# El Dorado County General Plan Biological Resources Policy Update Project

## Planning Commission April 27, 2017



12-1203 22Q 1 of 74

# Agenda

- Open Public Hearing
- Presentation
- Questions from Planning Commission
- Receive Public Comment
- Close Public Hearing
- Planning Commission Discussion
- Planning Commission Recommendation



#### **Presentation Overview**

- Purpose of Today's Hearing (Anne Novotny)
- Project Description and Objectives (Anne Novotny)
- Background and History (Anne Novotny)
- General Plan Biological Resources Policy Update Project (Dudek – Cathy Spence-Wells, Scott Eckhardt, Katherine Waugh)
- Environmental Review Process (Dudek)
- Public Involvement (Anne Novotny)
- **Staff Recommendation** (Anne Novotny)



3

### **Purpose of Today's Hearing**

- Planning Commission review and recommendation to Board of Supervisors regarding:
  - **1.** Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report
  - 2. Adoption of Amendments to General Plan Biological Resources Policies, Objectives and Implementation Measures
  - 3. Adoption of Oak Resources Management Plan
  - 4. Adoption of Oak Resources Conservation Ordinance



#### **Why Is This Project Important**

- Existing biological policies difficult and costly to implement
- Limited options and overlapping requirements for oak mitigation
- Current policies, such as requiring onsite preservation, constrain economic development opportunities in County's key growth areas such as Hwy 50 Corridor
- Oak woodland and oak canopy language unclear in current policies
- Lack of consensus by stakeholders and public on adequacy of data collected to date, and polarized views on approach to implement the policies
- Hwy 50 and surrounding development form substantial barrier to wildlife movement



5

# **PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES**



12-1203 22Q 6 of 74

#### **Project Description**

- Amendments to biological resources policies, objectives and implementation measures in 2004 General Plan, Conservation and Open Space Element
- Oak Resources Management Plan (ORMP)
  - Updates 2008 Oak Woodland Management Plan (OWMP)
  - Establishes in-lieu fee payment option
- Oak Resources Conservation Ordinance
  - Implements ORMP



# **PROJECT OBJECTIVES**



12-1203 22Q 8 of 74

## **Project Objectives**

- General Plan Policy Revisions
  - 1. Develop self-implementing biological resource policies
  - 2. Clearly define resources covered and development activities affected
  - 3. Streamline environmental review process
  - 4. Establish policies that comply with State and federal law

(Draft EIR, Chapter 3, Project Objectives, Section 3.3)



# **Project Objectives**

- Oak Resources Management Plan
  - 1. Define mitigation requirements for impacts to oak resources for oak resource management and conservation
  - 2. Comply with Implementation Measure CO-P
  - 3. Establish plan for voluntary conservation to use by landowners, County and others to seek grants/cost-sharing from state and federal funding for oak woodland conservation

(Draft EIR, Chapter 3, Project Objectives, Section 3.3)



# **BACKGROUND AND HISTORY**



12-1203 22Q 11 of 74

- County engaged in ongoing efforts to implement the biological resources policies in 2004 General Plan for over a decade
- Substantial resources (time and money) invested in this process which has not been completed
- Roadblocks to developing an Integrated Natural Resources
  Management Plan (INRMP) as required by Policy 7.4.2.8
- 2006 Settlement Agreement (GP lawsuit) limits Policy 7.4.4.4
  to Option A (oak canopy retention) until INRMP is adopted
- Delay in adopting in-lieu fee (Policy 7.4.4.4 Option B) impacting development



#### **Timeline 2004 – 2012**

#### 2004 General Plan Adopted / EIR Certified (7/19/04)

- In July 2006, policy issues requiring clarification presented to the Planning Commission
  - 1. Clarify intent/applicability of Policy 7.4.4.4
  - 2. Determine qualifications needed to prepare oak woodland inventory/impact assessment and mitigation/replacement program
  - 3. Define oak woodlands and related key terms
  - 4. Clarify exemptions to retention requirements of Policy 7.4.4.4
  - 5. Clarify 1:1 replacement requirements/options under Option A of Policy 7.4.4.4
  - 6. Establish process to consider minor modifications to retention/ replacement requirements if determined necessary to ensure reasonable use of property
  - 7. Clarify application of Policy 7.4.4.5 (Corridor Retention)



