



**Municipal Services Agency**

**Planning and Community  
Development**

Robert Sherry, Director

Terry Schutten, County Executive  
Cheryl Creson, Agency Administrator

## County of Sacramento

Richard Maddox, Code Compliance

Leighann Moffitt, County-Wide Planning

Dave Pevny, Community Planning

Ana Rhodes, Administration

### **A G E N D A - N O T E S**

#### **NATURAL RESOURCES STAKEHOLDER GROUP MEETING GENERAL PLAN UPDATE-2025 FEBRUARY 17, 2005**

**Time: 6:00-8:00 PM**

**Location: Hearing Room # 1, Next to Board of Supervisor's Chamber, 700 H Street, Sacramento**

1. Introduction of staff and stakeholder interest representatives.
2. An overview of the process and schedule for the General Plan Update 2025.
3. An overview of why we are updating the Agriculture, Conservation, and Open Space Elements.
4. Review issues and policies identified to date in County Departmental meetings.
5. Open the session to public comment, questions, and suggested directives.
6. Recap and closing remarks

This is the first public opportunity to hold a stakeholder meeting for the natural resources components of the General Plan Update process. A Natural Resources workshop will be held with the Board of Supervisors on February 23, 2005 at 2:30pm as part of the General Plan Update 2025 workshop series. A focus group meeting will be held on March 3, 2005 from 6:00pm – 8:00pm in the New Administration Bldg. 700 H Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor Training Room #6711. All meetings are open to the public and your attendance is welcomed. To learn when other General Plan Update meetings are scheduled please visit our website at <http://www.saccounty.net/planning/gpupdate/gpu-index.html> and the link to workshops and focus groups.

Please contact Edward J. Hard at (916) 874-6141 or [harde@saccounty.net](mailto:harde@saccounty.net) if you have any questions now or in the future.

*The Department of Planning and Community Development is a department of the Municipal Services Agency, a customer service organization of the County of Sacramento to provide innovative, efficient and effective residential, business and environmental services to the region's neighborhoods and communities and to engage residents in the decisions affecting their neighborhoods. Through its customer service model, the 10 departments that comprise the Municipal Services Agency are dedicated to protect, preserve and enhance the quality of life in our neighborhoods, business centers, recreation venues and wildlife corridors.*

*Municipal Services Agency: Keeping your community clean, safe, and beautiful for today and tomorrow.*

**GENERAL PLAN UPDATE 2025  
NATURAL RESOURCES STAKEHOLDER GROUP MEETING  
FEBRUARY 17, 2005**

**Attendees**

Nedzlene Ferrario, Sacramento County Planning and Community Development Department  
Dan Gifford, California Department of Fish and Game  
Tom Hall, California Native Plant Society-Sacramento Valley Chapter  
Edward Hard, Sacramento County Planning and Community Development Department  
Diana Hickman, California Native Plant Society-Sacramento Valley Chapter  
John Hunter, California Native Plant Society-Sacramento Valley Chapter  
Glen Holstein, California Native Plant Society-Sacramento Valley Chapter  
Gil Labrie, Delta Citizens Municipal Advisory Council  
Mary Maret, Private Citizen  
Jim Pachl, Friends of the Swainson's Hawk  
Richard Radmacher, Sacramento County Planning and Community Development Department  
Bonnie Ross, California Native Plant Society-Sacramento Valley Chapter  
Aimee Rutledge, Sacramento Valley Conservancy  
Kent Smith, California Department of Fish and Game  
J.P. Tindell, City of Sacramento Parks and Recreation Department  
Sue Torgusion, California Native Plant Society-Sacramento Valley Chapter  
Alta Tura, Sacramento Urban Creeks Council  
George Waegell, Private Citizen  
Betsy Weiland, American River Parkway Coalition  
Barbara Washburn, Private Citizen  
Tim Washburn, Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency  
Anna Whalen, Sacramento County Planning and Community Development Department

**Issues:**

1. McClellan and Mather Fields should be identified as sensitive areas for vernal pools and creeks relative to the development interests and plans by Sacramento County Economic Development Department.
2. The South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan should be folded into the Section 5 of the Conservation Element that addresses Vegetation and Wildlife.
3. The Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) assumes that mitigation should not occur outside the approved HCP area.
4. The National Diversity Database is outdated, yet environmental impact reports developed by outside consultants for mitigation in the County use antiquated species information.
5. The County should obtain the latest information regarding special status species occurrences by the state and federal agencies that regulate and protect those species.
6. It should be required by the County that protocol level surveys in the proper season be conducted according to state and federal resource agencies guidelines.

