

## Meeting #27 Summary

Butte Regional HCP/NCCP

Stakeholder Committee Meeting

April 14, 2010, 11:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

BCAG Conference Room

### Stakeholder Committee Attendees

Mary Watters (Sierra Club)	Scott McNall (CSU Chico)
Colleen Cecil (Butte Co. Farm Bureau)	Richard Price (Butte Co. Ag. Comm.)
Suellen Rowlison (CNPS)	
Virginia Getz (Ducks Unlimited)	
Robin Huffman (Butte Environmental Council)	
Rich Reiner (The Nature Conservancy)	

### Resource Agencies Attendees

Jenny Marr (DFG)

### Steering Committee and Staff Attendees

Chris Devine (BCAG)  
Jane Dolan (BCAG/ Supervisor)

Juan Pablo Galván (SAIC)  
Monica Hood (SAIC)  
Chris Hunt (SAIC) (via conf. call)  
Pete Rawlings (SAIC)

### Interested Public Attendees

Caroline Burnett (Butte Creek Canyon  
Coalition)  
Rob Capriola (Westervelt Ecological)  
Geoff Fricker  
Geoff Fricker Sr.  
Allen Harthorn (Friends of Butte Creek)  
Steve Lambert (Butte County Supervisor)

Jamison Watts (Northern California Regional Land  
Trust)  
Gregg McKenzie (Restoration Resources)  
Michelle Murray  
Riley Swift (Restoration Resources)

## Associated Documents/Handouts

Agenda packet including:

1. Draft Conservation Measures for Covered Fish Species (Handouts #1)
2. Draft Avoidance and Minimization Measures – Water Quality and Covered Fish Species (Handouts #2)
3. Individual Species Example for Goals, Objectives, Conservation Measures, etc. (Handout #3)
4. Meeting Notes from March 2010 Stakeholder Meeting (Handout #4)

## Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions and Agenda Review
2. Draft Conservation Measures for Covered Fish Species (Handouts #1)
3. Draft Avoidance and Minimization Measures – Water Quality and Covered Fish Species (Handouts #2)
4. Individual Species Example for Goals, Objectives, Conservation Measures, etc. (Handout #3)
5. Meeting Notes from March 2010 Stakeholder Meeting (Handout #4)
6. USFWS/DFG/NMFS Items for Discussion
7. Action Items and Next Meeting Agenda

## Introductions and Agenda Review

Agendas were distributed and names were announced. Chris Hunt was introduced as an SAIC fisheries biologist newly involved in the Butte Regional HCP/NCCP. Meeting handouts were introduced.

## Draft Conservation Measures for Covered Fish Species (Handouts #1)

Handout #1 was introduced as a draft set of conservation measures for fish species covered under the Butte Regional HCP/NCCP. The three-level approach to achieving conservation was described as landscape, natural community, and species specific measures. The landscape level goals, objectives, and conservation measures (CMs) have a broad scale, the natural community goals, objectives, and CMs are specific to certain habitat types, and the species CMs are narrowly focused on benefiting specific species. The definition of term "active floodplain" as applied in the conservation measures was discussed; there was discussion and questions about the exact definition of a floodplain and it was explained that it had not been fully defined but for purposes of the handout a floodplain was considered to be an area flooded every 3-5 years. "Active floodplain" will be defined in the next version of the measures. Examples of conservation goals and objectives and CMs that achieve them were described. It was explained that a single CM can serve multiple objectives and that a large crosswalk table linking each goal and objective to specific CMs had been distributed at a previous meeting. Handout #3b from the

March 3, 2010 Stakeholder Meeting was downloaded from the Butte Regional HCP/NCP website and described as a representation of how CMs are linked to all goals and objectives.

A question was raised if BCAG representatives, agencies, and other organizations that attend the meetings were coordinating with one another regarding the Plan and it was explained that this coordination is occurring and many attendees take notes, distribute information, and communicate on various levels to ensure coordination. It was explained that the Implementing Entity will ultimately be involved in the coordination as well.

Goals, objectives, and CMs were further described. Maps showing waterways in the Planning Area were shown to further illustrate and explain the CMs. It was explained that the map/figure depicting diversions needs updating as the data set used is outdated to some extent.