- In November 2006, Planning Commission adopted Interim Interpretive Guidelines for Policy 7.4.4.4 Option A and Biological Resources Study and Important Habitat Mitigation Program
- Policy 7.4.2.8 Integrated Natural Resources Management
  Plan (INRMP) process divided into two phases:
  - Phase 1 fact-finding (data collection, baseline conditions)
  - Phase 2 INRMP development and environmental review
- Two Board appointed committees were convened:
  - Plant and Wildlife Technical Advisory Committee (PAWTAC)
  - INRMP Stakeholders Advisory Committee (ISAC)

15

- May 2008 Board adopted Oak Woodland Management Plan (OWMP) - oak portion of the INRMP (Policies 7.4.4.4 and 7.4.5.2)
- June 2008 lawsuit filed asserting impacts from implementing OWMP not analyzed in General Plan EIR
- February 2010 Trial Court upheld the OWMP
- July 2012 Appellate Court held that County had not adequately evaluated environmental effects of the OWMP and required an EIR for the OWMP
- September 2012 County rescinded the OWMP and its implementing ordinance



16

- INRMP Phase 1 Completed in 2011
  - Oak Woodland Habitat Map (Board approved June 2007)
  - Initial Inventory & Mapping (Board adopted April 2008; Update adopted June 2010)
  - Indicator Species Report (Board accepted Oct 2010)
  - Wildlife Movement and Corridors Report (Board accepted Dec 2010)
- INRMP Phase II initiated in 2011
  - Draft RFP provided to the Board (June 2011)
  - Staff also presented list of 11 policy issues for Board direction to further refine the RFP

- INRMP Phase 2 Policies Issues presented to Board June 2011
  - 1. Mitigation Plan
  - 2. County ownership of fee title lands
  - 3. Land or easement acquisition from willing sellers
  - 4. Mitigation Plan funding mechanism
  - 5. Operational Costs
  - 6. General Plan Policies
  - 7. Williamson Act lands
  - 8. Agricultural lands
  - 9. Highway 50 (Caltrans facility) wildlife movement/safety
  - **10. Fire Prevention**
  - **11.** Oak Woodland Management Plan and Ecological Preserves

(See Legistar File 11-0330, Attachment 3E, Staff Memo dated 6/21/11)

- Options Memo presented to Board in September 2012
  - Report analyzed six different approaches to implementing the General Plan biological policies
  - Options 1 3: Implement Existing Policies (as written in the 2004 General Plan)
  - Options 4 6: Amend the biological policies for clarification
  - Staff recommended Option 6: Adopt a Resolution of Intention (ROI) to amend General Plan Policies 7.4.4.4, 7.4.4.5, 7.4.5.1, 7.4.5.2, 7.4.2.8, 7.4.2.9 and related Implementation Measures
- Board accepted staff's recommendation and directed staff to prepare the ROI and RFP to hire consultant to assist County with policy amendments and to prepare an EIR

(See Legistar File 12-1203, Attachment A, Staff Memo dated 6/20/12)

- Implementation of policies addressing protection of oak trees and oak woodlands has been difficult due to:
  - Policies controversial and difficult to apply uniformly due to different interpretations of policy language by various groups
  - Policy 7.4.4.4 open to interpretation over its intent, specifically whether to protect individual trees or oak woodland habitat (inclusive of area surrounding the trees)
  - Policy 7.4.4.4 Option B (in-lieu fee payment for impacts to oaks woodlands) is currently not available; limited to Option A only (oak canopy retention)



#### Proposed Development Potentially Projects Constrained by Policy 7.4.4.4 Option A (On-Site Retention)

- Proposed development projects that support the County's General Plan goals and objectives (such as economic development, creation of jobs, development of affordable housing, directing growth to areas with infrastructure) are:
  - Delaying or phasing projects can't meet on-site oak canopy retention requirements, or costs for monitoring plantings for 10 years
  - Design Modifications to accommodate on-site retention requirements, resulting in increased project costs and extended project completion dates
  - Potentially pushing development outside of Community Regions and into Rural Areas

