

SANTA CLARA VALLEY
HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN/NATURAL COMMUNITY CONSERVATION PLAN
Stakeholder Group Meeting | March 24, 2009 | Morgan Hill Community & Cultural Center

IN ATTENDANCE:

Kevin Bryant (California Native Plant Society)
Joanna Callenbach (YCS Investments)
David Collier (Sierra Club)
Craig Edgerton (Silicon Valley Land Conservancy)
Justin Fields (Santa Clara County Cattlemen's Association)
Jan Hintermeister (Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Commission)
Virginia Holtz (League of Women Voters)
Don Long (Castro Valley Ranch)
Bob Power (Santa Clara Audubon Society)
Kenn Reiller (Pajaro Watershed Council)
Brian Schmidt (Committee for Green Foothills)
Jack Sutcliffe (Santa Clara County Farm Bureau)
Carolyn Tognetti (Save Open Space Gilroy)

Keith Anderson, Jack Bohan, Suneil Thomas and Jeff Martin were excused from attending today's meeting.

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Joan Chaplick welcomed the group, provided a brief overview of the agenda, and noted that two recent documents were available in hardcopy: the significant issues chart and a narrative outline from David Zippin focused on issues from the first administrative draft that have been resolved. This second item was emailed to the group a day or two in advance of the meeting. For the afternoon's discussion, Joan noted that she would soon be asking group members to identify the issues people were most interested in reviewing.

Joan introduced Don Long, a new Stakeholder Group member. Don is Manager of the Castro Valley Ranch located on the west side of valley, just south of Gilroy and near Santa Cruz county line. The ranch encompasses roughly 15 square miles and Don has been witness to significant changes over the years, including the disappearance of many streams that used to run seasonally.

Ken Schreiber expressed appreciation for Don's participation, noting his property as one important example of the diverse landscape and natural communities that exist in Santa Clara Valley.

Suneil Thomas is meeting with Rep. Pelosi's staff, which is why he is not present at today's meeting. This discussion is one activity led by an active coalition of HCP groups from through California. This coalition represents an important effort that has not occurred before. A lot of the action in terms of habitat plans is here in Northern California: from the Bay Area to Placer County. An effort was made last fall by Northern California habitat planning program staffs to do some outreach to Southern California planning groups, which are primarily in the implementation phase, to put together a coalition. TNC is one group involved in this effort.

The coalition is now up and running and is lobbying for Section 6 money. We are now using Section 6 planning grants and hope to tap into notable federal Section 6 land acquisition grants. There is an actual decline in acquisition dollars available from the federal government and a dramatic decline in acquisition dollars due to inflation. This coalition and these discussions are an effort to change this. The current federal administration is far more receptive, and Suneil is coordinating state-wide efforts to lobby the federal

government. The coalition is turning into a good forum to take on a number of related issues, including State global warming legislation and policies, and is an important development in the broader scheme of things.

II. UPDATE ON PLAN SCHEDULE AND BUDGET

Ken provided a plan schedule update, noting that discussions related to the Pajaro watershed continue to impact the plan schedule. One month ago, we were dealing with very tough issues related to the aquatic conservation strategy. Last Tuesday, we had a very successful meeting with Fish and Game (DFG), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and Fish and Wildlife (FWS). The South-Central Coast Steelhead is on the endangered species list – the Pajaro River population is in dire straights. The HCP focuses principally on protection, the NCCP on enhancement, and the NMFS Recovery Plan focuses on species recovery. NMFS wants to do everything possible to recover the fish, but the question now relates to how far the Habitat Plan can go towards recovery. There are few covered activities in the Pajaro River area, and thus few wide-scale Local Partner benefits to obtaining Steelhead-related permits. We have had to convince NMFS that it is not possible to include all recovery goals in this plan. Recently, a lot of progress has been made.

In light of last Tuesday's meeting with the Wildlife Agencies, Management Team's March 21st meeting was positive. At the same time, the decision was made to instruct Jones & Stokes to push out the target date for the second administrative draft from April 1st to June 1st. By end of April 16, the goal is to have enough level of agreement with the Wildlife Agencies to determine that the second draft is soon ready for release – the aquatic conservation strategy must be part of this draft.

From the budget sense, this project needs to come to a timely conclusion. Extending the Second Administrative Draft publication implies that it will be difficult to keep from sliding the final plan adoption target into the 2011 calendar year. However, the target remains the end of 2010.

