

WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNTY MULTI-SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES NOVEMBER 16, 2000

1. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS.

Gail Wanczuk-Barton called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m. The following were in attendance:

Ileene Anderson	California Native Plant Society
Alison Shilling	California Native Plant Society
Larry LaPre *	Audubon Society
Gail Wanczuk-Barton *	Landowner - Committee Chairperson
Won Yoo *	Property Owner
Kerwin Russell * (Shelli Lamb)	Riverside-Corona RCD
Ashwani Vasishth	University of Southern California
Karin Watts-Bazan	County Counsel
Bruce Colbert	Riverside County Prop. Owners Assoc.
Wendy Picht *	Metropolitan Water District
Bob Hewitt	USDA – NRCS
Jim Sullivan	University of California, Riverside
Dr. Tom Scott *	University of California, Riverside
Borre Winckel *	BIA – Riverside
Ed Sauls *	Landowner
Tracey Alsobrook *	Southern California Edison
Mary Beth Woulfe *	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Robin Maloney-Rames	California Dept. of Fish & Game
Glenn Black *	California Dept. of Fish & Game
Kristi Lovelady	County of Riverside – TLMA
Dan Silver *	Endangered Habitats League
Michelle Staples* (Cindy Domenigoni)	Landowner
Pete Kiriakos *	The Sierra Club
Clem D. Lagrosa * (Tom White)	U.S. Forest Service – Cleveland
Judy Behrens	U.S. Forest Service – Cleveland
Richard Lashbrook	County of Riverside – TLMA
Paul Frandsen	Riverside County Regional Park & Open Space District
Bob Wheeler *	EMA / RCD
Sharon Bolton *	Riverside County Farm Bureau
June Collins	Dudek
Sara Lozano	Dudek
Richard Masyczek	City of Hemet
Michael Rowe	Property Owner
Steve Lecht	Riverside County Waste Management

Joel Schultz	BLM
Jim Miller	City of Murrieta
Paul Blanchard	Riverside County
Dennis Hollingsworth	Assemblyman-Elect

*Denotes Advisory Committee member

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None offered.

3. ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS CONCERNING ISSUES NOT ON THE AGENDA.

Gail Wanzcuk-Barton stated that contact would be made with those appointed to the Integration Committee.

Borre Winckel, referencing a meeting held on November 15, expressed concerns over the Coastal Commission's expanding influence in the Inland Empire area. He felt this influence would endanger the existence of a Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan. Dan Silver disagreed with Mr. Winckel's observations of the facts given at the meeting.

Ed Sauls requested that the following topics be agendized for future meetings prior to a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors: small property ownership issues, perspectives of the cities on the processes being undertaken, as well as wetlands and narrow endemic issues as they relate to the alternatives. Those present agreed that the issues should be placed on the next Funding and Implementation Subcommittee agenda for consideration.

4. CONSIDERATION OF THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PANEL'S COMMENTS REGARDING OCTOBER 4, 2000 MSHCP ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT DOCUMENT.

Dr. Tom Scott, UCR, representing Mike Allen, briefly stated that the SRP did not feel that the Alternatives Development Document was strong in its organization and referred to the fact that it lacked elements that were usually found in such a document. Further he stated that while Alternative 1 was based on ecosystems, Alternatives 2 through 4 were species based and would be much more difficult to work through because of the amount of scientific data required to validate conservation assertions. The SRP also felt that the document needed to address the impact of catastrophe on the persistence of species.

Ed Sauls and June Collins, Dudek, discussed whether Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 were ecosystem based in response to a suggestion that they were not. Ms. Collins clarified that Alternative 1 reflects the conservation program generally described in the August 9, 1999 proposal. Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 were not as robust as Alternative 1, but linkages and ecosystem issues were considered. Subsequent discussion focused on the preparation of the alternatives with consideration given to regulatory guidance of the NCCP, the federal Endangered Species Act and the basic tenants of ecosystem planning.

Michele Staples suggested that the SRP applied a different standard of comparison for analyzing Alternative 2, 3 and 4 than was used to analyze Alternative 1. Dr. Scott replied that each Alternative states a certain number of species will be protected based on and defining a specific number of relative acres. For example, conclusions based upon Alternative 1 are based upon one large and contiguous unit. Alternative 2 subdivides that large piece of land, suggesting the removal of landscape without knowing where specific animal habitat is and in doing so raises the issue of connectivity, thus making it less likely

that species would survive. Alternative 2 therefore raises the question of how the smaller piece of land could do the same job as the larger piece defined in Alternative 1. Dr. Scott added that standards were defined by what the committee has asked the alternatives to achieve. The SRP based their response on one body of information relative to all of the alternatives. Mr. Sauls opined that the assignment given to the SRP was missed.

Following additional discussion, it was concluded that committee members could submit requests for clarification. Staff would forward the questions to Mike Allen for review by the SRP, who would then by way of an addendum to their letter, attempt to clarify issues raised to the extent such issues fell within the scope of questions originally posed to the SRP.

Richard Lashbrook said that the SRP was asked to review the document and respond to a series of questions. While SRP response could be questioned, the SRP decision-making process and the content of their response would be the same. Kristi Lovelady explained that the SRP still has two items that would be completed in the due course of their contract. One task is to review the draft MSHCP and the other is to review the draft EIR / EIS.

Peter Kiriakos requested that the letter from The Nature Conservancy's response to the Alternatives Development Document be discussed. The Committee agreed to agendaize this item for a subsequent meeting.

5. NEXT MEETING.

Gail Wanczuk-Barton stated that meetings have been scheduled for November 30 and December 7. On November 30 an oral presentation will be given by USFWS addressing the joint comments on the Alternatives Document.

Kristi Lovelady outlined the following items to be agendaized for the next meeting of the sub-committee: effects of the MSHCP on the small landowner, input from the cities on their position regarding the plan, discussion of wetlands and narrow endemics, and discussion of responses to the SRP comment letter.

Sharon Bolton requested discussion of dissemination of information to the public. Gail Wanczuk-Barton stated that that topic would be addressed at the next regular Advisory Committee meeting scheduled for December 14.

In clarifying the request for discussion of narrow endemics, Ed Sauls requested definition for the term "narrow endemic," identification of the 22 species listed, and clarification of survey information relevant to conservation analysis required for species coverage.

Peter Kiriakos questioned whether the committee had voted to approve California Native Plant Society for membership. Gail Wanczuk-Barton responded in the affirmative but also stated that appointment required an action of the Board of Supervisors.

Bob Wheeler questioned the membership of the Integration Committee. Gail Wanczuk-Barton responded that the roster of members was being finalized and that notification would be forthcoming.

Gail Wanczuk-Barton announced that the next MSHCP Advisory Committee meeting would be November 30 at Flood Control.

6. FINAL PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ileene Anderson, California Native Plant Society thanked the SRP for their work and asked that the work on the narrow endemics be included in the SRP review. She expressed the desire to see alternatives to the Alternatives because of lack of information on some species.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.