

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

COUNTY OF EL DORADO

<http://www.edcgov.us/devservices>



PLACERVILLE OFFICE:
2850 FAIRLANE COURT PLACERVILLE, CA 95667
BUILDING (530) 621-5315 / (530) 622-1708 FAX
bdgdept@edcgov.us
PLANNING (530) 621-5355 / (530) 642-0508 FAX
planning@edcgov.us

LAKE TAHOE OFFICE:
3368 LAKE TAHOE BLVD. SUITE 302
SOUTH LAKE TAHOE, CA 96150
(530) 573-3330
(530) 542-9082 FAX
tahoebuild@edcgov.us

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Roger P. Trout, Director
Peter N. Maurer, Principal Planner

DATE: March 23, 2011

RE: INRMP Options Report

Background: Phase I of the INRMP is nearing its conclusion, with a final report and draft scope of work for Phase II to be submitted by the consultant within the next month. DSD and the consultant team, headed by Sierra Ecosystem Associates (SEA), have been working with the two appointed advisory committees, the INRMP Stakeholders Advisory Committee (ISAC) and the Plant and Wildlife Technical Advisory Committee (PAWTAC) to develop the scope. However, to ensure that the committees and staff have clear direction from the Board, a draft goals and objectives memo (Attachment A) has been prepared for Board consideration, so that all further work on the INRMP is consistent with the intentions and desires of the Board.

Discussion: As identified in the scope of work for Phase I (Attachment C), the final task for the consultant is to “identify alternative approaches for preparation of the INRMP.” This is broken into two subtasks. Subtask 2.a is the preparation of a report identifying the range of alternatives, identifying the advantages and disadvantages of the alternatives, including costs of acquisition programs, monitoring, and management, and a discussion of options used by other jurisdictions. Subtask 2.b is to assist the County in preparing the INRMP scope of work.

The administrative draft of the report called for in Subtask 2.a was presented to ISAC and PAWTAC in December, 2010. The committees want further direction from the Board before they recommend a course of action. The idea of the “goals and objectives statement” is a result of those meetings in order to clarify Board direction on the INRMP, and to identify the next steps. The larger report then becomes more of background information, because it contains the different options and their relative costs, advantages, and disadvantages. Both of these are combined into a single document, the Overall Approach for Preparing INRMP (Phase II) (Attachment B).

It is DSD's understanding that the INRMP is to:

1. Implement General Plan Measure CO-M and Policy 7.4.2.8 to mitigate, to the extent economically and practically feasible, the impacts of wildlife habitat loss and fragmentation from development anticipated by the 2004 General Plan.
2. Provide a program by which development projects could address the cumulative impacts of development contemplated in the General Plan.
3. Minimize revisions to land use designations or other development limitations authorized under the adopted General Plan, except as provided in Policy 7.4.2.9 and Implementation Measure CO-N (Review and update the Important Biological Corridor, -IBC, overlay designation).

Policy 7.4.2.8 identifies eight components that shall be in the INRMP. These are:

1. Habitat Inventory
2. Habitat Protection Strategy
3. Mitigation Assistance
4. Habitat Acquisition
5. Habitat Management
6. Habitat Monitoring
7. Public Participation
8. Funding

Different approaches to these components are included in the options and scoping report. There are, however, several issues that need clarification. Board guidance will assist in developing the recommendation for the scope of work for Phase 2. These will also have budget implications for Phase 2 of the INRMP.

Much of the discussion at the advisory committee meetings revolved around the level of CEQA analysis required to adopt the INRMP. Although it may be premature to conclude with certainty the level of CEQA analysis required at this time, it continues to be a source of concern and speculation. While preparation of the INRMP is a mitigation measure identified in the General Plan EIR, the resulting impact is still anticipated to be significant and unavoidable. Commitment to the preparation of an EIR, may be an effective means to address the level of mitigation the County ultimately decides upon. An EIR process would include a discussion of alternative mitigation scenarios, and provide the flexibility needed to develop a program to meet the varied needs of the County and its citizens. The EIR process is the only process which allows the County to make "findings of overriding consideration" that potential mitigation measures are either not feasible or are not implemented for the reasons the County determines more important.

The General Plan EIR identified impacts associated with ministerial development on existing lots as a potentially significant impact. Policy 2.2.5.20 (General Plan consistency review) was adopted to mitigate that impact. Although that policy was later amended to only address certain types of ministerial development (non-residential construction, building sites within the IBC, and

very large single family residences), the effect of home construction on existing habitat has also been a topic of concern for the advisory committees. To what degree is it the Board's intention that the INRMP apply to ministerial (building permit) projects? This may also be addressed under the different options analyzed in an EIR, if that is the document that is prepared for Phase 2 of the INRMP.

In addition to the statements of goals, purpose, and objectives, the draft report briefly addresses INRMP preparation requirements and a description of the possible elements that would be contained in the final INRMP. These include those items clearly mandated by the General Plan policy language, as well as optional components that could be considered to make the plan more dynamic and effective in meeting the County's goals and objectives. This opportunity to provide direction will ensure that the options and scope provided in the final work product for Phase 1 is consistent with Board policy and that Phase 2 proceeds efficiently.

The final component of the report, contained in Appendix D to Attachment A, is a Strategy for Preparing Phase II Scope of Work. This is a general guideline and not a direct, step-by-step recipe for creating the final plan, but it provides a framework of how to move forward into Phase II. The suggestions and recommendations contained in this section should assist County staff and the Board in the development of the scope of work.

Development Services Department staff recommends that the Board take the following action:

1. Receive and file the Draft Options Report, thereby completing Subtask 2.a;
2. Concur with the basic direction provided in the draft goals and objectives statement contained in the Report for the development of Phase II of the INRMP.