



# NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

## YOLO HABITAT CONSERVANCY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**TIME:** 4:00 – 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, February 10, 2016

**PLACE:** Yolo County Administration Building  
625 Court St., Woodland, CA 95695  
Atrium Training Room (in the basement)

**INFORMATION:** Contact Susan Garbini at 530-723-5909 or [susan@yolohabitatconservancy.org](mailto:susan@yolohabitatconservancy.org)

NOTICE: If requested, this agenda can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Federal Rules and Regulations adopted in implementation thereof. Persons seeking an alternative format should contact Susan Garbini for further information. In addition, a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, in order to participate in a public meeting, should contact Susan Garbini at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

### AGENDA

1. Call meeting to order and introductions
2. Approve agenda order
3. Approve November 9, 2015 draft meeting summary; review status of Action Items
4. Update on the Local Conservation Plan
  - Review draft from ICF – *Ellen Berryman*
  - Linking the LCP to the HCP/NCCP
  - Implementation entity? Implementation funding?
  - Comments due by April 1, 2016
5. Role of Advisory Committee in pre-implementation and implementation of HCP/NCCP
6. Announcements and updates: Advisory Committee members
  - City of Davis Open Space Public Forum and Survey
7. Adjournment to next meeting date: Monday, April 11, 2016, 4-6 pm, Atrium Training Room, Yolo County Admin Bldg

## CITY EMBARKS ON MAJOR OPEN SPACE OUTREACH EFFORT; LAUNCHES ON-LINE SURVEY AND SCHEDULES PUBLIC FORUM

January 8, 2016

The City, in partnership with the Open Space and Habitat Commission, is currently undertaking a major outreach effort to the Davis community to solicit a wide range of opinions, ideas and recommendations to strengthen the City's Open Space Program. Two major components of this outreach effort include:



**Public Forum.** The City will be holding a major public workshop on this topic on Wednesday, March 9, 2016 in the multipurpose room of the Davis Senior Center from 6:30 p.m. -- 9:00 p.m. The primary goals of the public workshop are (1) to educate the citizens of Davis about Measure O and what the parcel tax dollars have purchased over the last 15 years, and (2) solicit input from the community about how they would like those parcel tax dollars spent over the next 15 years, including identifying acquisition priority areas as well as the extent of public access. City staff and the Open Space and Habitat Commission will then use the results from the workshop to inform recommendations to the City Council for updating the City's [2002 Open Space Acquisition and Management Plan](#).

**On-line Survey.** The City developed a brief, easy-to-complete, on-line survey that is designed to solicit feedback about the City's open space areas and how they can be improved in the future. [Take the survey](#).

"We're fortunate to live in a community that has such a strong ethos around the preservation of open space and habitat," said City Councilmember Lucas Frerichs, who serves as the City Council's liaison to the Open Space and Habitat Commission. "Having reached the halfway point in the 30-year timeline of Measure O, now is the opportune time for the community to take stock of what accomplishments we've achieved and what priorities are important moving forward. The City Council and the Open Space and Habitat Commission both value the input received from the community, so I hope as many people as possible are able to participate in the upcoming public forum."

The City's formal Open Space Program was established in 1990 to implement long-standing policies that called for the protection of the farmlands and habitat areas that surround the community. Measure O, the parcel tax passed by Davis voters in 2000 that funds open space acquisition and maintenance, has been in place for 15 years. It works together with other tools in the City's open space tool box to protect open space around the City. Using the tremendous leveraging power of Measure O, and in conjunction with other monetary tools, the City has been able to purchase about \$22 million worth of conservation easements using only about \$8.1 million in City funds. These purchases have permanently protected more than 2,800 acres of farmland and habitat areas within the Davis Planning Area over the last 15 years. More information about the City's Open Space Program can be found on the [City's website](#) and in a [December 1, 2015 staff report to the City Council](#).

The City has commissioned UC Davis' Collaboration Center to assist staff and the Open Space and Habitat Commission with the City's community outreach efforts. Several other outreach activities are planned to ensure there are a variety of ways in which the community can provide comments.