In response to a question from Virginia Holtz, Ken stated that he does anticipate stakeholder meetings to continue on a monthly basis.

Kenn Reiller asked if the steelhead recovery plan is still in review. Jerry Smith told the group that the recovery plan for this region has not yet been sent out by NMFS for Fish and Game review. There is no public version for Coho salmon, which is the first public draft release that would occur. Jerry added that NMFS is still working on the first draft for steelhead recovery, but that some concepts are arising from this process with respect with how to deal with recovery in the Pajaro watershed.

Kenn asked how important these plans are for us. Ken said that without a document it is difficult to know. Jon Ambrose in Santa Rosa has been the NOAA representative for the HCP process and is working on recovery for Coho and steelhead, but the south central coast is under the jurisdiction of the southern California office. Jon is going across boundaries but action is coming out of the Ventura NMFS office, and Jerry has little knowledge of what is going on in Ventura.

III. STAKEHOLDER PRIORITIZATION OF SIGNIFICANT ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION

A) Wildlife Agency Significant Issues Overview

Joan opened conversation to priority issues, noting that we have the significant issues table and David's notes to refer to during conversation. We will take advantage of Troy Rahmig's expertise today, given that he is here on David's behalf, and will continue this discussion next month.

Ken noted that there were no changes to the significant issues table following the technical meeting on March 11. The meeting was productive but they were not able to resolve issues without Cori Mustin, who was not available due to illness.

Stakeholders then spent a few minutes prioritizing issues for the afternoon's discussion. The following items were identified as priority for the meeting:

- Aquatic Conservation Strategy
- Pacheco Reservoir
- Burrowing Owl
- Levee Reconstruction
- Riparian Setback
- Rangeland
- Environmental Baseline and Impact Assessment

Troy noted that part of the day's exercise is to identify the group's specific questions to determine what information Jones & Stokes needs to bring back to stakeholders next week.

Joanna Callenbach asked how changes to the first administrative draft will be tracked and clearly illustrated. Troy requested that the group identify some of the things they want to see and Jones & Stokes can bring them to the next meeting. Nearly all changes will show up in the second administrative draft in a way you can identify. We can either hold off on reviewing specific changes until the second administrative draft is available or if there are logical parts we can send you in advance, we can do so.

Joan then asked the group if there is any interest in seeing text reflecting particular issues that have been resolved. Joanna requested text related to impact issues and the changes to the section regarding existing land uses.

B) Pajaro Watershed Aquatic Conservation Strategy

Ken provided some detailed background related to the challenges that exist with the aquatic conservation strategy and how the Three Creeks HCP is related to this effort. With respect to watershed lands and San Jose's jurisdiction, the northern part of the Study Area excludes the Pajaro River watershed and includes all of Coyote Creek other than the Baylands and a good chunk of Guadalupe Creek. The SCVWD's Fisheries and Aquatic Habitat Cooperative is an effort in response to water release policies and procedures in Stevens Creek, Guadalupe and Coyote watersheds. Roughly 10 years ago there were complaints that policies were harming steelhead, and thus in violation of protection laws. Litigants reached a settlement agreement and a habitat conservation plan would be an important part of this. This HCP is called the Three Creeks. For two of the three creeks – Coyote and Guadalupe – the Three Creeks HCP strategy is the basic aquatic species conservation strategy in the northern part of the land in the Santa Clara Valley HCP..

Wildlife Agencies received the first draft of the Santa Clara Valley HCP in October/November 2008 and called out Pajaro watershed as an area with significant aquatic species issues. NMFS asked the HCP incorporate a list of 55 items or strategies into the plan, many of which came directly from timber harvesting areas in the Pacific Northwest. The list of recommendations was reviewed by Local partners and consultants. It was found that 25 of these were already in the plan, another 20 or so were already partially in the plan, and some were simply outside the pale. One example of the type of commitments that NMFS wanted included in the plan was a numerical reduction in sediment flow. We provided our comments on all 55 of these requests. Aside from the expansion of Gilroy, some residential sites, and some Morgan Hill activity, there are otherwise few covered activities in the Pajaro watershed. We are trying to convince NMFS that the value of the Pajaro steelhead permit and the costs to achieve it need to be in reasonable balance. Last week there was the

realization of the need to keep things in reasonable balance. In other words, we have made progress and are moving beyond discussion of creating specific numerical targets for sediment, etc.

