



COUNTY OF YOLO

Board of Supervisors

District 1, **Michael H. McGowan**
District 2, **Don Saylor**
District 3, **Matt Rexroad**
District 4, **Jim Provenza**
District 5, **Duane Chamberlain**

625 Court Street, Room 204 • Woodland, CA 95695
(530) 666-8195 • FAX (530) 666-8193
www.yolocounty.org

County Administrator, **Patrick S. Blacklock**
Deputy Clerk of the Board, **Julie Dachtler**

2013 Delta Priorities

Adopted January, 29 2013

#1: *Secure changes to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) Yolo Bypass Conservation Measure and/or the Yolo Bypass implementation action for the salmon Biological Opinion to avoid or minimize impacts on agriculture, flood protection, and terrestrial species habitat, including migrating waterfowl, as well as secure full mitigation for any unavoidable impacts.* The BDCP proposes to increase the frequency and duration of flooding in the Yolo Bypass for fish habitat. Any proposed project should limit flooding past February 15th because of the impact on productive farmland in the Yolo Bypass, as well as avoid other known impacts to the extent feasible. All unavoidable impacts should be fully mitigated, including economic impacts.

#2. *Ensure BDCP is integrated with Yolo Natural Heritage Program.* Ensure the Yolo Natural Heritage Program, including the HCP/NCCP, is fully integrated with the BDCP. The BDCP and the Yolo Natural Heritage Program have overlapping plan areas and cover similar terrestrial species, such as Giant garter snake and Swainson's hawk. The BDCP may propose mitigation and conservation easements for these and other species in Yolo County related to impacts outside of the County. Such proposals should be coordinated fully with the Yolo Natural Heritage Program. In addition, BDCP should commit to providing credit to the Yolo Natural Heritage Program for BDCP mitigation and conservation that takes place in Yolo County.

#3. *Support the requirement for federal legislation to authorize the BDCP.* The U.S. Department of the Interior and congressional representatives are discussing the need for federal legislation to authorize the BDCP. Previously, the U.S. Department of the Interior did not think such legislation was necessary to provide a Habitat Conservation Plan permit. (Implementation of the BDCP requires a Habitat Conservation Plan permit from the U.S. Department of the Interior.) Yolo County supports the need for federal authorizing legislation.

#4: *Eliminate or reduce local government match for Delta economic assistance in the water bond.* If legislation to amend the water bond moves forward, seek changes to increase funding for compensation for impacts of Delta proposals and reduce the local government match for economic assistance, among other issues.

#5: *Maintain a significant governance role in the BDCP.* Yolo County needs to maintain a high level of involvement in and oversight over BDCP project proposals in Yolo County, as well as help secure a high level of involvement for the Delta Counties Coalition in any future BDCP governance structure. Yolo County supports establishment of a BDCP implementation entity that has significant local government representation and is as closely aligned with Delta agencies established by the 2009 Delta Reform Act as possible. Yolo County also supports creation of a governance structure for the BDCP's proposed project to flood the Yolo Bypass for fish habitat that provides the County with a high level of influence.

#6: *Support adequate funding for studies of the impacts of BDCP and Biological Opinion proposals and evaluate alternatives for all Delta counties.* Although Yolo County has thus far received \$425,000 in grants and loans to complete studies related to BDCP impacts. With these funds, Yolo County has completed an analysis of the agricultural impacts of increasing the frequency and duration of flooding in the Yolo Bypass as well as a review of the MIKE-21 model. Yolo County supported the efforts of Ducks Unlimited to complete an analysis of potential waterfowl impacts of additional Bypass flooding. Yolo County seeks additional funding for studies to evaluate BDCP and Biological Opinion impacts, as well as funding needed to support similar efforts in the other Delta counties.

#7: *Secure funding outside the state General Fund for payment of fees in-lieu of property taxes for lands acquired by the state.* Past public acquisitions for habitat conservation and flood control have significantly reduced revenue available to local governments to provide services. The Department of Fish and Game (DFG) owes Yolo County over \$1 million for fees in-lieu of property taxes owed on the nationally-renowned Vic Fazio Yolo Wildlife Area. Despite statutory language requiring payment, the DFG has not paid since 2001. Yolo County supports creation of a funding source outside of the General Fund to pay existing and future obligations for state-owned land.

#8: *Support the evaluation of non-diversion and/or smaller alternatives to the existing BDCP proposal such as a 3,000 cfs facility, water conservation, storage, and desalination.* Yolo County supports the evaluation of non-diversion alternatives as part of the BDCP's EIR/EIS, as well as the evaluation of a 3,000 cfs facility (compared to the 9,000 cfs facility current proposed.) The nine project alternatives currently under consideration include eight alternatives that divert water from north of the Delta and one no project alternative. The greater the extent to which the state's water supply issues can be solved through water conservation, desalination, storage, or through a smaller facility, the less significant the impacts of the BDCP will be on the Delta counties.