**For More Information Contact:**

Tracie Reynolds, Property Management Coordinator, [TReynolds@cityofdavis.org](mailto:TReynolds@cityofdavis.org) or (530) 757-5669. #####

~~~~~

**Stacey Winton**

Media & Communications Officer

City of Davis

City Manager's Office

23 Russell Blvd, Suite 4

Davis, CA 95616

[CityOfDavis.org](http://CityOfDavis.org)



# YOLO LOCAL CONSERVATION PLAN

Preliminary Draft

# Regional Conservation Frameworks

- Potential new legislation
- Conservation frameworks to be adopted by CDFW, to guide mitigation under CESA and CEQA and provide a vehicle for advanced mitigation, and to guide investments in conservation
- Four pilot RCFs to be developed
- Similar to East Alameda County plan
- Preliminary draft LCP adopts terminology and approach being developed for RCFs

# Process for Developing Preliminary Draft

- Started with outline from Advisory Committee
- Re-arranged to more closely mirror East Alameda and Regional Conservation Framework Approach
- Filled in with existing information and language from Yolo HCP/NCCP, including First Administrative Draft
- Developed preliminary goals, objectives, and conservation actions based on AC “goals and subgoals”

# Chapters

- Chapter 1 – Introduction
- Chapter 2 – Environmental Setting
- Chapter 3 – Conservation Strategy
- Chapter 4 - Implementation

# Chapter 1. Introduction

- 1.1 – Purpose
- 1.2 – Relationship to Yolo HCP/NCCP
- 1.3 – Approach
- 1.4 – Role of Advisory Committee
- 1.5 – Scope of LCP
- 1.6 – Organization of the Document

# Purpose

- Provide a voluntary, non-regulatory framework for landscape conservation planning in Yolo County in partnership with landowners, resource managers, local agencies, and other regional conservation plans.
- Provide a voluntary, non-regulatory framework for conservation of all natural communities and native and desired non-native species in Yolo County.
- Provide a non-regulatory conservation framework for species and habitat types of local concern in Yolo County and adjacent areas that allows local, state, and federal agencies and concerned citizens to evaluate conservation opportunities in the county and adjacent areas.
- Allow private landowners to benefit from and better understand the conservation value of their lands in a regional context.
- Justify fundraising (e.g., grants, federal assistance) for financial assistance to landowners for voluntary conservation projects (e.g. pond maintenance).

# Relationship to Yolo HCP/NCCP

- The LCP provides a framework for additional conservation beyond what the Conservancy will achieve through the Yolo HCP/NCCP.
- The Yolo HCP/NCCP is regulatory, while the LCP is not, although it may provide background and context for developing project-specific mitigation programs and making significance determinations under the California Environmental Quality Act.
- The conservation strategies for the HCP/NCCP and LCP are meant to complement one another.

# Role of Advisory Committee

- Not yet drafted
- Hope is for Advisory Committee to have a significant role in completing the plan

# Scope of the LCP – Plan Area

- Entire Yolo County
- Divided into the same 22 planning units used for the Yolo HCP/NCCCP
- Added back the landscape planning units

# Scope of the LCP – Natural Communities

(15 – same as HCP/NCCP)

- Cultivated lands seminatural community.
- Grassland natural community.
- Serpentine natural community.
- Chamise natural community.
- Mixed chaparral natural community.
- Oak-foothill pine natural community.
- Blue oak woodland natural community.
- Closed-cone pine-cypress natural community.
- Montane hardwood natural community.
- Valley oak woodland natural community.
- Alkali prairie natural community.
- Vernal pool complex natural community.
- Fresh emergent wetland natural community.
- Valley foothill riparian natural community
- Lacustrine and riverine natural community

# Scope of the LCP – Focal Species

- 59 species (22 plants, 7 invertebrates, 2 amphibians, 21 birds, 7 mammals)
- Tier 1 species: former Yolo HCP/NCCP covered species (we have habitat models, species accounts)
- Tier 2 species: former Yolo HCP/NCCP local concern species (we have species accounts)

# Chapter 2 – Environmental Setting

- 2.1 – Introduction
- 2.2 - Physical Characteristics (climate, topography, hydrology)
- 2.3 – Land Cover Mapping
- 2.4 – Natural Communities and Associated Plants and Wildlife
- 2.5 – Other Land Cover Types
- 2.6 – Focal Species (details in species accounts)

# Chapter 3 – Conservation Strategy

- 3.1 - Overview, including Purposes and Priorities
- 3.2 – Methods (conservation gap analysis, geographic units of conservation)
- 3.3 – Results of Conservation Gap Analysis
- 3.4 – Conservation Goals and Objectives
- 3.5 – Conservation Priorities
- 3.6 – Monitoring and Adaptive Management

## 3.1.1 - Conservation Purposes and Priorities

- From Advisory Committee's "goals and subgoals"
- Integrated into remainder of chapter. Introduction refers to sections where each is addressed further
- Keep, modify, or remove?

# Gap Analysis – Natural Communities

- Overlaid GIS layers
  - Natural community/land cover
