

**ATTACHMENT 4  
SUMMARY OF OWMP TAC COMMENTS &  
RECOMMENDATIONS  
MARCH 22, 2007**

**ATTACHMENT 4**  
**OAK WOODLAND MANAGEMENT PLAN**  
**SUMMARY OF OWMP TAC CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

- On March 1, 2007 the OWMP TAC concluded discussions and approved recommendations for the Planning Commissions consideration as follows:

TAC concludes that the tree replacement/retention standards, 1:1 and 2:1 mitigation ratios and the tree replacement formula are supported by scientific evidence. However, the scientific evidence concerning tree replacement demonstrates that effective tree canopy replacement may take 50+ years to achieve the 10 percent canopy coverage standard.

TAC concurs and recommends that the Planning Commission continue to interpret that the Option B mitigation program in Policy 7.4.4.4 should be applied on a woodland habitat basis versus an oak tree canopy approach;

TAC recommends that woodland habitat conservation be addressed on a mapped resource approach vs. a parcel-based approach (This would require development of new thresholds);

TAC agreed that the alternative maps and associated woodland habitat acreage table demonstrate that a great deal of flexibility is expressed about how we can approach conservation of woodland habitat;

TAC determined, and recommends that the Planning Commission retain earlier determinations that Policy 7.4.4.4 Option A, Replacement/Retention standards have biological value and are applicable to both ministerial and discretionary projects. The replacement standards component, however, is not a preferred method of mitigation. Replacement should be mitigated by one or a combination of the following: 1) Payment of the Option B fee, 2) replanting On-site, 3) replanting on- or off –site in designated woodland habitat restoration areas. Retention/avoidance is the preferred method of woodland habitat conservation subject to case-by-case reasonable use, adaptive management, and best management practices needed to achieve woodland habitat enhancements, fuel modifications, and/or defensible space – fire safe conditions. This approach could allow consideration of individual tree species issues, also, on a case-by-case basis.

TAC agreed that Policy 7.4.4.4 Option A “urban vs. rural” application requires clarification. TAC recommendations include; that we accept a policy interpretation that “woodland habitat” conservation goals and standards are based more upon aesthetic/cultural values than biological values when woodland habitat is located within urban areas. Therefore, retention standards/reasonable use procedure should be applicable to urban areas,

except for corridors which provide connectivity to major expanses of important woodland habitat. Corridors, such as the IBC, need to be reviewed with more restrictive conservation goals/standards.

TAC recommends that rural areas should be subject to both replacement/retention standards pursuant to Policy 7.4.4.4 Option A, with flexibility to replace on-or-off site, and/or payment of the Option B fee or some combination of the above noted mitigation measures.

TAC agreed that Policy 7.4.4.4 Option B requires interpretation concerning applicable discretionary vs. ministerial permit procedures. TAC recommends that the Planning Commission interpret Policy 7.4.4.4 Option B to be applicable to both discretionary and ministerial projects, be applicable uniformly to urban and rural areas, and that Option B should be interpreted to be a fee payment/habitat retention approach.