

**Yolo Natural Heritage Program  
Steering Advisory Committee  
Meeting Summary  
May 10, 2010**

**Note:** *“The policy in preparing meeting summaries is to produce a record of discussion by all participants. Statements do not necessarily reflect the views of the YNHP Steering Advisory Committee or the JPA Board of Directors.”*

**1. Call Meeting to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 4:07 p.m. by John Hopkins

**2. Introductions and Welcome**

All those present introduced themselves, including, Dan Airola, of Airola Environmental Consulting/SAIC, Jim Estep of Estep Environmental Consulting/SAIC

*Attendees:*

**Steering Committee Members**

Steve Greco, UC Davis  
Glen Holstein, California Native Plant Society  
John Hopkins, Institute for Ecological Health  
Vinton Hawkins, Sierra Holdings  
Yvonne LeMaitre, Yolo County Farm Bureau  
Stefan Lorenzato, Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District  
Chad Roberts, Yolo Audubon Society  
Jeannette Wrynski, Yolo Resource Conservation District

**JPA Member Agency Staff and Liaisons**

Warren Westrup, Yolo County Parks and Resources  
David Shpak, City of West Sacramento

**JPA Staff**

Maria Wong, Executive Director  
Kate Montieth, Assistant to the Director

**Interested Parties**

Matt Keasling, Taylor-Wiley  
Rick Landon, Yolo County Agriculture Commission  
Chris Lee, Yolo Board of Supervisors, District Two staff  
Lynell Pollock, Cache Creek Conservancy  
Charles Tyson, Yolo County landowner  
Kathryn Tyson, Yolo County landowner

### 3. Approve Steering Advisory Committee (SAC) Meeting Summary – April 19, 2010

Approved as presented.

### 4. Continued discussion regarding the draft riparian “straw proposal” conservation Strategy

Referring to the table of Issues Identified at the April 19, 2010 stakeholder discussion, members reviewed the amended draft riparian “straw proposal” to verify that issues had been addressed.

#### SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

Page 3: Concern about characterization of blackberry as a desirable habitat. The extent of native blackberry is limited in the county. In general, non-native Himalayan blackberry should be discouraged, as it is highly invasive and degrades riparian ecosystems. In certain instances, however, it has important habitat value, especially as a major nesting substrate for the tricolored blackbird. In some areas, it occurs in wet pasture, where it is not as disruptive to riparian habitat, and provides cover, food, and structure for wildlife.

There is still too much emphasis on woody riparian vegetation, rather than herbaceous types, but not enough specificity. There are eleven woody riparian vegetation types and a number of riparian vegetation that is not woody. The document needs to provide more detail on which types are present, where they can be found in Yolo County, and which need restoration in order to link to species management.

It would be good to have a summary of acres by riparian vegetation type, and by landscape units. This level of detail is difficult to map, however. The riparian maps on the web site show individual riparian vegetation types.

Page 5: Table 5.6-2. Broaden the table to show individual vegetation types. Some of the streams have two settings, one above and one below the Winters Canal, which are affected differently by storm water diversion and irrigation water and need to be addressed separately.

Page 7: Add more of a framework and priorities for restoration – which vegetation types are targeted where?

Goal 1. Objection to the term “full” variety of native woody and herbaceous vegetation types...”, proposed the term “desirable”. “Desirable” was felt to be too subjective. Proposed revision: Goals will be revised to “*emphasize protection, enhancement, and restoration of native riparian vegetation types that support a variety of physical and ecological conditions that have been most diminished by past land uses and that best serve the needs of covered species*”, or other agreed-upon wording.

Page 8: Line 2. Broaden reference to matrix beyond agricultural lands to other landscape units.

Table 5.6-3. Present conservation objectives by vegetation type

Page 11 table: Adjacent sources of disturbance/specific guidelines – concern about including orchards and vineyards in examples of “less disturbing/more compatible crop types”. Disturbance should be considered in conjunction with different species needs (i.e., riparian

obligates vs. nesting species that use agricultural lands). The Committee decided to revisit the topic at a later date.

Page 16: Riparian habitat involves more than vegetation types - it's a complete ecosystem and should include water quality. How do BMPs fit into plan? Need to give an overview of water as well as vegetation. Can use the streamcourse classification system as a basis for recognizing these differences.

Need to define stream types with different hydrology and provide an overview.

Re: existing riparian plans of other agencies – need to know how the NHP interfaces with these plans to determine which plans will be supported or implemented through the NHP or by other agencies.

Page 17: Table - recommended actions: re: livestock grazing – ‘prohibit’ might be too strong a word. (Response: the table intends to provide guidance in other documents, not NHP recommendations. Will check to verify treatment of grazing in this plan.)

Lower Cache Creek documents - CCAP is main document, don't need both.

Re: Cache Creek Management Plan – coordination with gravel companies' important, update is in progress.

Page 18: Table - Haven't linked County Park management with NCCP yet, but most County park plans do not explicitly address riparian vegetation.

Page 20: Focus seems to be on the landowners. Need a more system wide approach that incorporates to the flood control and water supply entities, RCD, etc.

## **7. Summary and Next Steps**

Maria reminded the committee that this will not be their last opportunity to review the document.

The next meeting will be Monday, May 24 at 6:00 p.m. in the West Sacramento Civic Center Galleria.

## **8. SAC Announcements and Updates**

Maria Wong announced that the Biological Working Group will meet again to consider adding to the covered species list.

## **9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.