Another significant change is that Pacheco Reservoir expansion has been removed from the habitat plan by FWS. This was one of the largest covered activities, and it will now have to be covered by a future Habitat Plan amendment process. There will be discussion in the Habitat Plan on future terrestrial mitigation if the expansion is proposed. Pacheco Reservoir expansion was removed because of fear related to impacts to delta smelt from water allocation and the concern that Pacheco reservoir expansion could be linked to Delta issues.

David Collier asked how delta smelt and the Pacheco expansion are connected given that they are in completely different watersheds. Jerry and Troy responded that this concern relates to imported water - to have water coming downstream from the reservoir for steelhead requires imported water. In the current political environment, you have to assume that you'll need to legally defend yourselves on anything related to the Delta water flow. The decision has been made to isolate expansion of the reservoir as a future amendment to the plan, so if it comes under scrutiny and requires additional review time, the amendment to the plan will then be the focus, and not the plan itself.

Jerry noted that reoperation of Uvas Reservoir is another major point of discussion among the Wildlife Agencies and local people with interest in protection of Steelhead. At this point there is agreement among people in this group, but the agreed upon approach has not been approved by the Water District. This is another key reason why the first administrative draft did not include the Uvas re-operation aspect of the aquatic conservation strategy for South County.. Reoperation of Uvas is a critical piece for the strategy but we cannot add it to plan until the Water District approves.

The Water District will need either the Habitat Plan, a separate Pajaro Watershed HCP or one of more Section 7 permits to operate Uvas and Chesbro reservoirs. Ken is striving to keep the reservoir activities in the plan in a reasonable way. It is difficult convincing agencies that yes, these are important, but not so important that NMFS requirements put the plan in jeopardy.

Kenn Reiller noted the importance and implications of dam safety and infrastructure programs in the project area and the region. Despite the challenges in characterizing how important water supply is to the region and to the HCP in Santa Clara County (as in part evidenced in local urban water management plans), he would not want to see these issues drop out of plan. While we don't want to elaborate on the details and political implications of water supply during interest-based negotiations, he hopes people really understand how serious we are.

Virginia Holtz asked if Pacheco reservoir reoperation has been taken out of plan. Reoperation of the existing Pacheco reservoir is still on the table.

Brian Schmidt inquired into the February 4, 2009, recommendations from NMFS. According to Ken, reducing sediment and impervious flows below existing levels were the political challenges. But other noted issues here were legitimate.

C) Western Burrowing Owl

Troy provided background and an overview of where we are today with respect to western burrowing owl conservation. There has been a bit of progress since the last meeting. Burrowing owl impacts and assessing those for breeding western burrowing owls is one of the great challenges of this plan process. Doing so is difficult because we are dealing with a resource that is at a very, very low level in terms of both the number of owls and the number of locations where they exist. The other reality is that we have limited control about

what happens to existing populations – of the three multiple nesting locations, one is the San Jose airport and another is the San Jose Water Pollution Control Plant and both of these are not covered activities. We've drafted a conservation strategy to do our best to protect existing populations and to come up with rigid guidelines to determine how western burrowing owls can be impacted and how those impacts would occur (ratio and location). The bottom line is that with so few owls with so few locations you can have no net loss – the goal is to keep habitat where it is. Again, the difficult part of this is north San Jose. Maintaining habitat would require a high level of mitigation in an area of proposed development or bringing in land in lieu of fee to set aside as habitat. While this seems a good approach, it is somewhat tenuous. Land is limited and expensive, and even if we were to protect all land in the area we are not sure this would have a significant impact since bird numbers are so low.

This suggests that we need to get creative. If we want to meet our goals and objectives then we need to think about how to do that knowing that we have only two populations right now. Our two options are to bolster the existing population from within the study area and to trans-locate birds from outside the study area into the study area. Both are research-oriented at best and have only been met with marginal success where they have been implemented. DFG frowns upon trans-location – it doesn't like moving animals around, and only supports doing so when there are no other options.