21

#### County Transportation CIP Projects Constrained by Policies 7.4.4 and 7.4.5.2

- In-lieu fee option would help facilitate County's bridge replacement program and trail projects
  - Mitigation is inefficient each project must manage its own mitigation
  - Contract administration costs for planting and 10-year monitoring for each individual project substantial costs
  - Projects with oak mitigation must remain active in CIP for 5 years – additional administrative/budget expenses
  - Grant-funded projects typically only cover monitoring costs for first 5 years County has to fund for years 6-10
  - Grant-funded projects must remain open for 5 years grants not closed out in a timely manner



# GENERAL PLAN BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES POLICY UPDATE PROJECT

See Staff Report Exhibits B, B-1, and E (Legistar File 12-1203, Attachments 22F, 22G, and 22J)



12-1203 22Q 23 of 74

#### **Timeline 2014 – 2017**

2014	2015	2016	2017
Board contracted with Dudek (3/11/14) Dudek presented Board with Background and Options Memos (7/28/14) Board selected gation/Conservation Approach (10/7/14)	Board Workshops on 10 Decision Pts (Jan - Mar 2015) Board Workshop to present Draft Policy Revisions and Draft ORMP (5/18/15) Board adopts ROIs 108-2015 and 109-2015 (6/22/15) 118-2015 (7/14/15)	Draft EIR & Draft General Plan policies, ORMP, and Oak Resources Conservation Ordinance Released (6/30/16)	Final EIR Released (3/8/17)   Planning Commission Hearing (4/27/17)   Board Adoption Hearing (TBD)



### **Dudek Memos July 2014**

In July 2014, Dudek presented the Board with two memos:

- 1. Background Memo reviewed historical background and status of key General Plan biological policies and related implementation measures
- 2. Policy Options Memo outlined four broad policy options for the Board to consider

(See Legistar File 12-1203, Attachment 5B for Background Memo and Attachment 5C for Policy Options Memo)



# **Options Considered**

The four broad policy options proposed differing approaches to amending the General Plan Policies:

- Option 1: Compliance with State/Federal Regulations
- Option 2: Mitigation Approach
- ✓ Option 3: Mitigation/Conservation Approach
- Option 4: Conservation Approach

On October 7, 2014, the Board selected Option 3

(See Legistar File 12-1203, Attachment 5C and 6A)



12-1203 22Q 26 of 74

# **10 Key Decision Points**

- 1. ORMP In-Lieu Fee Study
- 2. Oak Resources Measurement Methodology
- 3. Roadway Undercrossing Requirements
- 4. Two-tiered Mitigation and Threshold
- 5. Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Update

- 6. Oak Mitigation Exemptions
- 7. Special Status Resource Mitigation
- 8. Important Biological Corridor (IBC) Standards
- 9. Whether to include Important Ecological Areas with PCAs & IBCs in Conservation Strategy
- **10. Database of Willing Sellers**



(See Legistar File 12-1203, Attachments 9B, 10A, 10B, 11A, 11B, 12A, 12B)

#### **Draft Policy Revisions & Draft ORMP**

- On May 18, 2015, Board Workshop to present Draft policy revisions and Draft Oak Resources Management Plan (ORMP)
- On June 22, 2015, Board Workshop to present Draft Oak Resources In-Lieu Fee Study and revised Draft Policies and revised Draft ORMP, and Draft Resolutions of Intention

(See Legistar File 12-1203, Attachments 13A – 13G)



### **Board Direction June 22, 2015**

#### **Resolutions of Intention (ROI)**

- No. 108-2015 Amend General Plan Biological Policies
- No. 109-2015 Amend
  Oak Woodland Management
  Plan (Retitled to Oak
  Resources Management Plan
- No. 118-2015 Amend General Plan Biological Policies (adopted 7/14/15; supersedes ROI 108-2015)



(See Legistar File 12-1203, Attachments 14C, 14D, 15A, 15B)

### **Proposed General Plan Amendments**

7.4.1.1, 7.4.1.2, 7.4.1.3, 7.4.1.4, 7.4.2.1, 7.4.2.4, 7.4.2.8, 7.4.2.9, 7.4.4.2, 7.4.4.3, 7.4.4.4	
7.4.1.5, 7.4.1.6, 7.4.1.7, 7.4.2.2, 7.4.2.6, 7.4.2.7, 7.4.4.5, 7.4.5.1, 7.4.5.2 (merge with Policy 7.4.4.4)	
7.4.1, 7.4.4, 7.4.3 (incorporated in Policy 7.4.2.1), 7.4.5 (merged with Objective 7.4.4)	
CO-L, CO-P	
CO-M & CO-U (per changes to Policy 7.4.2.8) CO-N (per changes to Policy 7.4.2.9)	

