

CDFW Terrestrial- Sites 60 day Evaluation

Meeting No.6 Minutes

Sites Reservoir Project

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date:** | *August 6, 2019* | **Location:** | *HDR Office: 2379 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 200 Raleigh Conference Room. Or Skype with Call in*: *866-583-7984,1502541* |
| **Time:** | 9:00 am – 11:00 am  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Purpose:** Continue terrestrial 60-day evaluation process.  |
| **Attendees** |
| Ali Forsythe, Sites AuthorityIan Boyd, CDFW | Monique Briard, ICFJohn Howe, ICF | Jelica Arsenijevic, HDR John Spranza, HDR |
|

| **Action Item** | **Owner** | **Deadline** | **Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Extended write up for the model layers and land cover types.  | Ellen B/John H. | 8/13/2019 | Complete – GGS template sent to Ian on 8/6/2019 after meeting 9 |
| 2 | Determine if Construction and Ops separate ITP or combine: Talk with Jeff RE: the structure prior to next steps.  | CDFW | Ongoing | Separate, but continue discussions |
| 3 | LSAA | CDFW | Ongoing | All separate , but continue discussions |
| 4 | Meet with CDFW regional contacts provided by Ian  | All | Late-August/early-September | Begin discussions to think about mitigation and regional perspective – add more value to species. |
| 5 | Funks Creek – Use of Creek | Ali F. | 8/2/2019 | Follow up on use of Funks CreekNumerous water rights on both Funks and Stone Corral creeks.  |
| 6 | Coordinate with engineer to attend next meeting | Authority | 8/13/2019 |  |
| 7 | Send GIS to CDFW | Authority | 8/13/2019 |  |

 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Minutes** |  |  |

1. Follow up from 8/2 Field Visit
	* If meeting with other agencies, maybe attend future site meetings together to be on same page.
	* Previous meeting notes referred to “historical” CDFW perspective of no GGS habitat west of GCID canal. However, based on field visit, agree due to presence of orchards etc.
	* Fletcher concept – understanding the outfall structure vs. fletcher option.
	* Further discussion on design options – engineering team to attend next week’s meeting. Current GIS developed with “on” and “off” features. Follow up on GIS and send to CDFW.
	* Looking at the intake was valuable to get idea of quality of cuckoo habitat. Doing preconstruction surveys is key to provide input on habitat use. Intake area may not provide suitable nesting habitat per Dettling, et. al. (2015) , but may provide foraging habitat and should be considered in CEQA analysis. Similar to BANS note below, should consider indirect effects to WYBC for intake structure impacts.
	* CDFW reviewing NOE and will provide feedback by end of week.
	* Bank swallow – proximity, noise, etc.
	* Geotech. CDFW will review AMM’s for the geotech work.
		+ Wording of killing, harming, etc. is a concern
		+ Agreement to have joint meeting with USFWS when they are developing BO.
		+ Discussed whether a NOE still acceptable with ITP or consistency determination?
			- NOE’s not typically acceptable for ITP’s, but CD’s are not discretioanary actions that do no require CEQA. Federal Agencies are listed as Permitttees under section 2081.2(a)(3) of the Fish and Game Code.
2. Continued Discussion of Terrestrial Species
	* Fully Protected Species Conservation Measures
	* Discussed last week with example. Provided CDFW a draft write-up of proposed AMM’s for all fully protected species. ICF to send to CDFW for review.
	* Geotech Environmental Commitments
		+ Ian reviewing and will get feedback to team by end of week to incorporate into the geotech BA.
	* Discuss measures proposed to protect birds during construction
		+ In geotech have migratory bird measure/nesting bird measures (Bio-9). If one in EIR is deficient, make similar.
	* Special-status plant surveys and measures
* Measure (Bio-20) included in the NOE for plant surveys. Team will check for consistency between the geotech NOE and Draft EIR
* CDFW typically recommends protocol level surveys, which may not be able to be done for geotech due to site access. Expand comments on the overall projects and include in EIR (try and do protocol level surveys for sensitive and natural areas).
1. Continuously update the modeling as surveys are being completed, as species are discovered (beyond CNDDB). Annual monitoring to see how things have changed.
* Updating modeling to make case to build in flexibility, document land use changes, etc. ICF following up whether a conservation measure in EIR or in ITP? Would likely be a requirement in ITP.
1. Other
	* Mitigation meeting – Sites Authority have another internal meeting and then intents to start engaging agencies for collaboration. Intending to invite CDFW, including regional staff, USFWS, NMFS, NGO’s, ag land organizations, mitigation banks (Westervelt), etc.