This, then, forces the question: when have we run out of options? When do we begin making decisions? We have drafted language that seeks to answer these questions in this context. It went to the Agencies, and San Jose and the Water District provided comments. FWS provided limited comments (the burrowing owl is not federally listed), and deferred to DFG. We have received no formal comments from DFG but we've had a couple of conversations and conference calls related to the subject, with no surprising outcomes. We are in the process of setting up a meeting in a couple of weeks that will hopefully include Wildlife Agencies and result in substantive comments from DFG.

Currently, we are reviewing what we do with the owls here at both the state and local levels. This issue has received a fair amount of attention as it relates to statewide habitat issues, and part of this process is to come up with solutions to problems like this. There is a larger process that we are trying to inform. At that point, Troy opened up the conversation to questions from the stakeholders.

Bob Powers asked if there have been any conversation about fostering chicks on-site? Troy responded that there have been only brief conversations about bringing in chicks and supplanting them into existing populations. Captive breeding is an option here, and there has been talk about fostering young into Santa Clara colonies.

Bob Powers stated that our population is on the brink. In his estimation, it doesn't appear to be a good use of resources to purchase suitable habitat because what we consider suitable habitat is available now and owls aren't using it. The only tools left are bringing in birds from other populations or begin captive breeding to augment the existing population. All strategies to preserve, acquire, and enhance land are only viable if you have population that is large enough to use land.

According to Troy, DFG agrees with that, but it seems it is working to justify that the owl populations are on the brink. In fact, these populations are on the brink. To design and begin implementation of a captive breeding program would take a few years, and it seems that this is the kind of activity you'd want to begin at day one in order to get it working. Bob expressed interest in participating in the conference call with Wildlife Agencies about determining the definition of "on the brink."

Jan Hintermeister agrees with Troy. If the water pollution control plant land is not on the table, then that is also very significant. That's the land that is available. Bringing owls in from the outside is also very expensive and so if this is a consideration we need to factor costs into our cost estimates.

One stakeholder asked, based on conversations with the Wildlife Agencies, will there be an update to the burrowing owl conservation strategy prior to release of second administrative draft? Troy affirmed that an updated strategy will be part of the second administrative draft. The goal is to receive FGD comments, revise, and incorporate into the second admin draft. This also depends on what we hear from FGD in early April. They want Esther Burkett to be involved. Certainly the strategy will be updated.

Ken noted that Dave Johnston is in great need of support from Sacramento, and can only go so far on his own. We know that the situation is dire, and even people less familiar with the issue here in the South Bay can attest to this. But we still work to boost existing, small populations. The number of locations will not increase soon.

One stakeholder asked about the potential in the future to think on a regional scale – looking from San Jose to Salinas, what is the pattern of use and how has that changed over time? Bill Borneman, a consultant working with Fish and Game on WBO issues, and Troy Rahmig spoke about it this morning.

Ken posed the question, have we reached a tipping point with the western burrowing owl? If we have, this begs the question of what is the appropriate expanse to look at. 520,000 acres is not necessarily a very large area to focus on with respect to conservation. The Statewide discussions of owl conservation is that the owl is doing pretty well in the San Joaquin Valley and the Central Valley.

The City of San Jose is still in the early stages of their master planning process for the water pollution control plant (north of 237 in North San Jose). In beginning of the process, the question was whether the master planning process would be covered under the plan. Originally it was thought that it would not, though the question remains about how these processes will continue to interact. The question is how much push-back the city will receive when the master plan is reviewed, as alternatives to the land use plan are still being worked out.

San Jose's challenge is that the water pollution control plant is a San Jose-Santa Clara facility, and Santa Clara is not in the plan. Plus numerous other Districts contract for use of the facility. This is a case where many different partners have access to the facility, but only San Jose owns the land. Given the situation, San Jose needed to remain less proactive with respect to burrowing owl habitat in order to maintain relations with partners.

Ken asked, at what point does mitigation outside the study area becomes an option? Jan noted that this is what happened previously – the purchase of land in turn for the de facto extermination of owls. Troy noted the central role of economics here. The City of San Jose has asked us to demonstrate how creating a preserve could match up dollar for dollar to developing the land. Of course, it cannot.

Even in the case of land purchased near Byron in the San Joaquin Valley, the decision was to exchange burrowing owls for unproductive land. There are no owls in Byron.

Bryan noted that even if local partners could get permission to take mitigation outside of the county, he imagines the local partners would have to decide whether they want to do this. He also noted that had we undergone this process ten years ago, we would already be in the adaptive management phase and this would be considered a changed circumstance. Troy noted that this may not even be considered a changed circumstance given the status of the species.

