



<osciorelli@cooperthorne.com>  
12/12/2007 04:53 PM

To <oaks@edcgov.us>  
cc <pmaurer@co.el-dorado.ca.us>  
bcc  
Subject Comments to draft OWMP

# 25  
Draft  
owmp

Dear Peter,

I would like to complement staff for a good work on the plan and getting it to a manageably sized document.

Below are my comments and suggestions on draft OWMP:

1. Pg 5; I would like the staff to rephrase first paragraph regarding 100' defensible space is a part of the project footprint. I am concerned that this will be viewed as a requirement by staff planners down the road ( requirement to place 100' zone around a building envelope and consider it as an impact and therefore apply a mitigation measures).
2. The defensible space has to be defined as 100' or a property line which ever is less.
3. Pg 5; I don't believe that the OWMP is a place for Affordable Housing incentives and reductions. That belongs to housing element or AH ordinance.
4. Pg 6; I believe that any oak canopy removal under the Option A should be mitigated at 1:1 ratio as Policy 7.4.4.4. suggests. If you punish applications for keeping the oak canopy removal under option A, you will find that some developers will do a clear cut and pay the fee. After all it is all the same.
5. Pg 7; Policy 7.4.4.4 clearly states that under the Option A a replacement ratio is 1:1. I would like to see a study supporting 2:1 mitigation (off-site or in-lieu fee) under the Option A. The applicant should be able to pay mitigation fee at 1:1 ratio if he/she stays within the Option A.
6. Pg 7; I would like to clarify bullet #6. I suggest that a definition of defensible space would be included (100' or a property line which ever is less). It may be an instance that 100' DS extends over the public right of way and cut or fill on another side, which would be appropriate for on-site replanting. Please do not limit this option.
7. I agree with the methodology used to come up with the fee but I disagree with some of the assumptions. Acquisitions should be based on 500 ac or at least 100ac. Some assumptions are excessive like survey equipment (\$1000 per every acre and \$950 fuel treatment per acre).
8. Please correct calculation error on Pg B-13; 30% of \$2,337 is \$701, not \$234. That brings Monitoring fee component to \$3,038 and not to \$2600.
9. There is no language included giving exceptions for dead dying and diseased oak trees as there are no exemptions for non-oak species. It is not clear if an applicant is expected to mitigate for pines, cottonwoods and etc. Please clarify.
10. There is not time line given for a preparation of Oak Tee Replacement Plan prepared by the qualified professional. In Interim Guidelines it is grading permit. Please include that language so it is not open to interpretation by the planning staff down the road.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my comments. I am looking forward seeing final plan.

Best regards,  
Sincerely,

**Olga Sciorelli, P.E.**

**CTA** Engineering & Surveying  
3233 Monier Circle  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95742  
Phone: (916) 638-0919 / Fax: (916) 638-2479  
[osciorelli@cooperthorne.com](mailto:osciorelli@cooperthorne.com)