

Handout #6A

Meeting Summary

Butte Regional HCP/NCCP

Stakeholder Committee Meeting

June 3, 2009, 11:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

BCAG Conference Room

Stakeholder Committee Attendees

Scott Huber (Altacal Audubon Society)	Virginia Getz (Ducks Unlimited)
Richard Price (Butte County Ag. Commission)	Colleen Cecil (BC Farm Bureau)
Suellen Rowlison (CNPS)	Pat Kelly (Sierra Club)
Pia Sevelius (RCD)	Phil Johnson (Altacal Audubon Society)
Mary Watters (Sierra Club)	Jeff Swindle (CalTrans)

Resource Agencies Attendees

Nina Bicknese (USFWS)

Steering Committee and Staff Attendees

Jane Dolan (BCAG/ Supervisor)

Paul Cylinder (SAIC)

Jon Clark (BCAG)

Holly Wilson (SAIC)

Chris Devine (BCAG)

Monica Hood (SAIC)

Interested Public Attendees

Jamison Watts

Chris Swift (Restoration Resources)

Associated Documents/Handouts:

Agenda packet including:

1. General Plan Updates/Urban Permit Areas (Attachment #1)
2. Conservation Acquisition Zones (CAZ) Update (Attachment #2)
3. CAZs and UPAs (Attachment #3)
4. CAZ Acreage Calculations (Attachment #4)
5. Meeting Notes from March 4, 2009
6. Factors in Determining Species Habitat Objectives
7. Butte Regional HCP/NCCP Updated Schedule

Action Items and Key Recommendations:

- The next Stakeholder meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 1, 2009, 11:00 am – 3:00 pm, at BCAG.

Handout #6A

Meeting Agenda:

- Introductions
- General Plan Updates
- Conservation Acquisition Zones (CAZ) Update
- Urban Permit Areas Update
- CAZ Acreage Calculations
- Factors in Determining Species Habitat Objectives
- Butte Regional HCP/NCCP Updated Task Chart and Schedule
- BCAG Stakeholder Meeting Notes from March 4, 2009

General Plan Updates

- Chris Devine discussed recent updates to County General Plan with additions to urban permit areas.

Butte Regional HCP/NCCP Updated Task Chart and Schedule

- Chris Devine discussed the updated Butte Regional HCP/NCCP task chart and schedule.

Urban Permit Areas (UPA) and Conservation Acquisition Zones (CAZ) Update

- Paul Cylinder presented updates to the BCAG UPAs and CAZs based on new data from County General Plan.
- He discussed suggested changes to the approach as a result of updates to General Plan. The goal is to simplify and to set conservation targets and goals by CAZ instead of specific goals for each UPA. There will be take limits set for activities in UPAs. This avoids breaking up the landscape into too many pieces, but still address the geographic distribution of covered species and natural communities.
- Members discussed a variety of issues related to the UPAs and CAZs including: whether take limits will be uniformly applied to all UPAs (no they will not – take limits will be identified for each UPA based on covered activities, covered species, importance of habitat, etc., so will be individualized); request for soil type clarifications; clear boundaries on the maps; guidelines for take; definitions of UPAs; and specific acreage.

CAZ Acreage Calculations Approved

- Presentation of Table 1 Acreage calculations for land cover type by CAZ. Discussion that the trigger for goals is the assessment of what is required to conserve the species in perpetuity.
- Discussion included: the use of the NCCP Act to conserve natural communities; funding sources and processes including the need for the implementing agency to obtain funding for the plan including monitoring and adaptive management, while the plan identifies the cost to implement, and Section 6 funding for planning and implementation (especially land acquisition) – Section 6 funding cannot be used for mitigation.
- FWS requested to know the specific areas where take will not occur within a given UPA and indicated that FWS often conducts its analysis by assuming that all landcover/habitat

Handout #6A

inside a UPA will be developed and lost, and asked if the UPA map could identify those areas inside each UPA that will not be developed under this HCP (will be preserved).

Factors in Determining Species Habitat Objectives

- Presentation of Table 2 Acreage calculations for selected species type by CAZ and discussion of the factors in determining species habitat objectives. Discussed Bald Eagle section as an example as well as the overlapping goals of natural communities, habitats and species.
- Members discussed the handout with issues raised such as: whether the most restricted species will be the determining factor (yes – example being if a 30% preservation goal is given to the Bald Eagle but a higher percentage exists for meadowfoam then the meadowfoam percentage would be used in that CAZ); possible future pressures to “swap” between CAZs; creation of corridors and connectivity; restoration vs. mitigation vs. preservation (preservation goals described are to be interpreted as the preservation of existing habitat, not restoration); species of local concern.
- Suggestion that models be developed that address whole life history of each covered species. Clarification that models are spatial habitat models only and that other life history characteristics are in species accounts. Limitation on how much information is available on species makes full ecological models challenging to develop.
- Species models in the joint USGS/DFG/FWS publication "Designing Monitoring Programs for Regional Multiple Species Conservation Plans" were also discussed.
- Using the term "Listing Status" as the first of the four "Factors", and the potential appearance that unlisted species are not being treated "as if they were listed" (per HCP requirements) was also discussed. It was agreed to replace the term "Listing Status" with the biological term "Rarity" or a similar biological term.

Meeting Notes from March 4, 2009

- Meeting notes from March 4, 2009 were approved.

Upcoming Workshops/Meetings:

- The next Stakeholder meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 1, 2009, 11:00 am to 3:00 pm, at BCAG.