Late Distribution 7-13-15 EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Public Comment: BOS Meeting July 14, 2015; Agenda Item #30; File #12-1203

1 message

Cheryl <Cheryl.FMR@comcast.net> Mon, Jul 13, 2015 at 1:56 PM
To: "bosone"@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us

Public Comment

BOS Meeting of July 14, 2015

Agenda Item # 30

File # 12-1203

Supervisors:

The revised Resolution of Intention (ROI) for the Oak Resources Management Plan does not include mention of ***oak retention standards***, in fact, it specifically ***excludes*** retention standards:

Table
Summary of Revisions to General Plan Objectives, Policies, and Implementation Measures

General Plan Objective/Policy/ Implementation Measure	Changes Made
	oak woodland mitigation (Policies 7.4.4.4) and oak tree mitigation (including heritage trees (Policy 7.4.5.2). Framework removes necessity for two oak woodland mitigation options (Option A and B) and removes retention standards by incorporating an incentive-based approach for oak woodland impact avoidance. • Revisions to projects or actions exempt from oak woodland and oak tree mitigation requirements. • Addition of criteria for conservation area identification outside of Priority Conservation Areas (PCA).

At the June 22, 2015 Biological Resources meeting it was determined oak retention standards ***would*** be a part of the process:

12-1203 PC BOS Rcvd 7-13-15

A motion was made by Supervisor Ranalli, seconded by Supervisor Veerkamp to Approve this matter, Adopt Resolution's 108-2015 and 109-2015 and direct staff to:
Consider project alternatives as part of the environmental review process including:
1) Adding oak resource retention standards;
2) Options for Individual Oak Tree (IOT) replacement mitigation (e.g. acorn to 15 gallon potted tree) and associated analysis of the implications for the In-lieu Fee Nexus study based on these options, and
3) Oak resource mitigation requirements related to discretionary and ministerial projects.

This ROI should be revised to reflect this change.

In conclusion, I must say it is clear—through the language in this ROI and the Oak Resources Management Plan—that many of the mitigation measures that supported the 2004 General Plan are being eliminated/undercut. Oaks are a valuable, virtually irreplaceable asset. **Please, do not adopt this ROI until it includes language that *supports oak retention***.

Cheryl Langley

Shingle Springs Resident

12-1203 PC BOS Rcvd 7-13-15