Joanna asked, if we reach the point where we institutionally elect to go to the last resort, can you identify locations that would actually work for trans-locating? Is there any certainty?

Troy replied that no, there is very little certainty. Much land has been surveyed and owls do not exist there, or at least not in colonies. There is some certainty related to fostering burrowing owls in Santa Clara County, but prospects remain relatively uncertain. According to Ken, research with respect to trans-locating owls paints a very dire picture. This would be one of the things that would be done in a research driven, adaptive management way in coordination with FGD so we can learn something about owls, not just here but in general, and hopefully apply our new knowledge elsewhere.

Ken noted that we are dealing with a local, regional and Statewide policy issue that goes all the way to the top of FG, which is probably why it is difficult getting the detailed responses from FG to our local specific situation.

D) Levee Reconstruction

Kenn Reiller opened conversation with comment and a question for Don Arnold. If a levee encroaches on a riparian setback, he would like to think that this would require an alternatives analysis related to high-tech structures or a floodwall. He noted that opportunities exist to deal with setbacks and other things in the context of levee and floodwall construction and repair – today’s levee replacement won’t be like it was in the 50’s. Kenn also requested clarification related to how levees are counted. Ken requested that levee measurement be clearly explained in the plan. According to Don, the size of the levee is actually half the length described in the plan – since each side of the levee is counted in the total.

People have tried to do things in past to reduce conflict between levees and existing vegetation. Technology exists today to provide some possible alternatives. Kenn also requested that the plan distinguish between a credible levee and an illegitimate levee.

Don A. agreed, and noted that there are multiple definitions of levees: FEMA, Army COE, raised dirt, etc. We have worked hard to determine what we call a levee and have created a GIS layer to organize our understanding of our levees. Jones & Stokes will have a GIS layer that includes the levees in covered areas.

Conversation continued with questions related to levees and riparian vegetation. One stakeholder asked, can you commit to replacing shaded vegetation on a stream? Do we have to replace vegetation in kind? We may be able to add value where it didn’t exist before.

Jerry noted that there has been conservation action in South County to girdle and remove vegetation for the purposes of simulating successional mosaics along Uvas for least bells vireo and steelhead. He explained that when it comes to riparian vegetation and other habitat, there is such thing as too much of a good thing. For example, in a fast-water situation more sun is actually preferred to support steelhead. More shade equals less productivity with respect to algae growth, food, etc.

Kenn then asked if we can add dikes to the definition of levees and noted the similar function of levees and dikes with respect to habitat creation. Levees and dikes both collect water, creating potentially rich habitat.

Carolyn inquired regarding the status of the riparian setback. Ken noted that setbacks are a “yet to be discussed in detail” issue. There has been a lot of discussion among local partners, particularly regarding how setbacks should be applied to the variety of classes of creeks. The question becomes how to differentiate creek types and how to deal accordingly with setbacks. Sediment is also a central issue. There is a natural

tension between the natural function of creeks to move sediment and the negative impacts of too much sediment. The wrong amount of sediment in the wrong locations impedes spawning.

Questions asked currently include: to what extent should setbacks foster vegetation for fish, be designed to preclude activities that damage the creek, be designed to reduce sedimentation, etc.? Where we have ended up is to make a couple of differentiations. We have differentiated among setbacks for types of streams: ephemeral, intermittent and perennial. First, for ephemeral streams a setback of 35 feet is recommended. Below that, slopes over 30% should have greater setbacks. Then, the setback needs to be behind riparian vegetation – 50 feet behind riparian vegetation.

We have also differentiated between setbacks inside planned urban areas or outside planned urban areas. The proposed setback shrinks in higher density urban areas. In these areas, trying to determine a larger setback would create a situation in which many exceptions, or variances, are required given existing development patterns and the location of existing parcels.

Ken continued, stating that most developed creeks have been developed with shallow setbacks and so it is not very feasible to impose greater setbacks at this stage. We came up with a policy that is based on San Jose's policy. You are not allowed to develop closer than 35 ft. to the creek, but if you're within 30 and 75 feet you are required to pay a restoration fee. This is where we are trying to address the issue of maintaining the creek. This issue remains on the list of things to discuss with the Wildlife Agencies. A similar tension exists here related to what is ideal and what is working in the world.

