

**Santa Barbara County  
Regional Conservation Strategy**

**Conservation Steering Committee Meeting**

**Board of Supervisors Hearing Room, Santa Maria**

**Wednesday, March 28, 2007**

**Draft Minutes**

---

**Committee Members Present:**

Jerry Bunin – Home Builders Association

Katie Drexhage – Fish and Wildlife Service

Tom Maloney – The Nature Conservancy

Martin Potter – CDFG

Bill Shipsey – Local Jurisdictions, (City of Santa Maria – Community Development)

Susan Petrovich – Ranching Community, (Hatch & Parent)

Sam Sweet – Environmental Community, (PhD Biologist UCSB)

**Committee Members Absent:**

Ronda Lucas – Farm Bureau

**Alternate Committee Members Present:**

Willy Chamberlin – Ranching Community, (S.B. County Cattlemen Association)

Wendy Stockton – Local Jurisdictions (City of Santa Maria – Attorney)

Suneil Thomas – The Nature Conservancy

**Project Staff Present:**

Joy Hufschmid – Project Manager, Santa Barbara County

Peggy Burbank- Senior Planner, Santa Barbara County

Whitney Wilkinson – Assistant Planner, Santa Barbara County

Mike Ghizzoni- Chief Deputy County Counsel

---

**1. Public Comment on non-agenda items.**

- 1.1. Question regarding substitute person filling in for Farm Bureau member/alternate since both are absent. Standard practice is to not allow substitute for absent members unless it is the member's designated alternate.
- 1.2. A provision for the use of speaker phone participation was suggested and will be made available when needed.

**2. Review of Interview Questions and Procedure:**

- 2.1. The format of the interviews would include assigning each committee member questions prepared by staff with emphasis that both candidates be asked the same questions to ensure fair interviews be given to both candidates.
- 2.2. Follow up questions would be allowed if necessary.

- 2.3. Clarification was asked as to the procedure of hiring of the facilitator and what their role would be in the committee process:
  - 2.3.1. The facilitator Request for Qualification (RFQ) process was reviewed. Staff received committee recommendations on facilitator candidates and sent out five RFQs to potential candidates.
  - 2.3.2. Two responses were received, one from Solution Strategies Inc. and another from Robert Copper of the Plover Group.
  - 2.3.3. An overview of the role of the facilitator as well as qualities and experience they should possess was presented by the project manager.
- 2.4. Discussion of adding additional questions to those presented by staff:
  - 2.4.1. WS: Proposes to add an additional question: “What is your experience with building public and private partnerships.” Committee consensus was reached, and it was added as question 9.
  - 2.4.2. SP: Proposed to add a 10<sup>th</sup> question: “What is your experience with mitigation banks and purchase of mitigation credits.” Committee consensus was reached, and it was added as question 10.
  - 2.4.3. MP: Proposed to add “NCCP experience” in addition to HCP experience in questions #1, 2 and 5 with the justification that there is a possibility the plan will need to include knowledge of this type. Committee consensus was reached.  
SP: Proposed to edit Question #1 “comprised of” to “comprising.”
- 2.5. Questions were raised as to the necessity of ratings. The PM reviewed the procedure and format proposed for the interviews. Committee consensus was reached on the format of the interview process.

### **3. Interviews and Decision:**

- 3.1. Two additional follow up questions were asked after staff questions were presented to the first interviewee, the same questions were then asked of the second interviewee by the project manager.
  - 3.1.1. Additional Question #1: What is your experience and familiarity with the Brown Act?
  - 3.1.2. Additional Question #2: Is it feasible to do an HCP on a single species?

### **4. Public comment period and comments by alternate committee members.**

### **5. Evaluation and Selection of Facilitator**

- 5.1. Open discussion of strengths and weaknesses of both candidates. Committee consensus was reached that both candidates are qualified.
- 5.2. Public comment was allowed before a decision was made.

5.3. Consensus: Committee decided that both candidates are qualified, the committee can work with either candidate, and that in this special case the committee would make a decision based on a vote since there was no clear decision of one candidate over the other.

5.4. They voted 4-3 in favor of selecting Robert Copper of the Plover Group as the CSC's facilitator.

## **6. Formation of Brown Act Committee**

6.1. County Counsel discussed Brown Act rules the committee would be governed by pending formation by the Board of Supervisors. The committee was also informed that any change of a committee member or alternate would need to be approved by the Board of Supervisors.

## **7. Committee consensus was that items #8 and #9 would be postponed until the April 25th meeting**

## **8. Next Meeting and Adjournment**

8.1. Committee consensus was formed on meeting time. It will begin at 10:00am and end at 3:00pm with a short lunch break.