  - 3 categories of “baseline public and easement lands”
  - Impacts from development
- Acres to be protected through Yolo HCP/NCCP
- Total percent protected

| Natural Community                | % of Plan Area |
|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Cultivated Lands – Rice          | 22%            |
| Cultivated Lands – Non-rice      | 11%            |
| Grassland                        | 16%            |
| Serpentine                       | 66%            |
| Chamise                          | 49%            |
| Mixed Chaparral                  | 27%            |
| Blue Oak and Foothill Pine       | 36%            |
| Blue Oak Woodland                | 27%            |
| Closed-Cone Pine-Cypress         | 99%            |
| Montane hardwood                 | 34%            |
| Valley Oak Woodland              | 22%            |
| Alkali Prairie                   | 57%            |
| Vernal pool complex              | 96%            |
| Fresh Emergent Wetland           | 59%            |
| Valley foothill Riparian         | 30%            |
| Lacustrine and Riverine          | 16%            |
| <b>Total Natural Communities</b> | <b>22%</b>     |

# Gap Analysis – Focal Species

- Overlaid GIS layers
  - Models for Tier 1 species
  - 3 categories of “baseline public and easement lands”
- Percent protected
- Have not yet factored in Yolo HCP/NCCCP impacts or conservation

| Species                     | Modeled Habitat (ac.) | % of Modeled Habitat Within Category 1 Protected Land | % of Modeled Habitat Within Category 2 Protected Land | % of Modeled Habitat Within Category 3 Protected Land | % of Modeled Habitat Within Category 1, 2, or 3 Protected Land |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Alkali Milk Vetch           | 575.6                 | 25%                                                   | 50%                                                   | 3%                                                    | 77%                                                            |
| Baker's Navarretia          | 301.0                 | <1%                                                   | 95%                                                   | 5%                                                    | 100%                                                           |
| Black Tern                  | 40,243.0              | 10%                                                   | 7%                                                    | 1%                                                    | 19%                                                            |
| Brittlescale                | 583.2                 | 24%                                                   | 49%                                                   | 3%                                                    | 76%                                                            |
| Colusa Grass                | 1.2                   | <1%                                                   | 88%                                                   | 8%                                                    | 96%                                                            |
| Conservancy Fairy Shrimp    | 575.6                 | 25%                                                   | 50%                                                   | 3%                                                    | 77%                                                            |
| Foothill Yellow Legged Frog | 579.0                 | <1%                                                   | 51%                                                   | 11%                                                   | 63%                                                            |
| Grasshopper Sparrow         | 80,375.7              | 9%                                                    | 8%                                                    | <1%                                                   | 17%                                                            |
| Heckard's Pepper Grass      | 575.6                 | 25%                                                   | 50%                                                   | 3%                                                    | 77%                                                            |
| Linderiella                 | 575.6                 | 25%                                                   | 50%                                                   | 3%                                                    | 77%                                                            |
| Loggerhead Shrike           | 214,545               | 6%                                                    | 15%                                                   | 1%                                                    | 22%                                                            |
| Midvalley Fairy Shrimp      | 575.6                 | 25%                                                   | 50%                                                   | 3%                                                    | 77%                                                            |