For details, see Table 3-1 in Staff Report Exhibit B (Legistar File 12-1203, Attachment 22F) \*Deleted for purposes of clarification and/or consolidation



- Proposed Policy 7.4.2.8 Biological Resources Mitigation Program
  - Restructure current INRMP requirements into the mitigation/conservation approach
  - Establish mitigation ratios to be applied uniformly county-wide
  - Conserves contiguous blocks of important habitat



- Proposed Policy 7.4.2.8 Discretionary development projects required to:
  - Prepare biological resources technical report that determines area of impact to each habitat type supported at project site
  - Mitigate impacts through preservation and/or creation to ensure current range and distribution of special-status species within the County are maintained
  - Provide for mitigation monitoring



- Proposed Policy 7.4.2.8 Self-implementing
  - Establishes standards for biological resources technical reports
  - Defines categories of plant and wildlife special-status species
  - Sets minimum ratios for mitigating impacts to all vegetation communities
  - Provides criteria for identifying mitigation sites



- Proposed Policy 7.4.2.9 Important Biological Corridors (IBCs) Overlay Standards
  - No net loss of wildlife movement function and value
  - Weber Creek Canyon
- Proposed Oak Resources Policies
  - Consolidated 7.4.4.4 and 7.4.5.2
  - Revised to refer to oak tree/woodland mitigation requirements in the ORMP



# OAK RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN (ORMP)

See Staff Report Exhibits C, C-1, and F (Legistar File 12-1203, Attachments 22H, 22P, and 22G)



12-1203 22Q 35 of 74

### **Oak Resources Management Plan**

- County encompasses approx. 1,800 square-mile area
- Nearly half the land area of the County falls under other jurisdictions (e.g., National Forest Lands, Bureau of Land Management, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit)
- ORMP would apply to areas within the County at or below 4,000-foot elevation, which encompasses approx. 872 square miles (560,000 acres)
- Acreage of Oak Woodland in ORMP Planning Area is approx. 247,000 acres (2015 FRAP Data)
- Projected Land Cover Conversion (of all habitat types) by
  2035 is approx. 13,000 acres (4,848 acres of oak woodland)


# **Oak Resources Management Plan**

- Updates 2008 Oak Woodland Management Plan (OWMP)
- Defines mitigation requirements for impacts to oak woodlands, individual native oak trees and Heritage Trees
- Outlines County's strategy for oak resource management and conservation
- Functions as the oak resources component of County's Biological Resources Mitigation Program identified in proposed Policy 7.4.2.8.
- Complies with Implementation Measure CO-P



# **Oak Resources Management Plan**

- Two-tiered mitigation approach
- Incorporates oak tree, heritage tree and oak woodland mitigation
- Incentive-based approach for oak woodland impact avoidance
- Identifies projects or actions exempt from oak woodland/oak tree mitigation requirements
- Criteria for identifying conservation lands outside of Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs)
- Technical report submittal requirements and minimum qualifications for report preparation
- Mitigation monitoring and reporting requirements



# **Oak Resources Mitigation Options**

- Acquire Conservation Easement, Deed Restriction, and/or Property
  - On-site and off-site options
- Replacement Tree Planting
  - On-site and off-site options
- In-lieu Fee Payment
- Combination of options



39

# **OAK RESOURCES CONSERVATION ORDINANCE**

See Staff Report Exhibits D and G (Attachments 22I and 22L to Legistar File 12-1203)



12-1203 22Q 40 of 74

# **Oak Resources Conservation Ordinance**

- Implements ORMP
- Provides detailed standards regulating oak resources including:
  - Definitions of Terms
  - Mitigation requirements and exemptions
  - Oak tree/oak woodland removal permit and reporting requirements
  - Enforcement and monitoring



# **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS**



12-1203 22Q 42 of 74

## **Environmental Review**

- The Program EIR evaluates range of potential impacts related to proposed policies and ORMP
- Adoption of GP policies and ORMP would not approve any construction or specific development projects
- Project-specific CEQA compliance required for any future discretionary actions