Jack Sutcliffe asked if stream-side setbacks will apply to streams on agricultural or cultivated lands. Ken answered that setbacks would only apply to developed land. Cultivated land is not a covered activity.

In response to a question from Carolyn, Ken clarified that the HCP would set a minimum setback requirement and local agencies could always set requirements that exceed that minimum.

Jerry noted that setback may save habitat, but if you have a culvert you get increased sediment and may actually be worsening in-stream water quality. In this case, you have a riparian area good for habitat but are trashing habitat in-stream. An alternative to this situation could be a stronger focus on retaining run-off water on-site.

Ken told the group that there was a meeting in Sacramento a week ago during which it was agreed to target post-construction runoff to be no more than pre-construction run-off. However, upon reading the County drainage manual it seems this wouldn't work. Much of the County has clayey soils, so if you manage water exclusively on-site then stagnant water would remain on-site, causing potential public health issues. One of the regulatory forces requiring that water leave the development site is disease control. Ken noted the need to discuss this further.

Joanna stated that the HCP should refer to this process and to the importance of on-site management. Brian noted that in Los Angeles they store water underground in on-site detention ponds. Water Resources Control Board C3 provisions say that you must manage your hydrograph.

Ken reminded that group that that provision is one of the SF Board, and that the Central Coast Board is limited to Morgan Hill, Gilroy and San Martin. Regulations applicable to unincorporated county lands are limited to management of point sources.

Kenn suggested that unless there is a case study to illustrate what stream setbacks really accomplish, we'll run into situations on a case by case basis where we either deny people the ability to defend their property or we

will see more and more concrete along stream corridors. To have a rational argument, we need to look at other reasons why setbacks are important – we can't simply limit the argument to environmental reasons. Doing so does a disservice to people who buy property and have to deal with flooding conditions and resulting property damage. We need to characterize stream setbacks in a comprehensive way and look at what a city's mission and duty is.

E) Rangeland

Ken thanked Justin and Jack for participating in a recent meeting with Sheila Barry and the Santa Clara County Cooperative Extension. The extension is working with the California Rangeland Coalition and recently met in Morgan Hill with the Farm Bureau and rangeland owners. Ken noted that rangeland is a potentially very big missing piece of this plan. The California Rangeland Coalition is a consortium of rangeland owners, environmental groups, etc, and the preservation of rangeland and ranching and cattle lands is the issue that brings them together. Rangeland has significant habitat value but does not often get recognized for this value. The fish and wildlife group wants to find out where rangeland is in Santa Clara County. This seems compatible with many reserve strategies but we need GIS data to confirm that. The working landscapes have very important habitat functions and we really have not addressed that here, but we will. To begin, rangeland/pastureland needs to be clearly defined. It's possible to define almost anything wide open as rangeland.

Troy noted that agriculture and rangeland is a category used in Alameda County. It is easy in that county to identify rangelands because the County has a large parcel agricultural zoning policy that matches up pretty well with rangeland. We could use something similar here. The statewide map of critical rangeland habitat could serve as a useful resource.

Don Long suggested that there is definitely some confusion here: we call rangeland a variety of different things. The term can apply to open space, agricultural lands, etc., and there is additional confusion in terminology when looking at older maps and newer maps. Different jurisdictions are calling rangeland different names and setting different rules, which creates a difficult situation and a potential minefield for landowners with land in different jurisdictions. Carolyn asked how you would define rangeland. Troy responded that you could create an overlay of rangeland to address or include a variety of ownership and land uses.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT AND NEXT STEPS

There were no comments from members of the public. Joan noted that there will be updates given next month on other important issues. Please email Joan with issues of special interest for next month's agenda. For the next meeting, the group will discuss environmental baseline and impact assessment, and additional items identified by stakeholders.

Troy reminded group members that if they have specific items or pieces of information they wish to discuss or receive, please send to Joan and she will pass requests along to Jones & Stokes. Joan will send a reminder if she doesn't here from stakeholder group members. Ken also said that he has asked Suneil to report back from the meeting with Rep. Pelosi's office. Ken will give an update and we can also revisit this list for additional topics to discuss.

The next meeting will take place on April 28th. The meeting room will be on the agenda when it is distributed, but may also be subject to change.