

Comments on Draft El Dorado County Oak Woodland Management Plan 9/12/07
From Gene Thorne

#13
Draft
Owmp

1. Figure S-1 is very difficult to read because of color choices and the large amount of information contained. Colors tend to blend together.
2. Farming and ranching operations have historically not intended to save oak woodlands in their operations.
3. Objective 4, p. 4 is unclear.
4. Discussions of values of ecosystem functions are meaningless in terms of their cash value when compared with the cost of acquiring the land.
5. Unclear as to plantings not fulfilling more than one-half of the mitigation requirements. Is this for both Option A and B?
6. Much of the Plan seems to be directed into redesigning all projects. While it is understood projects should be designed to minimize disruption of oak habitat, the whole idea of the mitigation is to *mitigate* for those trees that cannot be saved and still have a viable project.
7. The thresholds of significance don't seem to reflect the General Plan designations for developable areas. The Plan seems to revisit the whole idea of the General Plan with the unwritten conclusion no trees are to be removed in developable areas and mitigation is just a buzzword.
8. What are the certain projects that will be exempt from impact significance thresholds and mitigation? (p.23)
9. Little credence is given to the cost to the County of lost tax revenue for County owned mitigation sites. Although lost revenue is acknowledged it would seem that more importance should be placed on maintaining conservation easements and still having private ownership. This would push the costs to the lower end of the scale.
10. It is also an unwritten underlying fact that grants and other public monies should be sought after, thus giving way to the conclusion that we may be developing a large money sink. The idea of looking for existing, healthy woodlands that have generally maintained themselves naturally should be more strongly endorsed.
11. The monitoring and reporting section can certainly be reduced in cost if item 10 above is considered during the acquisition process.
12. The items on the list on p.35, especially the final bullet, are punitive in nature, especially when the developer pays to the County the fee. How can the developer's project be subject to revocation if he has paid the fee and some other party or entity is maintaining or not maintaining it?

2007 SEP 24 PM 4: 59
RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
EL DORADO COUNTY