# **EIR Content**

- Draft Program EIR
  - Describes proposed project
  - Identifies impacts and levels of significance
  - Recommends mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts
  - Evaluates project alternatives that could reduce or avoid significant impacts

The Draft EIR is posted on the County website at following link: http://www.edcgov.us/Government/LongRangePlanning/Environmental/ BioPolicyUpdateDraftEIR.aspx



## **Resources Evaluated in the Draft EIR**

- Draft EIR, Chapters 5 9
  - Land Use and Planning (includes agricultural resources)
  - Biological Resources
  - Forestry Resources
  - Greenhouse Gases (focused on loss of carbon sequestration)
  - Visual Resources

The Draft EIR is posted on the County website at following link: http://www.edcgov.us/Government/LongRangePlanning/Environmental/

#### BioPolicyUpdateDraftEIR.aspx



# **Final EIR**

- Final EIR prepared following Draft EIR public circulation
- Final EIR includes:
  - Draft EIR comments and responses
    - Master Responses
    - Individual responses to comments
  - Revisions to Draft EIR
- Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (See Staff Report Exhibit A-3, Attachment 22E to Legistar File 12-1203)

The Final EIR is posted on the County website at following link: http://www.edcgov.us/Government/LongRangePlanning/Environmental/

#### BioPolicyUpdateDraftEIR.aspx



# **Environmental Review Timeline**

Notice of Preparation Released 7/17/15 (30-day review period ending 8/17/15)

Revised Notice of Preparation Released 11/23/15 (30-day review period ending 12/23/15)

> Draft EIR Released 6/30/16 (45-day review period ending 8/15/16)

County responds to Comments on DEIR in Final EIR (Final EIR Released 3/8/17)

You Are Here

Planning Commission Hearing (4/27/17)

Board certifies Final EIR, makes CEQA Findings, and adopts Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Board of Supervisors makes decision on Project

CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15082, et seq.

EIR Process

47

### **CEQA Public Noticing Requirements For EIRs**

Required by CEQA	Completed by County
Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR (30-day public review period)	First NOP Released 7/17/15 and Second NOP Released 11/23/17 for 30-day review periods
1 Public Scoping Meeting during NOP to receive comment on Draft EIR content	Public Scoping Meeting at Planning Commission meeting 8/13/15
Notice of Availability (NOA) of Draft EIR published in one newspaper of general circulation in project area	Legal Notices published in Mt. Democrat & Tahoe Tribune (6/29/16), and Georgetown Gazette (6/30/16)
Draft EIR (45-day public review period)	Draft EIR Released 6/30/16 for 45-day review period
Final EIR – Prepare written responses to comments on Draft EIR	Final EIR Released 3/8/16; Responses to comments included in Final EIR Chapter 3 (Master Responses in Chapter 2)



# SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES



12-1203 22Q 49 of 74

# **Significant Impacts**

- LU-2: Substantially alter or degrade the existing land use character of the County
- BIO-1: Result in the loss and fragmentation of wildlife habitat
- BIO-2: Have a substantial adverse effect on special-status species
- BIO-3: Have a substantial adverse effect on wildlife movement
- BIO-4: Result in the removal, degradation and fragmentation of sensitive habitats



# **Significant Impacts (Con't)**

- FOR-1: Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use
- FOR-2: Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use
- GHG-1: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment
- VIS-2: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the area or region



51

## **Mitigation Measures**

- MM BIO-1: Conservation Area Monitoring
  - Added language to proposed Policy 7.4.2.8 establishing requirements for mitigation monitoring
- MM BIO-2: Require Mitigation for Valley Oak Tree and Valley Oak Woodland Impacts
  - Added language to ORMP and Oak Resources Conservation Ordinance to exclude valley oak trees and woodlands from ORMP exemptions



# DRAFT EIR PROJECT ALTERNATIVES



12-1203 22Q 53 of 74

## **Draft EIR Project Alternatives**

- CEQA Requirements
  - Reasonable range
  - Reduce or avoid the proposed project's significant impacts
  - Feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives



# **Draft EIR Project Alternatives**

- Potential Alternatives Identified:
  - No Project
  - Minimum Oak Woodland Retention Requirement
  - No Net Loss of Oak Woodlands
  - Assessment District
  - Habitat Fragmentation/Wildlife Movement
  - No Development in Important Biological Corridors (IBC)
  - Replacement Tree Sizes
  - Conservation Alternative (smaller minimum habitat areas)