| Northern Harrier            | 321,824               | 5%                                                    | 5%                                                    | <1%                                                   | 10%                                                            |
| Solano Grass                | 1.2                   | <1%                                                   | 88%                                                   | 8%                                                    | 96%                                                            |
| Spadefoot                   | 53,949.4              | 8%                                                    | <1%                                                   | <1%                                                   | 8%                                                             |
| Spearscale                  | 583.2                 | 24%                                                   | 49%                                                   | 3%                                                    | 76%                                                            |
| Townsend's Big Eared Bat    | 284,812               | 7%                                                    | 5%                                                    | <1%                                                   | 12%                                                            |
| Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp    | 575.6                 | 25%                                                   | 50%                                                   | 3%                                                    | 77%                                                            |
| Vernal Pool Tadpole Shrimp  | 575.6                 | 25%                                                   | 50%                                                   | 3%                                                    | 77%                                                            |
| Yellow Breasted Chat        | 2,925.0               | 5%                                                    | 14%                                                   | 3%                                                    | 22%                                                            |

# Conservation Goals and Objectives

Generally, conservation actions will be measured by whether they “contribute” to the completion of conservation goals and objectives, not necessarily if they accomplish the goal or objective on their own accord.

# Conservation Goals and Objectives

- GOAL 1
  - Objective 1.1
    - Conservation actions
  - Objective 1.2
    - Conservation actions
- GOAL 2
  - Objective 2.1
    - Conservation actions
  - Objective 2.2
    - Conservation actions

# Landscape Goals and Objectives

- Environmental gradients
- Connectivity
- Patch size
- Natural processes (fluvial, fire)
- Reducing stressors (pollutants, etc.)

# Natural Community Goals and Objectives

- Protection, restoration, management
- Pollinators
- Question: add target acreages?
- Question: add mitigation ratios?
- Question: add avoidance and minimization measures?

# Tier 1 Focal Species Goals and Objectives

- Vernal pool, alkali prairie, and fresh emergent wetland species – nothing proposed beyond existing protection and Yolo HCP/NCCP
- Additional conservation proposed for foothill yellow-legged frog, western spadefoot, northern harrier, loggerhead shrike, yellow-breasted chat, grasshopper sparrow, Townsend's big-eared bat.
- Question: add target habitat acreages?
- Question: add mitigation ratios?
- Question: add avoidance and minimization measures?

# Tier 2 Focal Species

- Currently no goals or objectives
- Looking for feedback
  - Group according to natural community or other?
  - Include ratios, target acres, avoidance and minimization measures?
  - Prioritize?

# Conservation Priorities

- Added general priorities from Advisory Committee
- More specific priorities – how would this differ from conservation actions?  
Recommend folding priorities into goals, objectives, and conservation actions
- Identify priority conservation areas (in addition to HCP/NCCP priority 1 and priority 2)
- To discuss - “Based on conservation significance, identify a generalized habitat-type priority array for possible acquisitions that can be used to maintain or improve habitat values for LCS natural communities and species. Provide a “roadmap” for land acquisition organizations to inform future land acquisition and land use decisions that assists in implementing a regional conservation framework for Yolo County and adjacent areas.”

# Monitoring and Adaptive Management

## Challenge -

- who to implement?
- how funded?

# Chapter 4 – Implementation

- 4.1 – Overview
- 4.2 – How to Use the LCP
- 4.3 – Implementation Structure
- 4.4 – Stewardship Program and Plans

# How to Use the LCP

- Stewardship-driven conservation
- CEQA compliance
- NEPA compliance
- CESA/FESA compliance

# Implementation Structure

- Implementing Entity
