

## Staff Report

TO: Chair and Board Members  
Yolo County Habitat JPA

FROM: Maria Wong  
Executive Director

DATE: April 25, 2011

SUBJECT: Discussion and Board direction regarding the proposed governance structure for the Yolo HCP/NCCP.

---

### ***Requested Action:***

Allow staff presentation of the draft governance proposal and provide Board direction as needed.

---

Large scale HCP and HCP/NCCPs are typically managed using one of three basic governance models. All of the models are effective; the choice is based on circumstances related to each individual plan, particularly with respect to how regulatory permits are issued. The Yolo NHP Permittees are currently comprised of the County and the four incorporated cities. Under staff's proposal, other agencies seeking coverage under the HCP/NCCP, including UC Davis<sup>1</sup>, would gain access to regulatory permits using a Certificate of Inclusion option.

The Three Governance Models are generally outlined below:

1. Permittees jointly form an Implementing Entity to assist in implementing the Plan but Permittees perform central functions within their own jurisdictions, such as determining eligibility for coverage (through the CEQA process), issuance of take authorizations to third-party participants, and collection of fees. Reserve assembly, reserve management, and Plan reporting would likely be assigned to the Implementing Entity under this model.
2. Permittees jointly form an Implementing Entity to implement the Plan and charge the Implementing Entity with responsibility for all aspects of Plan implementation, including determination of eligibility for coverage, issuance of all take authorizations to third-party participants, collection of fees, reserve assembly and management, and Plan reporting.
3. Permittees do not jointly form an Implementing Entity. Instead, the Permittees implement the Plan in their respective jurisdictions and undertake all tasks identified in the Plan, including issuance of take authorizations,

---

<sup>1</sup> This decision was made in consultation with FWS and UC Davis.

collection of fees, reserve assembly, reserve management, and Plan reporting. This model would typically be used where the Permittees have developed stand-alone subarea Plans under a framework Plan.

Based on discussions with each of the potential Permittees in the NHP, staff recommends that the Board pursue Governance Model #1 above, with minor modifications that will be provided at the meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

ATTACHMENTS: This is a PowerPoint presentation. The presentation will be available on the JPA's website April 25 before noon and handouts will be provided at the Board meeting.