12-1203 22Q 55 of 74

# **Project Alternatives Evaluated**

- Alternative #1: No Project
  - Proposed General Plan amendments, ORMP and implementing ordinance would not be adopted
  - Future development would continue to be evaluated under existing General Plan policies
- Alternative #2: Minimum Oak Woodland Retention Requirement
  - Would require minimum 30% oak woodland retention for all future development at or below 4,000-foot elevation
  - Would require modification to ORMP and implementing ordinance



# SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO DRAFT EIR



12-1203 22Q 57 of 74

### **Changes to Proposed Project & Draft EIR**

- Minor corrections, additions and revisions
- Changes represent minor corrections/clarifications to the DEIR analysis as a result of public and agency comments and additional review by staff/consultants
- Changes do not constitute significant new information that would require recirculation of the Draft EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5)

These changes do not affect the significance of identified environmental impacts, nor the effectiveness of proposed General Plan policies.



(See Final EIR, Chapter 4 – Text Changes to the Draft EIR)

### **Changes to Proposed Project**

- 1. Changes to Policy 7.4.1.1 Removed the proposed language "where feasible" from the draft policy
- 2. Changes to proposed Policy 7.4.2.8 Subsections C & F
- 3. Revisions to land cover impact totals, including oak woodlands resulting from a calculation error
- 4. Agricultural Activities Exemption Would not apply to activities that require a Conditional Use Permit
- 5. Personal Use Exemption Clarify tree removal limits



### **Changes to Proposed Project & Draft EIR**

- 6. Revise proposed ORMP mitigation exemptions for consistency with Draft EIR Mitigation Measure BIO-2
- 7. Clarify scenic viewpoints on Hwy 50 near Bass Lake Road
- 8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Additional technical explanation/clarification of previously identified impacts



# **PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**



12-1203 22Q 61 of 74

### **Public Involvement Process/Timeline**

Over 10-year period (2006-2016), over 150 public meetings were held in which Project-related items were discussed.

2004 General Plan Implementation EIR Certification and General Plan Biological (Existing Policies, INRMP, OWMP) Resources Policy Update **Project Adoption** 2006 - 2012 2014-2016 2017 **Board of Supervisors Board of Supervisors** Planning Commission Meetings (58) Meetings/Workshops (17) Hearing (4/27/17) **Planning Commission Planning Commission** Meetings (21) Meetings (2) **Agricultural Commission** 19 Total **Board of Supervisors** Meetings (8) Hearing (Mid-2017) **ISAC Meetings (23)** Note: This list is not all inclusive and does **PAWTAC Meetings (22)** not include other presentations/meetings with individuals, community groups, etc. 132 Total

## Planning Commission Meetings 2006 - 2017

General Plan Biological Resources Policies discussed at 24 Planning Commission Meetings 2006 – 2017

Discussion	2006	2007	2008	2015 - 2017
Interim Oak Guidelines for Policies 7.4.4.4, 7.4.4.5, 7.4.5.1, 7.4.5.2	7/27, 8/10, 8/24, 9/14, 9/28, 10/12, 11/9	5/10		
Oak Woodland Management Plan (Policies 7.4.4.4 and 7.4.5.2)	11/16, 12/14	1/25, 2/9, 2/22, 4/26, 5/10, 10/11, 10/25, 12/13	3/13/18	
Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (Policy 7.4.2.8)			2/28, 3/27	
Biological Resources Policy Update/ORMP				8/13/15, 8/11/16, 4/27/17



63

# **Board Public Workshops 2014 - 2015**

#### 12 public workshops held in 2014-15 as summarized below

Date	Discussion
7/28/14	Review History/Background and Policy Options memos
10/7/14	Public comments and Board selection of Mitigation/Conservation Approach
11/21/14	Discussion of Oak Woodland Management Plan (OWMP) and in-lieu fee
1/13/15, 1/26/15, 2/23/15, 3/30/15	Public comment and Board direction on Decision Points 1 through 10
5/18/15	Public comment and Board direction on proposed draft policies and draft Oak Resources Management Plan (ORMP)
6/22/15	Presentation of revised draft policies and draft ORMP and initial presentation of draft Oak Resources In-Lieu Fees Nexus Study
7/14/15	ROI 118-2015 (supersedes ROI 108-2015) to more accurately reflect proposed amendments to the General Plan biological polices
8/13/15	EIR Scoping Meeting during Planning Commission meeting
9/29/15	Discussion of key comments raised during Draft EIR NOP public comment period on Draft ORMP and Draft Oak Resources In-Lieu Fee Nexus Study