7. The adaptive management approach needs to be measurable and be reflected in the policies of each section of the Conservation Element to make the policies effective and ensure that they accomplish what they set out to accomplish.
8. All mitigation approaches, not just banking, should be addressed in the revised Section 5 outline under Mitigation Approaches (Attachment A) to reveal what options are available to the County.
9. When mitigating for the Swainson's Hawk, the land should be provided up front as part of the mitigation and not through in-lieu fee.
10. There needs to be mitigation oversight of all projects by the County or some department.
11. Riparian Forests should be addressed in Section 5. These Ecosystems are distinctly different compared to policies addressing stream vegetation.
12. Concern over the nomenclature of grasslands verses prairies. Suggestion that grassland sub section of Section 5 be called Prairies.
13. Concern voiced as to why Section 5 does not address a watershed approach in concert with an ecosystem approach.
14. Attachment A should have the section order changed under the proposed new Section 5 to begin with Aquatic Resources then Terrestrial Resources, and followed by Special Status Species.
15. Local government should recognize other regional efforts to address natural resource issues such as habitat conservation.
16. Regarding the American River Parkway, where are the policies addressing the Parkway in the Conservation Element and how is the parkway combining zone being addressed in the Element?
17. Could the American River Parkway Plan be considered for a Habitat Conservation Plan?
18. Grazing land is an important asset to the County and should be protected by the resource conservation areas identified on the General Plan Land Use Diagram.
19. There should be design review guidelines for all development projects that include Low Impact Development technologies to incorporate the amenities of creeks and rivers.
20. There should be a watershed approach to help facilitate the design guidelines for development projects.
21. Natural resource based planning would really help address the way development is allowed in Sacramento County.
22. The implementation of the Parkway Corridor Combining Zone should have connection to the law/policy for the State and/or Federal Wild & Scenic designations along the Lower American River.
23. It would appear that the Conservation and Open Space Elements do not address the American River Parkway and the Parkway Combining Zone. Will these elements address these topics?

24. There should be a discussion about Rivers in the Conservation Element that call attention to the American, Cosumnes, Mokulumne, and Sacramento Rivers.
25. Was the Sacramento River Greenway Plan ever approved by the Board of Supervisors?
26. The Tree Ordinance has problems and needs to be fixed because it does not address the unincorporated portions of the County outside the urban services boundary and only includes oak trees.
27. There should be a higher violation fee for oak tree removal as well as stiffer penalties for the removal of the habitat provided by the oaks.
28. Mitigation for trees currently is a tree for a tree. Should the County consider allowing mitigation to include acquisition of land with trees and land where trees could be planted?
29. The Tree Foundation needs to raise the fees associated with mitigation and work more effectively towards collaborating with its partners.
30. On the issue of mitigation plantings, smaller trees are best and even planting acorns is a solution towards the revegetation of oak woodlands.
31. The County needs to take advantage of the resource specialists and knowledgeable staff at the Bufferlands Regional Sanitation facility and at Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency to better understand the natural resource issues surrounding the mitigation of vegetation and wildlife.
32. Once completed, the use of the Deer Creek Hills Management Plan should be used as a guideline towards managing oak woodlands in Sacramento County.
33. The Open Space Vision Map does not show any corridor connectivity within the American, Cosumnes, Mokulumne, or Sacramento Rivers. There needs to be some discussion around this issue to facilitate a better approach towards managing these river corridors individually or collectively.
34. The Sacramento Area Council of Governments Blueprint Preferred Scenario seems to incorporate and justify the Open Space Vision Map.
35. Agri-Tourism discussion as it evolves should address eco-tourism issues to ensure that activities are complementary and compatible with existing agricultural uses like ranching and agricultural operations.
36. The Economic Development Element should include an Agri-Tourism discussion to reveal consistency with the Agricultural Element policies on Agri-Tourism once developed.