

YNHP SAC Issues Identified Regarding the Riparian Conservation Strategy Straw Proposal
(based on April 19, 2010 stakeholder discussion)

Issue	Response
The focus of the strategy on woody riparian vegetation is too limited by failing to include herbaceous riparian vegetation types.	Strategy broadened to include herbaceous riparian vegetation associated with streamcourses. Larger areas of herbaceous wetlands are addressed in the Valley Natural Communities Strategy.
Catchment and distributor riparian habitats have different functions that need to be recognized, particularly as they affect mitigation and restoration efforts	Recognition of these different riparian conditions has been incorporated into the strategy.
The plan needs to focus more on riparian functions rather than mostly on vegetation	More emphasis on functions has been added. Additional specific suggestions are welcomed.
Need to ensure that this permit also serves to cover permitting needs for restoration work (i.e., DFG streambed alteration permit)	This issue will be addressed, but not within the Conservation Strategy.
The recent observation of singing least Bell's vireos in the bypass, after a long absence from Yolo County and the rest of the Central Valley, suggests it be reconsidered as a covered species in the plan, and illustrates the benefits of restoration	Although the covered species list is not addressed in this section, the Least Bell's Vireo has been added as a covered species. The setting where the vireos have colonized, a young (<3 yr old), restored riparian habitat area illustrates the need for incorporation of ongoing creation of young habitat as a need in the strategy
The plan targets have too much emphasis on acreage and not on other values that need to be achieved. Riparian corridor values need to be clearly addressed and defined.	The strategy does target acreage as a quantifiable objective, but other aspects of the strategy do address quality (e.g., Assembly Rules and forthcoming section on Riparian Restoration and Enhancement Concepts). We have identified corridor values as a critical component of conservation in the strategy. We welcome specific suggestions regarding other values, including riparian corridors.
The proposal's expectations re: tree ordinances may be too extensive. The County's intent in the GP was to focus on the oak management plan and protection of isolated trees and stands, not necessarily all riparian species. Also, we need to better reflect the city's existing tree ordinances	Specifics regarding proposals for the tree ordinances will be added later.
The proposal does not identify all of the plans of other entities within the county.	We are reviewing the County's Parks Master Plan and Oak Woodland Plan for applicability to the entire Conservation Strategy. Reviewers should identify any other plans that should

	be incorporated, in addition to those noted in Table 5.6-7?
The word <i>matrix</i> needs to be clearly defined and correctly used in the context of this proposal.	<i>Matrix</i> will appear in the Glossary. Use of the term in the Riparian strategy has been modified.
The small streams and channels on the valley floor need to be identified by name and included in the Table 1 (now Table 5.6-1), so that there is a clear image of where they are located.	Table 5.6-1 has been augmented to include the names of more watercourses.
Minimize use of certain words such as <i>monitor</i> , <i>intervention</i> and <i>permits</i> that may create landowner concerns. Use more precise terms in the plan, or carefully define them in the Glossary	Use of these terms has been evaluated in the text to minimize misperceptions. The terms will appear in the Glossary.
Correct referent to conserving “full range of riparian habitat conditions” since we do not want to conserve non-native riparian vegetation types or low quality riparian habitats.	This language has been modified to convey the intent to conserve, enhance, and restore examples of high quality habitat
Conservation Measure R-2 needs language to address connections between wetter riparian areas and drier upland natural habitat areas (e.g., Grasslands Park).	Establishing connections between riparian areas and conserved uplands is included in riparian conservation goals and was added to Assembly Rule #4.
The straw proposal indicates bias toward major riparian systems. Riparian areas along smaller streams and canals should receive greater attention.	Modifications were made to emphasize that the strategy is a balanced approach.
The plan should not preclude landowners and agencies from engaging in normal flood control maintenance practices.	Such restriction was not intended. Some clarification has been made re: this topic. We welcome any other specific suggestions.
Corridor values of riparian habitat need to be clarified: who they serve and don’t serve. Also, conditions of riparian habitat, especially choking with vegetation due to lack of natural disturbance, should be recognized and addressed through management.	The importance of riparian areas as corridors is noted in the introduction (p.1) and the Riparian Conservation Goals (p. 7). More information on management conditions to be achieved will be included in a forthcoming section on riparian habitat enhancement and restoration concepts. Management goals for individual species that use riparian corridors will be addressed in Covered Species Goals and Species Conservation Measures. Other specific suggestions for changes to the strategy are welcome.