

Madeline Sutherland

From: Smith, Amaia A (DFW) <Amaia.Smith@dfw.wa.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2023 2:10 PM
To: Madeline Sutherland
Subject: RE: Camas Meadows Hole 9 -White Oaks On Site

Hi Madeline,

Thanks for following up, I was out of office Friday and in the field this morning. The consultant was able to provide justification for the removal of the OWO trees and I believe its included in the Critical Areas Report. Since they are able to justify why they need to be removed, I am comfortable with where we are since they will be mitigating for those impacts.

Thanks,
AS

From: Madeline Sutherland <MSutherland@cityofcamas.us>
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2023 1:37 PM
To: Smith, Amaia A (DFW) <Amaia.Smith@dfw.wa.gov>
Subject: RE: Camas Meadows Hole 9 -White Oaks On Site

External Email

Hi Amaia,

I wanted to follow up on my previous email since this is a bit time sensitive. Thanks!

Madeline Sutherland, AICP

Planner

Desk 360-817-7237

Cell 360-326-5524

www.cityofcamas.us | msutherland@cityofcamas.us

From: Madeline Sutherland
Sent: Friday, August 18, 2023 8:45 AM
To: 'Smith, Amaia A (DFW)' <Amaia.Smith@dfw.wa.gov>
Subject: RE: Camas Meadows Hole 9 -White Oaks On Site

Hi Amaia,

I wanted to follow up on this topic since we have had phone conversations and it sounds like you are working with the applicant to finalize their mitigation plan. Based on your SEPA comment below, it sounds like the applicant is not meeting the mitigation sequencing requirements. However, after speaking with you over the phone last week, it sounds like they are meeting them and are just finalizing the last pieces of the mitigation plan regarding oak enhancement plantings on site. Are you able to confirm that WDFW is ok with the layout and that they meet the mitigation sequencing requirements?

Thank you,

Madeline Sutherland, AICP

Planner

Desk 360-817-7237

Cell 360-326-5524

www.cityofcamas.us | msutherland@cityofcamas.us

From: Smith, Amaia A (DFW) <Amaia.Smith@dfw.wa.gov>

Sent: Thursday, June 8, 2023 10:05 AM

To: Madeline Sutherland <MSutherland@cityofcamas.us>

Subject: RE: Camas Meadows Hole 9 -White Oaks On Site

WARNING: This message originated outside the City of Camas Mail system. **DO NOT CLICK** on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are expecting the content. If you recognize the sender as a city employee and you see this message this email is a phishing email. If you are unsure, click the Phish Alert button to redirect the email for ITD review.

Good morning,

Thank you for reaching out on this one. I wanted to follow up with our phone conversation and provide a summary on initial thoughts for this project.

It looks like the oaks identified in the preliminary drawing are different than what is showing on the map. Based on your description of the tree inventory, it sounds like there are oaks <20in DBH present on site. Even if the oaks are not considered habitat of local importance, our new guidance recommends mitigation for oaks <20inch DBH (I believe down to 6" DBH). Additionally, it is possible that the other oaks within this project area are actually contributing to an Oregon white oak woodland. Additional information is needed to determine if these oaks will be regulated individually or as an oak woodland since the mitigation requirements are different. I've attached a screenshot of the oaks we have mapped in this area and marked the oaks in red that appear to differ than what is identified in the preliminary layout.

Additionally, there needs to be demonstration on how this layout follows the mitigation sequence, starting with exhausting avoidance option. Based on that, it looks like there are oaks that can be retained for this development located in parcels 41, 21. I recommend alternative layouts to see if additional oaks can be retained on site and justification why the final design maximizes avoidance of impacts. Also, you mentioned that their justification for removing the oak in parcel 21 is that the dripline abuts to a retaining wall. While I recognize that the retaining wall may impact the oak's health, can the retaining wall be adjusted to lessen impacts? Also, can this oak be retained on the landscape with contingency that if it shows signs of decline, subsequent mitigation will be required? Even dead/dying oaks provide ecological function, so retaining it on the landscape will provide future benefit as a snag. I think there are steps the applicant can take to avoid/minimize impacts before removing the oak in parcel 21 entirely.

Last, we are finalizing our new Best Management Practices for OWO mitigation and the requirements to meet no net loss of ecological function are more than what has been recommended in the past. Based on this, the applicant will likely need additional mitigation than what is identified in this preliminary site plan, even if additional oaks are retained on the landscape. The final mitigation requirements will be based on if this stand is an oak woodland or regulated based on individual oaks.

Also, I'm familiar with the area and think that there are snags within these parcels. Is that also addressed in the critical areas report and/or mitigation report? If not, I am interested in knowing if the snags meet our PHS definition found in our [Washington State Priority Habitats and Species List](#).

Thanks again and let me know if there are additional questions,
Amaia

From: Madeline Sutherland <MSutherland@cityofcamas.us>
Sent: Wednesday, June 7, 2023 2:23 PM
To: Smith, Amaia A (DFW) <Amaia.Smith@dfw.wa.gov>
Subject: Camas Meadows Hole 9 -White Oaks On Site

External Email

Hi Amaia,

I am working with an applicant on a project and they have 7 Oregon White Oaks over 20" DBH on site. Per our code, they are considered habitat of local importance and need to be retained or mitigated for if they meet the mitigation sequencing requirements per CMC 16.51.170.

Based on their submittal attached, they will be removing 5 out of the 7 oaks. They submitted a critical area and mitigation report outlining mitigation plantings they will be providing for the removal of the 5 oaks. My question is if the removal of the 5 oaks is something WDFW is ok with if they are mitigated for? Or would you like to see more oaks retained? To me, it seems like the oak on lot 41 and 21 could potentially be retained as well. Let me know when you are free for a phone call to discuss this further.

Thank you,

Madeline Sutherland, AICP

Planner

Desk 360-817-7237

Cell 360-326-5524

www.cityofcamas.us | msutherland@cityofcamas.us

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.