cover the entire Plan Area and access to do this

might be problematic since most of the Plan Area is private property. It was explained that system monitoring does not require physical access to all lands, but includes assessment of remote sensing data (e.g., aerial imagery) and review of relevant data and study results collected and prepared by others (e.g., agency species status reviews).

It was commented that a description of what is in the toolbox of the Implementing Entity to resolve problems related to changed circumstances seems lacking in the chapter. SAIC indicated that changed circumstances will be address in Chapter 6, *Plan Implementation*.

## **Meeting Notes from May 2010 Stakeholder Meeting (Handout #2)**

The meeting notes from May 2010 were approved.

## **USFWS/DFG/NMFS Items for Discussion**

USFWS thanked BCAG for providing an updated schedule. DFG thanked everyone for their efforts. The next Stakeholder Committee meeting will include a discussion of the structure of the BRCP Implementing Entity. It was requested that an email be sent stating the next meeting would include a discussion on the Implementing Entity. The Agencies indicated that many different structures for Implementing Entities have been approved. DFG indicated that DFG is preparing a NCCP handbook that includes a chapter on structures for implementing entities, is uncertain of its status. If a draft is available, DFG will forward a copy to BCAG.

## **Action Items and Next Meeting Agenda**

- The next Stakeholder meeting will be held on July 7, 2010 from 11:00 to 3:00 pm at BCAG.

The primary July agenda item will be a discussion of the BRCP Implementing Entity.