

Sites Terrestrial Species Federal Agency Coordination Meeting Agenda and Action Items



Date: October 1, 2019

Location: 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, CA

Time: 1:00p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Leader: Ellen Berryman

Recorder: Ellen Berryman

Purpose: Sites BA, Terrestrial coordination with Federal Agencies

Attendees:

Dan Cordova
Monique Briard

Lauren Sullivan
Jelica Arsenijevic

Ellen Berryman
John Spranza
Ian Boyd

Agenda:

Discussion Topic	Notes
1. Meeting Purpose and Schedule of Topics, Process	<p>Discussed the meeting topics and schedule, and everyone agreed with the order and dates, except that Lauren is not available October 22. All three present are available the 23rd before 3 pm, and anytime on the 24th. Cuckoo will be the topic so we will need Ian with CDFW to attend.</p> <p>Action: Ellen to check on Ian’s availability the 23rd and 24th, and reschedule the cuckoo meeting.</p>
2. Action Area	<p>Looked at the map of the action area from the preliminary BA, with the understanding that the action area will change. Ellen explained that this was what the iPAC list was generated from, and that most of the action area is relevant to fish and flows, and not to terrestrial species. This was to provide background for the may affect/no effect table, which included all species potentially occurring in the action area.</p>
3. May Affect/No Effect Species	<p>Regarding may affect/no effect table –</p> <p>Dan said to make sure it all has parallel construction with similar findings, terminology (may be an issue if several different people worked on the table).</p> <p>Lauren requested two different may-affect columns – one for the construction area and one for operation (flows). Then if either column is “may affect”, it’s a may affect finding for the BA.</p> <p>Lauren said she doesn’t think LBV of concern in Yolo Bypass and the project wouldn’t affect other LBV in Delta.</p> <p>Lauren - Snowy plover that stops over in the action area is not the listed coastal population segment – no effect.</p> <p>FYLF probably won’t be proposed before BO is complete, so we don’t need to conference on this species. Possible need to conference on longfin smelt if it is proposed in the near future.</p> <p>Lauren said she’d like to look at the table some more after the meeting and get back to us.</p>

Action: Ellen put may affect/no effect table on agenda for next meeting, for additional input from Lauren. (Lauren will also let us know whether there longfin smelt might be proposed in time to conference).

Decision: Put all fish, wildlife, and plants in table and don't need to describe all the no-effect species in the Intro chapter, just reference the table in an appendix.

4. Surveys

The group briefly discussed surveys. Any benefit to doing surveys this year?

CRLF – Lauren said we may be able to get to a not likely to adversely affect from surveys. May be able to use eDNA, but it may be only to confirm presence and they may need to couple with protocol-level surveys to get to a *not likely*. We plant to discuss species survey needs in more detail when we address each species in future meetings.

5. Project Description

The group briefly discussed project description and lack of available detail for some project components – some of which will not be available prior to the completion of the biological opinion. Dan requested that we state the level of design and Lauren requested that we specify where uncertainty is – size, location of components, but put sideboards around it, such as specifying that maintenance buildings will be within the footprint. The BA can also specify that some components of the project may change and re-initiation will not be required unless it changes effects on the species (use re-initiation language from BOs). Also, in some cases we can say project description can change in a certain way upon USFWS approval (or concurrence that effects do not differ from what was analyzed in the biological opinion).

Next Meeting: October 15, 2019