

**From:** Marti Kie <mkie@water.ca.gov>  
**To:** DOM\_SA.PO\_PBR(AitchiD)  
**Date:** 5/18/99 4:14PM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Re: species goals

>Date: Tue, 18 May 1999 10:52:35 -0700  
>To: michael\_fris@mail.fws.gov  
>From: Marti Kie <mkie@water.ca.gov>  
>Subject: Re: species goals

>  
>Mike,

>  
>it is Lester asking the question of why we are pushing so hard to recover  
>species that the program will not impact. If the potential to impact the  
>species is low to non-existent, why are we going beyond the actions in the  
>ERP? We have never said that mitigation for any program impact wouldn't be  
>necessary, therefore for the Mason's lilaepsis the impact from the levee  
>and conveyance programs would be mitigated at whatever ratio is deemed  
>necessary. The actions within the ERP for Mason's lilaepsis should then be  
>enough to get us to the standard of doing more than mitigation. There are  
>also actions that are apart of the Levee program that will consider  
>M.lilaepsis, so it is well covered.

>  
>I don't know why I am having such a hard time with this, but I am.

>  
>I realize the Antioch dunes are within the Eco zones but we will not be  
>impacting the dunes or the suite of species that inhabit the dunes in any of  
>our actions. The ERP threw in the protection of 50-100 acres due to this  
>being an ecosystem plan and that was a doable part of ecosystem protection.  
>Why do we need more? We aren't going to be managing the habitat, I would  
>imagine that whomever owns the contiguous part would have the part that is  
>acquired with ERP funds deeded over. You tell the stakeholders that they  
>are going to be paying for the management of a species that will have not  
>been impacted by this program one iota.

>  
>At 09:16 AM 5/18/99 -0700, you wrote:

>> Mason's lilaepsis is found only in the delta and suisun. It's also  
>> found on the types of habitat which levee actions may directly impact.

>>  
>> Antioch dunes is a riverbank dune system along the lower San Joaquin  
>> River and is included in the ERP Delta ecozone. It's got a unique  
>> assortment of plants and animals which are on the evaluated species  
>> list.

>>  
>> This area is already included in the ERP; additional measures were  
>> included in the CS.

>>  
>> I certainly dont think that the conservation measures included are in  
>> any way out of line. The additional actions (apart from ERP goal of  
>> protecting 50-100 acres) consist of attempting to replant host plants,  
>> and looking for additional restoration areas, and the umbrella  
>> "coordinate with other recovery efforts". All the 'additional' stuff  
>> included would be done anyway while properly managing for Antioch  
>> Dunes species. It would be included in any management program for the

>> area.  
>>  
>> If anyone truly believes what is suggested below: that CALFED's  
>> ecosystem restoration program should only attempt to recover species  
>> for which take authorization is needed, I'd suggest that they bring it  
>> up to Lester, and have him make CS Policy Group decide.  
>>  
>>

>> \_\_\_\_\_ Reply Separator  
>> \_\_\_\_\_

>>Subject: species goals  
>>Author: Marti Kie <mkie@water.ca.gov> at ~INTERNET  
>>Date: 05/17/1999 3:11 PM  
>>

>>My mind is gone. Do we have it written down anywhere why the Big R species  
>>were so chosen? Same with little r? Why do we think that Mason's  
>>lilaeopsis should be big R? Why Lange's metalmark? I thought that for  
>>those species that weren't going to be significantly impacted by the  
>>program, but that were gaining a significant benefit from implementing some  
>>program actions, they were recoverable almost incidentally. Lange's  
>>metalmark for instance. I was told at one point, though I don't remember  
>>by whom, that through the ERP's target of protecting an additional  
>>50-100 acres of Antioch dunes habitat, that would recover the butterfly.  
>>But now we are saying other stuff needs to be done. So why are we  
>>recovering a species that will probably not be detrimentally impacted by  
>>the program at all, will probably not be on a take permit due to there  
>>being no impact, and is definitely not one of the focus species. Please  
>>explain, or reexplain this to me in plain English so that I can explain it  
>>to our agencies and stakeholders.

>>  
>>Thanks.  
>>  
>>Marti  
>>