

## Outline for Planning Commission, February 22, 2007

**Goal for today's meeting:** To begin to identify and review key policy issues/questions that will need to be addressed in the OWMP. Upon completion of this task, staff will provide the Board of Supervisors with a status report on the OWMP and the policy issues/questions that have been raised and seek further direction from the Board prior to directing the consultant team to finalize the public review draft of the OWMP. Staff suggests that the Planning Commission begin this discussion today and then continue the discussion to March 22.

### Key Issues for Review/Discussion:

**1) Review OWMP Purpose:** As an integral part of the future Integrated Resource Management Plan (INRMP) the purpose of the OWMP is to identify important oak woodland areas and protection and mitigation strategies for those areas; and provide guidance for acquisition and management of lands or easements necessary to implement the plan. It also will act as the guiding document for implementation of the "Option B" Mitigation Fee and must be in place before the mitigation fee program can be implemented (See GP Policies 7.4.2.8 & 7.4.4.4).

**2) Identify Oak Woodlands that Should be Addressed by the OWMP:** Confirm whether the oak woodland types identified in the mapping by the consultant team to-date encompass the "important" oak woodlands that were intended to be addressed by the General Plan.

*EN2 is available to review mapping with the Commission as part of this discussion item.*

**3) Confirm the Criteria for Determining Important and High Priority Oak Woodlands:** Confirm whether the criteria identified by the consultant team defining important and high priority oak woodlands are consistent with what was intended to be addressed by the General Plan.

*EN2 is available to review the importance/priority criteria with the Commission as part of this discussion item.*

**4) Review the Assumptions for the Mitigation Fee and Work Toward Identifying the set of Assumptions to Use for Developing the Fee.**

*EN2 is available to review these assumptions with the Commission.*

**5) Work Toward Clarifying Policy 7.4.4.4 as needed through the OWMP:**

- Review Policy Thresholds (parcel based, woodland based, % of canopy cover, etc)
- Determine if Option A (on-site retention/replacement) is necessary once the OWMP and Mitigation Fee are in place or should all project impacts be addressed through the mitigation fee program or some combination of the two depending on the type of resource affected?
- Should the County determine whether Option A or the Mitigation Fee is used for mitigation or should that be left to applicants' discretion?
- Should location (urban/rural) or type of resource be a factor to determine if Option A or the Mitigation Fee should be used for mitigating a project's impacts?
- Should the Mitigation Fee to implement the OWMP be based on impacted oak tree canopy or on oak woodland habitat area (oak woodland habitat can include a variety of non-oak species while oak tree canopy only consists of oak tree species)?
- Confirm that the mitigation ratios in 7.4.4.4 (1:1, 2:1) should also be assumed for the OWMP.
- Confirm that higher mitigation ratios should apply in the IBC and possibly other sensitive habitat areas (see GP Policy 7.4.2.9).