**Natural and Working Lands Technical Advisory Committee**

January 16, 2024 | 3:00 PM – 4:30 PM

Join via Zoom: <https://yolocounty.zoom.us/j/86355571657>

NWL TAC Members

**Pelayo Alvarez,** Climate Action Commission (YCCAC) Member, Audobon Conservation Ranching Program

**Mica Bennett,** YCCAC Member

**Humberto Izquierdo,** Yolo County Department of Agriculture

**Andrew Truman Kim,** YCCAC Member

**Sarah Morgan,** YCCAC Ex-Officio Member, Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation *(not in attendance)*

**Neil Muller,** M Three Ranches

**Heather Nichols,** Yolo County Resource Conservation District

**Kate Reza,** Yolo County Resource Conservation District

**Denise Sagara,** Yolo County Farm Bureau

**Adrian Solis,** RISE Inc. *(not in attendance)*

**Scott Stone,** Yolo Land & Cattle Co.

**Eric Willson,** Rominger Brothers Farms

Staff Members

**Gretchen James,** Yolo County Associate Administrative Services Analyst

**Yuridiana Pantoja,** CivicSpark Fellow

**Tess Vaccaro,** CivicSpark Fellow

**Kristen Wraithwall,** Yolo County Sustainability Manager

**AGENDA**

1. **Staff Updates**
   1. The TAC has been meeting for about a year to identify strategies and get the NWL survey out. The next few months will focus on summarizing collected data to incorporate into the CAAP.
   2. The Natural and Working Lands section of the CAAP has a tight review timeline. The draft chapter will be received by the TAC in mid-April. The TAC will have the opportunity to meet together and thoroughly review whether the CAAP accurately reflects the work and recommendations provided by this group. The review period is from February 5th to February 19th.
   3. It was shared that paper mailers and hard copies of the survey were successful in getting producer engagement.
2. **Review Yolo County Acreage Data** *(Attachments B, C)* 
   1. It was shared that this dataset reflects existing protected lands in Yolo County. The first tab of the spreadsheet shows an overview of land cover types for protected and jurisdictional controlled lands. It was added that the acreage data reflects agricultural land in easements broken down by entity type.
   2. RCD recommended cemetery districts be included as they are protected open land that sequester carbon.
   3. It was shared that Table 19 shows existing conservation efforts relevant to the CAAP, along with data on the land cover acreage, length of implementation, and general information for each plan.
   4. The following questions were shared to guide feedback on this dataset:
      1. *Protected Areas. Please let us know if the protected/easement land acreages and site names are accurate. If anything seems missing or acreages seem off, please let us know.*
      2. *Existing Plans. The plans/policies are consistent with the most recent policy table provided to Dudek (12.07.23 NWL CAAP Strategy 8). All of the local plans from that policy table should be included with the exception of the following:* 
         1. *The Yolo Natural Heritage Program. I haven’t been able to locate a plan specifically associated with the YNHP. Apologies if I missed this in our correspondence. If you’re able to provide this plan I would be happy to update the spreadsheet with the relevant policies.*
         2. *The Yolo Bypass Drainage and Water Infrastructure Improvement Study. This study did not appear to have any carbon-related policies. Please let me know if there are specific items from that study we were hoping to highlight.*
      3. *Management/Restoration Acreages. We included acreages for existing planning efforts where possible, but in some cases, specific detail was not provided in the plans. As you review, please let us know if there is more specific information for these existing planning items.*
   5. It was added that this reflects a small percentage of Yolo County land, and much of it is not within the expertise of the TAC members.
   6. A commenter shared they feel the information is accurate based off of how the data was sourced.
   7. **Feedback should be provided by EOD this Friday, January 19th.**
   8. A comment was made that not all land under easement is reflected in this dataset, about 600 acres was noted as missing. (Swainson’s Hawk easements held by Yolo Land Trust)
      1. Staff requested more details on the 600 acres to check whether this land is reflected elsewhere.
   9. A comment was made that 10% of the County’s acreage is under protected status. It was asked how the percentage of protected lands compares to other counties in California.
      1. A response was made to check with the Yolo Land Trust on this.
   10. A comment was made that there is a privately owned park, Nelson’s Grove, in unincorporated area that is not included.
   11. It was asked how the data was pulled for Row 32, *Objective SH1*, on the Land Conservation Plans table.
       1. Acreage data was pulled directly from the Yolo HCP/NCCP plan.
       2. It was added that this is reflective of objectives and not what has necessarily already been achieved.
   12. It was asked why this level of detailed data is necessary, and whether it will be associated with carbon sequestration values for habitat types.
       1. Getting an estimate of current land under conservation will inform prioritization and sequestration potential for both natural and working lands.
       2. It was added that including existing plans is important to prevent duplicative work and enables CAAP implementation to add onto years of existing work.
   13. Staff shared that at the next TAC meeting the group will receive a list of sequestration practices broken down by crop type. This will include estimates of potential adoption rates, along with estimates of adoption with the addition of incentives. The TAC will then discuss whether they feel the estimates are accurate.
   14. It was asked if it would be permitted to reference specific farm & producer names to showcase on-farm carbon plans.
       1. A response was made that this would be okay.
   15. It was shared that this dataset shows land that is legally protected from change by ag easements or conservation easements. The data will be presented in the CAAP broken down by overall crop type.
   16. It was shared that the County is coordinating with the landfill on 1383 efforts.
   17. A question was asked regarding whether Yolo has looked into how other RCDs estimated Carbon sequestration.
       1. It was shared that there were interviews with other counties’ RCDs about their climate action planning processes before the NWL TAC was formed.
   18. The next TAC meeting will be on February 13th from 3 PM – 4:30 PM.
   19. A commenter asked if the water district area should be excluded due to the fact there isn’t carbon sequestration potential.
   20. A commenter asked whether UC Davis's ag lands will push tenants to follow carbon sequestration practices.
   21. A commenter asked how the consulting team will approach the huge variety of land uses in protected spaces. It was also asked how the recommendations will be broken down/set up. (By land use? By adoption estimates?)
       1. Staff responded that this question can be passed on to the consulting team.
   22. A comment was made that there is a lot of land that is owned by UC Davis, such as the arboretum and open plots of land used for research. It was asked how this land is being incorporated.
   23. A comment was made that the C sequestration potential of plant communities does not change with ownership or conservation status. It was added that the information may only be relevant to evaluate the likelihood of implementing different practices.
   24. A comment was made that the riparian wetlands acreage may be too high by including some land used for rice.
   25. Staff shared that additional questions should be sent to Staff/RCD by Monday (ideally EOD Friday) so that they can be passed on to the consulting team.