### **Public Notification Methods**

- *Legal Notices* published in all major local newspapers
- NOP/NOA Postings at County Recorder's Office, by main public entrances to County Buildings A, B & C, and at all **County public libraries**
- **Direct Mailings** to approx. 200 interested parties, agencies, Native American Tribal and Military contacts and including tribal contacts provided by the Native American Heritage Commission (AB 52 and SB 18)
- *County Website Postings* on County website's home page under News & Hot Topics and email notifications sent to News & Hot Topics subscriber list (over 1,400 subscribers)
- **Project Webpage** frequent updates; NOPs and NOA posted on dedicated project web page
- **Email Blasts** to over 1,300 subscribers to Long Range Planning **News & Updates**
- **Direct Emails** to external agencies and other interested parties
- *Flyers* Project Fact Sheets posted prior to many public meetings



#### County updating General Plan's biological policies By Chris Daley From page A1 | July 27, 2015

Public hearings will be set

Nows

El Dorado County's 2006 Oak Woodlands Management Plan. newly rechristened as the Oak Resources Management Plan, is once again getting a makeover

Developed by the Long Range Planning Division of the Community Development Agency, the biological policy update project's new resolution of intention was presented by Principal Planner Shawna Purvines at the Board of Supervisors' July 14 meeting. Initially slated on the Consent Calendar, the items were moved off for discussion at the urging of local resident/activist Jamie Beutler and others.

As explained by Purvines, the new ROI was needed because an earlier version "didn't accurately reflect the language of dealing with the ORMP and Rare Plants." Both are part of the General Plan's Chapter 7 - Conservation and Open Space Element - and the issue goes back nearly a decade. The original Oak Woodlands Management Plan was overturned by a court decision, in part, because the county did not adequately address mitigation methods regarding removal or disruption of oaks and oak woodlands in its environmental impact report.

**General Plan Biological Resources Policy Update Project Fact Sheet** 



Meeting

1:00 p.m. on Thurse

seek input and com

scope and content of th

series of five public w ps were held with the Bo

cussion of the 10 dec

ary 13, 2015. Work

Email or Call: Shawna Purvines shawna.purvines@ed (530) 621-5362 Direct (530) 621-4650 Main

ironmental analyses to i

he County is updating the biological resources poli easures in the County's General Plan and the Oak Public Scoping RMP). The project requires the comp August 13, 2015 from public agencies and



included in the draft EIR Regular Meeting of the Planning Commi PC Hearing Room, Bldg. e Ct., Placery Public Workshops

Court over-ruled that decision, ren nitigate impacts

per 2012, the Board of Sup ent to amend the Conse envation of Biological rvation and Open Space Element of the ation Measures. In March 2014, the Board approved a three-yea Iting firm Dudek to assist the County with this pro ieneral Plan biological po



Draft EIR Public Review Period (Public Meetings) Planning Commission Hearing on Final EIR Board of Supervisors Hearing/Adoption of Final EIR Nov - Dec 2015 April 2016

Revised: 7/14/2015 For more information, visit the project webpage on the County website

65

# **Dedicated Project Webpage**

#### **General Plan Biological Resources Policy Update**

The County is updating the biological resources policies and implementation measures in the General Plan and the County's former Oak Woodland Management Plan (OWMP), now referred to as Oak Resources Management Plan (ORMP). The project requires the completion of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

On March 8, 2017, the County released a Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for this Project. The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for this project consists of the Final EIR and the Draft EIR (incorporated by reference in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15132). The Final EIR contains the public and agency comments received on the Draft EIR. All written comments received during the public review period (June 30, 2016 through August 15, 2016), and responses to each of those comments, are included in the Final EIR. The Final EIR also includes those pages from the Draft EIR and its appendices that have been revised in response to comments.