- Implementation Committee
- Public Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee?)
- Annual meeting
- Data tracking and reporting

# Stewardship Programs and Plans

- Existing (ICF requests assistance)
- Future

# Figures

- Used figures that were already created for Yolo HCP/NCCP.
- Will need to be revised slightly to refer to LCP (see comments on figures)
- May add new figures identifying priority acquisition areas, if we decide to take that approach.

**Yolo Habitat Conservancy  
Advisory Committee  
Meeting Summary  
February 10, 2016**

**ACTION ITEMS**

- **Clarify “safe harbors” and “neighboring lands” agreements under the HCP/NCCP**
- **Provide briefing to the AC about proposed changes in the Woodland Regional Park.**

**1. Call meeting to order and introductions**

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. by Yolo Habitat Conservancy Advisory Committee Chair, **John Hopkins**. All those present introduced themselves.

*Attendees:*

**Advisory Committee Members, Liaisons, and Alternates**

Michelle Azevedo, Ridge Capital  
John Brennan, Tule Basin Farms  
Steve Greco, UC Davis  
John Hopkins, IEH  
Kent Lang, Yolo County Farmer  
Chad Roberts, Tuleyome/Yolo Audubon Society  
Steve Thompson, Conaway Ranch  
Charles Tyson, Reynier Fund  
Jeanette Wrynski, Yolo County Resource Conservation District

**Member Agency Staff and Liaisons**

Sean Denny, Yolo County, YHC Board  
Eric Parfrey, Yolo County  
Tracie Reynolds, City of Davis  
Elisa Sabatini, Yolo County

**GUESTS**

Omar Carillo, Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation  
Bruce Guelden, Yolo County resident  
Betsy Marchand, Yolo County resident  
Michael Perrone, California Department of Water Resources  
Bruce J. Rominger, Yolo County landowner  
Ed Whisler, Davis Resident, STAC member

### **Conservancy Staff**

Petrea Marchand, Executive Director  
Chris Alford, Deputy Director  
Heidi Tschudin, Project Manager  
Susan Garbini, Research Associate  
Ellen Berryman, ICF

***Remembrance of Yvonne LeMaitre***, (August 25, 1940 – December 5, 2015)  
by **Petrea Marchand**, Executive Director

We are saddened by the death of our colleague, Yvonne LeMaitre, on December 5, after a long and difficult battle with cancer. She was a tough but caring lady, who kept her many civic and personal commitments as long as she could, even while undergoing painful treatment. Yvonne’s legacy to our program remains as a strong commitment to preserving the agricultural identity and integrity of Yolo County in the midst of change and growth, combined with a dedication to protection of important habitat. She donated precious time and energy to this purpose in her enthusiastic and energetic participation in our Advisory Committee – serving on the Agriculture/Conservation Working Group, which prepared an issues paper on Agricultural Conservation Strategy that has been incorporated into our plan. Yvonne also walked the walk in her everyday life by preserving, improving, and restoring habitat on her family ranch over the years. Yvonne served the Yolo County community in a variety of ways, including serious support for the arts in both Davis and Sacramento. We are grateful that she made time in her very busy schedule to include serving as an involved member of our Advisory Committee as long as she could physically participate. Her contributions will not be forgotten and will live on in our program.

### **2. Approve agenda order**

The item on “City of Davis Open Space” (item #6) was moved to the start of the meeting. An item was added by Chair John Hopkins on “HCP/NCCP Philosophy” along with an “Update on the HCP/NCCP”.

### **3. Approve November 9, 2015, draft meeting summary; review status of action items**

The November 9, 2015 draft meeting summary was approved with no changes.

### **4. City of Davis Open Space Forum and Survey – *Tracie Reynolds, City of Davis***

The City of Davis, in partnership with the Open Space and Habitat Commission, is soliciting opinions, ideas, and recommendations from the public to strengthen the City’s

Open Space Program. There will be a “Public Forum” on March 9, 2016, 6:30-9:00 pm, at the Davis Senior Center. The goal of the public workshop is (1) to educate citizens of Davis about Measure O and what the parcel tax dollars have purchased over the last 15 years; and, (2) to solicit input from the community about priorities for spending the parcel tax dollars over the next 15 years.

The City has developed an on-line survey designed to solicit feedback about the City’s open space areas and how they can be improved. All are encouraged to come to the Forum and to complete the on-line survey (information is available at this meeting).

*Discussion*

