

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Notes – September 7, 2004

Chair – Anjanette Martin

Vice Chair – Stacy Cepello

The Chair opened the meeting with self-introductions. Stacy Cepello, Department of Water Resources (DWR), announced CALFED will be coming out with 2 Proposal Solicitation Packages(PSP), a science PSP later this month followed by a PSP with a focus on monitoring.

Current Projects/Updates – None at this time

New Projects or Proposal Review – Stacy noted River Partners had submitted a fact sheet on a new proposal; however, it did not get into the SRCAF office in time to meet the 10-day timeline for distribution. The project will be reviewed at a later date. Stacy provided a preview of the electronic version of the project fact sheet which is now available on the SRCAF website, [www.sacramentoriver.ca.gov](http://www.sacramentoriver.ca.gov). Project proponents were asked to use the electronic version for their new projects and provide any input and/or suggestions.

Cross-Boundary Issues – Representatives from the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) have done a first cut at Task 1 on the draft work plan for cross-boundary issues. They have compiled a complete description of Endangered Species Act (ESA) and California Endangered Species Act (CSEA) threatened and endangered (T&E) species and special status species found in the Sacramento River Conservation Area. The Landowner Assurances Committee (LAC) had reviewed the draft work plan at their September 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting and provided some input. The LAC had discussed the reference to open space in the work plan and suggested the definition needed to be clarified. Following discussion at the TAC, it was decided to remove the reference entirely. The LAC also suggested splitting out “exploring potential solutions” in Task 2, using the Good Neighbor Policy list of 24 possible impacts specifically in Tasks 2, 3C, and #4. The LAC Chair stressed the need to avoid duplication of efforts between the LAC and the TAC. Stacy suggested the next step at the TAC will be to form a subcommittee, review the information in the document from USFWS, and begin developing a matrix. The matrix will include a needs category such as the need to recover species, the need to continue farming and a potential solutions category. It was suggested that this matrix could be used as a tool to answer questions about e.g. buffers and also through this process determine what are real issues. The solutions available now don't work for many of the people implementing them. The SRCAF staff will email the TAC group for those who weren't able to attend today's meeting asking for volunteers for the subcommittee.

Scott Clemons, Wildlife Conservation Board, noted two ongoing test cases revolving around the planting of Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle habitat. One, a Feather River Project, has raised local concerns about maintaining the floodway, and Yuba and Sutter Counties have asked for a solution between USFWS, Department of Fish & Game (DFG) and DWR on this issue.

Next Meeting – The next meeting was set for Tuesday, October 12<sup>th</sup>, 9:30 a.m., at the Willows City Hall.

\*\*The TAC meeting was adjourned at 2:10 and was followed at 2:30 by a workshop on the Action Specific Implementation Plan (ASIP). Presenters at the workshop were Dave Zezulak and Scott Cantrell from DFG and Darrin Thome from the USFWS. An ASIP must be prepared on projects funded by CALFED or projects implemented by a CALFED agency if projects may adversely affect species or habitat. The discussion included an overview of the ASIP which was identified in the Multi Species Conservation Strategy (MSCS) as the instrument for project-level Federal Endangered Species Act, California Endangered Species Act, and Natural Community Conservation Plan compliance. The presentation also included an overview of the MSCS, content of an ASIP, who needs to prepare ASIPs, and the responsibilities of the ASIP Team which is comprised of DFG, UFWS, and NOAA Fisheries. The ASIP Team works with the project proponents upfront to provide guidance for developing impact assessment methods, and project-specific compensation measures. Following the presentation, several questions were raised including concerns about the potential for additional costs to a project because of this requirement and, although named in the Record of Decision, some project proponents had not heard of the ASIP, others expressed concern about the lack of a clearly defined process. Lewis Bair, RD 108, has been involved in the ASIP process and they have found it to be a very expensive and lengthy process and expressed concerns that instead of improving the system, it may be making it worse. Dave Zezulak offered his assistance to project proponents who might have questions about their project. Please contact the SRCAF office for contact information. For more detailed information on the presentation, Darrin Thome also offered to provide today's powerpoint to the SRCAF office to be forwarded to anyone who might be interested.