



Development Scenario 1: Infill/Moderate Income Housing

- 5.08-acre Site (Same site as Development Scenario 1 in Policy Options Memo)
- Oak woodland coverage – 1.35 acres
- Actual zoned parcel in El Dorado County
- No field evaluations conducted

Development examples on the following pages identify:

- Example 1: Full development envelope (2.45 acres)
- Example 2: Woodland-avoidance development envelope (1.91 acres)

Each of the four broad policy options presented in the Policy Options Memo are evaluated for the two development examples.

Assumptions:

The following assumptions for oak woodland/tree mitigation are based on ordinances or practices employed in local or surrounding jurisdictions. These mitigation values and ratios are provided for reference only and are not recommendations.

- Conservation easements acquired at a 2:1 ratio (consistent with OWMP)
- Oak woodland in-lieu fee payment based on 2008 El Dorado County Oak Woodland Management Plan at \$4,700/acre
- Oak tree replacement planting conducted on an inch-for-inch basis, where one 15-gallon tree equals 1 inch trunk diameter (consistent with Placer County, other jurisdictions)
- Tree replacement plantings to be monitored/maintained for 7 years (consistent with PRC 21083.4)
- Oak tree in-lieu fee payment based on \$100/diameter inch of removed tree(s)



Example 1: Full Development Envelope

Policy Option 1: Compliance with State and Federal Regulations

- Oak woodland mitigation only (consistent with PRC 21083.4)
 - 0.7 acres of woodland impacted, mitigation options include: conservation easement acquisition (1.4 acres), tree planting (up to 0.7 acres), in-lieu fee to state or county fund (\$3,290)
- Use GP EIR definition of special-status biological resources and require compliance with state and federal requirements for evaluation and mitigation of impacts to biological resources (e.g., vegetation communities, plants, wildlife)
- Applicant responsible for mitigation program design and documenting success; County staff to verify compliance
- County staff responsible for evaluating the project's proposed biological mitigation in the context of meeting the requirements of state and federal law and being adequate for the purposes of CEQA
- County staff responsible for evaluating the project's cumulative impacts (such as from habitat loss and fragmentation) analysis and adequacy of mitigation, tiering from the General Plan Amendment EIR

Policy Option 2: Mitigation Approach

- Mitigation for impacts to oak woodlands (PRC 21083.4) AND individual trees (outside of woodlands)
 - 0.7 acres of oak woodland impacted and will require mitigation
 - Conservation easement, tree planting, in-lieu fee to state or county fund
 - Oak trees outside of woodlands impacted and will require mitigation
 - Planting (inch-for-inch replacement) or fee payment (e.g. \$100/trunk diameter inch removed)
- Use GP EIR definition of special-status biological resources and require compliance with County mitigation requirements specific to each category of special-status resources (e.g., vegetation communities, plants, wildlife)
- Applicant responsible for mitigation program design and documenting success; County to verify compliance
- Applicant required to provide undercrossings for future 4- and 6-lane roadway projects (if applicable) and project design must not result in barriers to wildlife movement
- County Staff responsible for evaluating the project's cumulative impacts (such as from habitat loss and fragmentation) analysis and adequacy of mitigation, tiering from the General Plan Amendment EIR

Policy Option 3: Mitigation/Conservation Approach

- Mitigation for impacts to oak woodlands OR oak trees (criteria defined in the OWMP)
 - Oak woodland mitigation (same as Option 2), or
 - Oak tree mitigation (within and outside woodlands) via replacement planting or fee payment
- Use GP EIR definition of special-status biological resources and require compliance with County mitigation requirements specific to each category of special-status resources (e.g., vegetation communities, plants, wildlife), as well as PCA and IBC standards
- Applicant required to provide undercrossings for future 4- and 6-lane roadway projects (if applicable) and project design must not result in barriers to wildlife movement
- County would provide mitigation assistance by maintaining a database of willing sellers within PCAs and IBCs
- Applicant's cumulative analysis could rely on conformance with the OWMP, PCAs, and IBCs to address cumulative impacts (such as from habitat loss and fragmentation) and mitigation, utilizing the General Plan Amendment EIR cumulative analysis
- Applicant responsible oak mitigation planting/monitoring/reporting or fee payment and County responsible for managing in-lieu fees or verifying successful completion of mitigation requirements