On Thursday, April 27, 2017 at 2:00 p.m., the Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to receive public comment and prepare recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding the Final EIR and the General Plan Biological Resources Policy Update, ORMP, and Oak Resources Conservation Ordinance Project. The hearing will be held in the Building C Hearing Room at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667. The Planning Commission Agenda is available online at: *(Meeting Details)*.

The Final and Draft EIR documents are posted at the following link

- Background Information
- Scope of Work
- General Plan Biological Policies
- Board of Supervisors/Planning Commission Agenda Items
- Board Workshop Attachments (Legistar File #: 12-1203)
- Supporting Documents

Features detailed project information organized in "accordions"

Project webpage

and GovDelivery

Notices sent to

Range Planning

(approx. 1,400)

frequently updated

subscribers to Long

News and Updates

#### http://www.edcgov.us/Government/LongRangePlanning/Environmental/BioPolicyUpdate.aspx





# STAFF AND PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION



12-1203 22Q 67 of 74

## Preparing Recommendation for Board Consideration on Final EIR

- County's environmental manual for CEQA implementation requires that when the Planning Commission is required to make a recommendation on a project, the Commission shall also review, consider, and make recommendations on the environmental document
- Board action of certifying the EIR does not approve or deny the project; it finds that the EIR adequately analyzed the project as described in the project description
- Board is ultimately responsible for certifying the EIR, making Findings of Fact and adopting Statement of Overriding Considerations

68

# **Staff Recommendation**

- Staff recommends Planning Commission forward a recommendation to Board of Supervisors to take the following actions:
  - 1. Adopt Resolution to Certify Final EIR for General Plan Biological Resources Policy Update, Oak Resources Management Plan, and Oak Resources Conservation Ordinance (Exhibit A)
    - A. Make Environmental Findings of Fact (Exhibit A-1)
    - **B.** Adopt Statement of Overriding Considerations (Exhibit A-2)
    - C. Approve Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Exhibit A-3)



# Staff Recommendation (Con't)

- 2. Adopt Resolution to Amend the Biological Resources Policies, Objectives and Implementation Measures in El Dorado County General Plan (Exhibit B);
- 3. Adopt Resolution adopting Oak Resources Management Plan (Exhibit C); and
- 4. Adopt Oak Resource Conservation Ordinance (Exhibit D) to be incorporated into County Code of Ordinances, Title 130 (Zoning Ordinance) as Chapter 130.39 (Oak Resources Conservation)



70

# **Draft Board Adoption Documents**

	Document	Staff Report Exhibit	Legistar 12-1203 Attachment
1.	Resolution Certifying the EIR	Α	22B
2.	CEQA Findings of Fact	A-1	22C
3.	Statement of Overriding Considerations	A-2	22D
4.	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	A-3	22E
5.	Resolution Adopting an Amendment to the Biological Resources Policies, Objectives and Implementation Measures in the General Plan	В	22F
6.	Resolution Adopting Oak Resources Management Plan	С	22H
7.	Resolution Adopting Oak Resources Conservation Ordinance	D	221

# **Draft Board Adoption Documents**

	Document	Staff Report Exhibit	Legistar 12-1203 Attachment
8.	Conservation and Open Space Element	B-1	22G
9.	Conservation and Open Space Element (with Errata and underline/strikeout)	E	22J
10.	Oak Resources Management Plan	C-1	22P
11.	Oak Resources Management Plan (with Errata and underline/strikeout)	F	22K
12.	Oak Resources Conservation Ordinance	D	221
13.	Oak Resources Conservation Ordinance (with Errata and underline/strikeout)	G	22L
14.	Final EIR (link to document on County website)	I	22N
15.	Draft EIR (link to document on County website)	J	220

# **Next Steps in this Hearing**

- Questions from Planning Commission
- Receive Public Comment
- Close Public Hearing
- Planning Commission Discussion
- Planning Commission Recommendation



# **Options for Preparing Final Recommendation to the Board**

- Option 1 Recommend adoption of the Project as Proposed (without modifications)
  - Commission may to choose to recommend adoption of the Project as proposed
- Option 2 No Recommendation
  - Commission may choose not to offer a recommendation to the Board on any or some of the project components, as the Commission deems appropriate
- Option 3 Selective Recommendations
  - Commission is not required to advise the Board on all of the policy changes and other components of the Project, and may choose to make selected recommendations only

