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#1: Secure changes to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) Yolo Bypass Conservation Measure 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 flood the Yolo Bypass more frequently 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: Support full reconsideration of the existing First Amended Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the state and federal government and water contractors related to the BDCP. Yolo County supports reconsidering the MOA – an agreement developed to secure funding from the water contractors to complete the BDCP planning process - to address the following concerns: 1) the aggressive timeline for completion; 2) the authority of water contractors to control consultants; 3) the special access to confidential documents provided to contractors; and 4) the potential designation of the contractors as BDCP permittees. The MOA as currently written does not ensure the integrity and transparency of the BDCP process, including planning and environmental review, because it does not provide sufficient time to include the public and provides water contractors with preferential access to documents and consultants.

#3: Explore creation of a Yolo County flood control entity for the unincorporated area in the Sacramento River floodplain. As a result of the need to better advocate for flood protection funding and regulatory flexibility in the Delta, the Yolo Bypass, and elsewhere in the Sacramento River floodplain, Yolo County will explore with local stakeholders the establishment of a flood control entity focused on the unincorporated area in the Sacramento River floodplain. The need for the entity is based on two recent developments: 1) proposals in the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan and the BDCP to improve the flood capacity of the Yolo Bypass; and 2) the Delta Stewardship Council’s proposal to create a Delta regional flood agency to prioritize levee improvements and other flood management efforts, as well as distribute funding. Yolo County needs a professional local entity to represent the unincorporated area in ongoing discussions about flood protection improvements and other issues.
#4: Support “beneficiary pays” legislation for Delta water projects. Yolo County supported SB 200 (Wolk), which failed passage in 2011, to ensure that beneficiaries of any projects in the Delta to improve the state’s water supply pay for their share of the projects. SB 34 (Simitian) is a two-year bill on this issue that Yolo County expects will be developed in 2012.

#5: Eliminate or reduce local government match for 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.

#6: Maintain a significant governance role in the BDCP. While Yolo County’s involvement in the BDCP significantly improved in 2011, Yolo County needs to maintain a high level of involvement in and oversight over 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.

#7: Support adequate funding for studies of the impacts of BDCP proposals and evaluate alternatives for all Delta counties. Although Yolo County has thus far received $415,000 in grants and loans to complete studies related to BDCP impacts, the other Delta counties have not received any funding. Yolo County seeks at least an additional $485,000 for Yolo Bypass-related studies, as well as funding needed to support similar efforts in the other Delta counties.

#8: 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.

#9: Secure funding for implementation of Delta Multi-Hazard Coordination Task Force recommendations. Yolo County actively supported the passage of SB 27 (Simitian) in 2008, which established the Delta Multi-Hazard Coordination Task Force to develop Delta emergency preparedness recommendations. The resulting recommendations are on the desk of the Secretary of the California Emergency Management Agency and
should be officially released in early 2012. Yolo County supports allocating existing bond or other funds to implement the Task Force’s recommendations in the 2012-13 budget, including funding for California Emergency Management Agency staff to lead implementation efforts.

**#10: Support the creation of BDCP technical working groups in all five Delta counties.** The state created a technical working group to help develop the proposal to flood the Yolo Bypass more frequently for fish habitat, but has not developed technical working groups to explore proposals in other Delta counties. Yolo County supports the expeditious development of such working groups.

**#11: Support the evaluation of non-diversion alternatives in BDCP, such as water conservation, storage, and desalination.** Similar to the request of environmental groups to BDCP, Yolo County supports the evaluation of non-diversion alternatives as part of the BDCP’s EIR/EIS. 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 other means, the less significant the impacts of the BDCP will be on the Delta counties.

**#12: Support development of an independent review of BDCP science in coordination with the Delta Counties Coalition.** Given the significant uncertainty and complexity associated with habitat conservation and other proposals associated with BDCP, the Delta counties should be involved early in the development of a process to independently review the scientific findings of BDCP consultants.

**#13: Ensure BDCP is integrated with Yolo Natural Heritage Program.** The BDCP is currently discussing ways in which the BDCP will be integrated with local HCP/NCCPs. Ensure that Yolo County’s Natural Heritage Program recommendations (currently under development) are adopted, including the recommendation that BDCP provide regulatory assurances for landowners adjacent to BDCP habitat project areas and support for efforts to retain vegetated levees within the Natural Heritage Program planning boundary.

**#14: Support extension of the timeline for completion of the Delta Plan, Central Valley Flood Protection Plan and Economic Sustainability Plan.** The current 2012 deadlines for the Delta Plan and the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan make it difficult for the responsible agencies to incorporate information and decisions resulting from the BDCP and other ongoing planning efforts. Yolo County supports extending the deadlines to ensure all planning efforts are integrated.