Policy Option 4: Conservation Approach

- Mitigation for impacts to oak woodlands AND oak trees (criteria defined in the OWMP)
 - Oak woodland mitigation (same as Option 2), and
 - Oak tree mitigation (within and outside woodlands) via replacement planting or fee payment
- Use Phase II of the INRMP for definition of special-status biological resources and mitigation requirements specific to each category of special-status resources, as well as PCA and IBC standards
- County would provide mitigation assistance by maintaining a database of willing sellers within PCAs and IBCs
- Applicant's cumulative analysis could rely on conformance with the INRMP (including the OWMP, PCAs, and IBCs) to address cumulative impacts (such as from habitat loss and fragmentation) and mitigation, utilizing the General Plan Amendment EIR cumulative analysis
- Applicant responsible oak mitigation planting/monitoring/reporting or fee payment and County responsible for managing in-lieu fees or verifying successful completion of oak mitigation requirements
- County would be responsible for managing biological mitigation fees and acquiring/managing conservation lands or easements in perpetuity



Example 2: Woodland Avoidance Development Envelope

Example 2 is provided to highlight a potential scenario where the oak woodland impacts in Example 1 result in the need to modify the project design. For example, oak woodland mitigation costs may make Example 1 infeasible financially for the applicant. Alternatively, oak mitigation requirements may make the project design infeasible in respect to oak canopy retention and replacement requirements, in the absence of an in-lieu fee payment option.

Policy Option 1: Compliance with State and Federal Regulations

- Oak woodlands avoided; no mitigation required
- Use GP EIR definition of special-status biological resources and require compliance with state and federal requirements for evaluation and mitigation of impacts to biological resources (e.g., vegetation communities, plants, wildlife)
- Applicant responsible for mitigation program design and documenting success; County staff to verify compliance
- County Staff responsible for evaluating the project’s proposed biological mitigation in the context of meeting the requirements of state and federal law and being adequate for the purposes of CEQA
- County Staff responsible for evaluating the project’s cumulative impacts (such as from habitat loss and fragmentation) analysis and adequacy of mitigation, tiering from the General Plan Amendment EIR

Policy Option 2: Mitigation Approach

- Oak woodlands avoided so no woodland mitigation required
- Individual trees impacted require mitigation
 - Planting (inch-for-inch replacement) or fee payment (e.g. \$100/trunk diameter inch removed)
- Use GP EIR definition of special-status biological resources and require compliance with County mitigation requirements specific to each category of special-status resources (e.g., vegetation communities, plants, wildlife)
- Applicant responsible for mitigation program design and documenting success; County staff to verify compliance
- Applicant required to provide undercrossings for future 4- and 6-lane roadway projects (if applicable) and project design must not result in barriers to wildlife movement
- County Staff responsible for evaluating the project’s cumulative impacts (such as from habitat loss and fragmentation) analysis and adequacy of mitigation, tiering from the General Plan Amendment EIR

Policy Option 3: Mitigation/Conservation Approach

- Oak woodlands avoided so no woodland mitigation required; individual trees impacted require mitigation (same as Option 2)
- Use GP EIR definition of special-status biological resources and require compliance with County mitigation requirements specific to each category of special-status resources (e.g., vegetation communities, plants, wildlife), as well as PCA and IBC standards
- Applicant required to provide undercrossings for future 4- and 6-lane roadway projects (if applicable) and project design must not result in barriers to wildlife movement
- County would provide mitigation assistance by maintaining a database of willing sellers within PCAs and IBCs
- Applicant’s cumulative analysis could rely on conformance with the OWMP, PCAs, and IBCs to address cumulative impacts (such as from habitat loss and fragmentation) and mitigation, utilizing the General Plan Amendment EIR cumulative analysis
- Applicant responsible oak mitigation planting/monitoring/reporting or fee payment and County responsible for managing in-lieu fees or verifying successful completion of mitigation requirements

Policy Option 4: Conservation Approach

- Oak woodlands avoided so no woodland mitigation required; individual trees impacted require mitigation (same as Option 2)
- Use Phase II of the INRMP for definition of special-status biological resources and mitigation requirements specific to each category of special-status resources, as well as PCA and IBC standards
- County would provide mitigation assistance by maintaining a database of willing sellers within PCAs and IBCs
- Applicant’s cumulative analysis could rely on conformance with the INRMP (including the OWMP, PCAs, and IBCs) to address cumulative impacts (such as from habitat loss and fragmentation) and mitigation, utilizing the General Plan Amendment EIR cumulative analysis
- Applicant responsible oak mitigation planting/monitoring/reporting or fee payment and County responsible for managing in-lieu fees or verifying successful completion of mitigation requirements
- Applicant responsible oak mitigation planting/monitoring/reporting or fee payment and County responsible for managing in-lieu fees or verifying successful completion of mitigation requirements
- County would be responsible for managing biological mitigation fees and acquiring/managing conservation lands or easements in perpetuity