**PETREA:** We also have entered into a partnership with City of Davis, Open Space Program to integrate some of our habitat responsibilities into their program.

**STEVE GRECO:** How is our HCP/NCCP going to interact with Davis Measure O funds? What are we asking of them? Are we partnering to buy parcels together? Or are we asking for credit on parcels that meet our objectives?

**PETREA:** Both as appropriate. Some properties could count towards the pre-permit requirements of our program. We can help make their open space dollars go further by applying for grants where they provide matching funds. Those parcels would count toward our conservation requirement (but not towards mitigation).

**STEVE G:** There are forces who have concerns about encouraging development through mitigation.

**JOHN H:** We have had discussions about conservation above mitigation with the federal and state agencies.

**STEVE G:** To what extent do we rely on Section 6 grants?

**PETREA:** Very significantly. We made a clarification that City of Davis contributions would be used only to match those federal and state grant funds. Conservation is a requirement of our permit.

**JOHN H:** We have explicitly stated that Davis money would not to be used for mitigation. The literature strongly supports pooled mitigation (regional).

**CHAD ROBERTS:** We need to emphasize that mitigation is s paid for by those who develop projects.

**PETREA:** We will develop accounting to explicitly report how funds are spent and in what categories.

**CHAD:** We need to engage with the City of Davis. This enables blending together programs to accomplish bigger goals than could be accomplished by either entity alone.

**TRACIE:** We expect that the HCP/NCCP would be a topic of discussion. It would be helpful to have some representation from this group at the meeting on March 9.

## **5. HCP/NCCP Philosophy – John Hopkins, Chair**

I have some particular concerns about the philosophy guiding our process. We have constraints, but it is essential that we have targets that are not minimal for two important and threatened species: Burrowing owl and Tri-colored blackbird. I worry that a Yolo plan with minimal requirements is not going to meet our conservation moral obligation if our targets are minimal.

### *Discussion*

**PETREA:** We have updated our Burrowing owl target.

**ELLEN:** There are special considerations since it is an NCCP. The California Department of Fish & Wildlife requirement is that you need to do everything you can within the plan to recover species.

**PETREA:** The Pre-public review draft is completed. We are now in the EIR/EIS process phase. We expect to have a nearly final plan for release by February 15 and plan for October release of the Public Review Draft EIR/EIS. At the Board meeting in November, both agencies testified that they had no “fatal flaws” with plan. We do anticipate some concerns with public release.

**STEVE THOMPSON:** The Giant Garter Snake Recovery Plan and GGS listing with state are also of concern. Are we in sync? Conaway Ranch has easements for GGS and for Tri-colored blackbird. I want to make sure about “safe harbors” agreements. What happens if it becomes listed before the plan is completed. Landowners worry. We need to offer hope regarding regulatory relief. If it is listed, you have to have coverage unless there is as safe harbor agreement.

**PETREA:** You are looking for exemption for agricultural operations. We have budgeted for “neighboring landowners” agreement. We would hope we could help with that. But we don’t cover agricultural activities in our plan.

**STEVE T:** It could cost a landowner a lot of money to get coverage.

**PETREA:** We did build the landowner agreements into our plan. We would have to develop specifics of this during implementation.

**SEAN DENNY:** The plan should help protect local land owners that are farming as well as the County and species.

**JOHN H:** There is protection for land that is under easement. As long as it is consistent with what is needed to conserve the species protected by the easement.

**PETREA:** We should ask about covered activities related to farming. We need to make agricultural activities explicit. We say we negotiate neighboring land agreements upon request.

**JEANETTE WRYSINSKI:** The neighboring lands agreement part is critical.

## **6. Update on the Local Conservation Plan – Ellen Berryman, ICF**

*Background.*

**PETREA:** We were able to get some funding from the Wildlife Conservation Board and member agencies to develop a Local Conservation Plan. The initial work on this task was done by a subcommittee. That material was then passed on to ICF who have now prepared a Preliminary Draft LCP.

**ELLEN:** The State has recently proposed new legislation to encourage conservation frameworks to be adopted by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to guide mitigation under CESA and CEQA and to provide a vehicle for advanced mitigation and to guide investments in conservation – a Regional Conservation Framework. The LCP could fit into this task if the legislation is implemented.

**PPT Presentation on LCP Preliminary Draft** (*see attached copy of Presentation*):

### **CHAPTERS**

- **Chapter 1 – Introduction**
- **Chapter 2 – Environmental Setting**
- **Chapter 3 – Conservation Strategy**
- **Chapter 4 - Implementation**

### **CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 – Purpose
- 1.2 – Relationship to Yolo HCP/NCCP
- 1.3 – Approach