It was commented that flood control mandates may supersede MOAs discussed on page 4 of Handout #1 for example. It was commented that even in such cases, solutions that achieve multiple objectives may be able to be found.

In response to discussion of conservation measure AQUA CM3, the measure will be revised to explicitly include reference to oxbows as being a feature that could be enhanced along preserved stream corridors.

Another question was raised regarding why the Sacramento River had been left out of certain goals, objectives, and CMs. It was explained that under the Planning Agreement no covered activities are included on the Sacramento River. It was recommended that limitations on the types of measures that can be implemented should be described in introductory sections.

It was commented and agreed that a data set that identifies where and how much riprap has been placed along streams in the Planning Area would be very helpful. It was requested that if a member of the group has information about an available data set and can provide this information it would be appreciated.

A question was raised if the drainages listed were the only ones where conservation actions would occur. It was explained that these waterways were the ones that data provided by NMFS indicated were occupied and important habitat for covered species. It was commented that Angel Slough might provide rearing habitat for some species, but there are issues such as flooding frequency, barriers to fish passage, and the fact that it receives treated effluent that may render this area as a low priority in terms of fish conservation.

There was discussion about water supply for the Plan and whether acquiring water is within the scope of the Plan. The possibility of linking with the Butte County General Plan water related policies was suggested and this will be reviewed. It was commented that suggestions from the group on how to get at this issue would be welcome.

It was requested to add “channel meander” to the second to last bullet of CM7 on page 7.

A question was raised regarding if setting back levees had been considered since there seem to be valuable opportunities to achieve conservation. It was explained that it had been assumed that this lay beyond the jurisdiction of the Implementing Entity.

The importance of addressing agricultural runoff for water quality was discussed. It was commented that the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program deals with agricultural runoff issues. The intent is to provide for uniform regulation.

It was explained that the CMs discussed are meant to provide an idea of the direction and scope of actions that could possibly be taken but over the coming months more detail will be added for all aspects of the CMs as needed.

## **Draft Avoidance and Minimization Measures – Water Quality and Covered Fish Species (Handouts #2)**

Handouts #2 was introduced and explained as a document describing avoidance and minimization measures that would be implemented to avoid/minimize impacts associated with covered activities. Specific measures were explained and described in detail.

A question was raised if cities and counties already have some of the stormwater plan requirements described in the handout and if the Implementing Entity would be the entity responsible for enforcing such plans. It was explained that this would need to be investigated further and it would have to be decided and stated who does what and where responsibilities lie.

## **Individual Species Example for Goals, Objectives, Conservation Measures, etc. (Handout #3)**

Handout #3 was introduced and it was explained that it was requested during last month's Stakeholder Committee Meeting. It is an example of how the pieces of the plan thus far presented fit together and form a cohesive conservation strategy for a species. The document was reviewed and explained in detail. It was commented that this document was extremely helpful and well received. It was also commented that this would be the format followed in the Administrative Draft of the document.

It was clarified that the "Total" column in Table 5.X.2 presented numbers for the total acreage in the entire Conservation Acquisition Zone, and that the "Total Conserved" column presents the acreage numbers that would be conserved at the end of Plan implementation timeline, and that it includes acreage already conserved. It was suggested that the title of the column should be changed since the past tense conveyed that this acreage was already conserved, when in reality the numbers are a target. It was also suggested that this column should be broken out into more data types, for example, "Acreage already conserved" and "Acreage to be conserved". The Committee was reminded that the conservation targets are draft and serve as a starting point for further evaluations. As such, they are subject to change up until the Plan is finalized. The Committee raised and discussed the process through which the Implementing Entity would acquire lands to achieve the habitat conservation targets.

A question was raised about the status of Butte County meadowfoam. It was indicated that there may be an update at the June Stakeholder Meeting.

## **Meeting Notes from March 2010 Stakeholder Meeting (Handout #4)**

The meeting notes from March 2010 were approved.

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

None; no resource agency staff were present at the end of the meeting.

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

- The next Stakeholder meeting will be held on May 5, 2010 from 11:00 to 3:00 pm at BCAG.
- It was indicated that a draft of Chapter 1, *Introduction*, a draft of the Adaptive Management framework, and a Powerpoint presentation on the Monitoring section will be provided. An updated Status of the Chapters table and an updated schedule will also be distributed.