- 1.4 – Role of Advisory Committee
- 1.5 – Scope of LCP
- 1.6 – Organization of the Document

*Discussion*

**SEAN:** Need to make sure this reflects the agricultural character of Yolo County.

**ELLEN:** We will need feedback from your review

**PETREA:** This will include all of Yolo County (unlike the HCP/NCCP). This plan can be what we want it to be.

**CHAD:** The underlying assumption from the WG was a conservation strategy/framework – how to accomplish larger conservation goals. It is protective of conservation in an agricultural context.

## **CHAPTER 2: ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

- 2.1 – Introduction
- 2.2 - Physical Characteristics (climate, topography, hydrology)
- 2.3 – Land Cover Mapping
- 2.4 – Natural Communities and Associated Plants and Wildlife
- 2.5 – Other Land Cover Types
- 2.6 – Focal Species (details in species accounts)

## **CHAPTER 3: CONSERVATION STRATEGY**

- 3.1 - Overview, including Purposes and Priorities
- 3.2 – Methods (conservation gap analysis, geographic units of conservation)
- 3.3 – Results of Conservation Gap Analysis
- 3.4 – Conservation Goals and Objectives
- 3.5 – Conservation Priorities
- 3.6 – Monitoring and Adaptive Management

### *Discussion*

- Purposes and Priorities
- Gap Analysis – Natural Communities
- Gap Analysis – Focal species
- Conservation goals and objectives
  - Do we want to add quantitative goals?
  - Specify actions?
- Landscape Goals and Objectives
- Natural Community Goals and Objectives
  - Protection, restoration, management
  - Pollinators
  - Add target acreages?
  - Add mitigation ratios?
  - Add AMMs?
- Tier 1 Focal Species Goals and Objectives
  - Same questions?
- Conservation Priorities
  - Questions (see slide)
- Monitoring and Adaptive Management
  - Challenge: Who to implement? How to fund?

**CHARLES TYSON:** Who would hold title?

**PETREA:** That is a question for the Conservancy Board. Will need to be delineated. Lots of dimensions and issues.

**JOHN H:** Needs to be written as options. If this is adopted, then people will join the bandwagon.

**MICHELLE AZEVEDO:** How does this relate to developers? How does this work?

**PETREA:** The majority of this conservation (LCP) will be funded by grants -- not by developers. Everything in the LCP will be voluntary. Because the LCP includes other species (not covered by the plan), this LCP could be used by agencies to deal with these species in the future. In the event that the HCP/NCCP does not cover them, then there would be some guidelines for mitigation.

**SEAN:** It is in the same family as our other plan?

**CHAD:** The real purpose of the LCP is to provide conservation for species outside the HCP/NCCP. But it could provide guidance and a conservation framework.

**PETREA:** How LCP could be used:

- Stewardship-driven conservation
- CEQA Compliance
- NEPA compliance
- CESA/FESA compliance

**CHAD:** The LCP could be used to explain about CEQA process and requirements.

**CHARLES:** Better to have guidelines.

**STEVE T:** Need to include agriculture and development aspects in the LCP.

#### ▪ **CHAPTER 4: IMPLEMENTATION**

- 4.1 – Overview
- 4.2 – How to Use the LCP
- 4.3 –Implementation Structure
- 4.4 – Stewardship Program and Plans

*Discussion*

**Implementation Structure**

- Implementing entity
- Implementing committee
- Public Advisory Committee
- Annual meeting
- Data tracking and reporting

**Stewardship Programs and Plans**

- Existing
- Future

**PETREA:** We will review with two deadlines for April and May Advisory Committee meetings. Comments on chapters 1 and 2 are due by April 1 for discussion at the April 11 meeting. Comments on chapters 3 and 4 are due by April 29 for discussion at the May 9 AC meeting.

**PETREA:** We are moving out of the phase of developing plan and into implementation phase. This will be on the agenda for the next meeting. What role do you want to play? Should we make terms 1 year instead of 2 years. October 2017 is the goal for the permits. The LCP should be finished earlier or at the same time.

**CHAD:** Better thought about as a “Local Conservation Strategy”.

**7. Role of Advisory Committee in pre-implementation and implementation of the HCP/NCCP**

See discussion above. We will revisit this topic at future AC meetings.

**6. Announcements and Updates**

**PETREA:**

- The Yolo Habitat Conservancy has been awarded a grant to preserve CTS habitat in Dunnigan Hills.
- We have entered into an Agreement with the City of Woodland on Regional Park to preserve Swainson’s hawk in an easement. The City will include a palmate-bracted birdsbeak easement that the Plan will receive credit for when approved. The site will have public recreation and learning activities, including an Education Center and park.

**CHAD R:** There should be a briefing to the Advisory Committee about proposed changes in the Woodland regional park

**JOHN H:**

- The NCCPP workshop is scheduled for October 19, in Vacaville

**7. Adjournment; Next meeting**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m. The next meeting will be held on Monday, April 11, at the Yolo County Administrative Building.