

Implementing Entity Structures of other HCP/NCCPs in Northern California

Plan	Plan Status	Implementing Entity	Why this type of IE was chosen	Board Composition	Number of Administrative Staff	Approximate Annual Admin. Budget	Size of Planning Area
Yolo Natural Heritage Program (HCP/NCCP)	Under Development	Yolo County HCP/NCCP Joint Powers Agency (JPA)	This JPA was established to govern the development of the HCP/NCCP. They had considered the Yolo County Parks Department to possibly serve as the Implementing Entity since it had performed some similar work in the past, but the department disbanded due to funding issues leaving the JPA as the only other logical choice.	7-member Board of Directors comprised of representatives from member agencies, which include two members of the Yolo County Board of Supervisors, one member each from the City Councils of Davis, Woodland, West Sacramento and Winters, and one ex-officio member from UC Davis.	TBD	TBD	653,820 acres
Solano HCP	Under Development	Solano County Water Agency	They wanted to keep things simple and not deal with the complexities of creating a new JPA. SCWA is a good fit because their existing Board of Directors is comprised of all the mayors and all the Solano County Supervisors so Plan Participants are already represented	Existing SCWA Board includes all five members of the Solano County Board of Supervisors and one representative from the cities of Benicia, Dixon, Fairfield, Rio Vista, Suisun City, Vacaville, Vallejo, Maine Prairie Water District, Solano Irrigation District, and Reclamation District 2068 (15-member Board)	Expect 2 full-time and one part-time	TBD	585,000 acres
San Joaquin HCP	Approved; Being Implemented	San Joaquin Council of Governments (regional government entity)	It was an existing forum (JPA) where all the regional needs were being handled. The collective group did not want to reinvent the wheel since the COG Board already represented all of the Plan Participants.	13-member Board of Directors comprised of all San Joaquin Board of Supervisors, and one city council member from each city	1.5 to 3 full time staff depending on workflow	This fluctuates annually depending on workflow, but approximately \$500,000 to \$935,000	900,000 acres
East Contra Costa County HCP/NCCP	Approved; Being Implemented	East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservancy	This JPA was established specifically to govern the implementation of the HCP/NCCP. It includes all of the permittees.	5-member Board of Directors comprised of a single representative from Contra Costa County and the cities of Pittsburg, Clayton, Oakley and Brentwood	3-5 full time depending on workflow	Approx. \$600k per year for administration	175,000 acres
Placer County Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP)	Under Development	Leaning toward a separate JPA between Placer County and Lincoln	JPA's have been a successful model used for management of waste disposal facilities, highway planning/construction and fee programs	3-member Board of Directors: Placer County (2 votes) and Lincoln (1 vote). Note that Placer Co. Water Agency would not have seat on JPA Board (does not have land use authority)	up to 4.5 full time staff for administration	\$600-700k for administration per year; \$8M in annual operating cost in perpetuity	212,000 acres
Santa Clara Valley Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP)	Under Development	Expect to form JPA	They wanted to find a structure that their elected officials would be most comfortable with. For them, that was a JPA. But, a big problem that had to be worked through is that under State law, a JPA's power is limited to all powers shared by all members. For them, their attorneys wanted the Implementing Entity to adopt development impact fees and three of the seven local partners do not have development impact fee authority. This resulted in a two-governing board format.	Will have two boards because they want the IE to adopt development impact fees and three of seven local partners do not have this authority (water dist, open space authority, transp. agency). A "Governing Board" will meet 1-2 times/year with major task to adopt budget and fees. An "Implementing Board" will meet more regularly and recommend budget and fees to Governing Board.	TBD	TBD	519,475 acres
Natomas Basin HCP	Approved; Being Implemented	Separate Conservancy (Natomas Conservancy)					
South Sacramento County HCP	Under Development	Expect to form JPA	Keeps control of Plan with the Plan Participants who are currently developing the Plan. Considered existing conservancies but concerned that they also have boards with missions that differ from what was needed to implement to HCP. Also considered creating separate conservancy, but legal complexities made this not as desirable.	They have not yet determined the # of Board members, but expect the Board of Directors to be comprised of the Sacramento Co. Board of Supervisors plus a representative from each participating city. It is likely that only the agencies with land use authority will have seats on the JPA Board (i.e. Sacramento County and Cities of Rancho Cordova, Galt, and Elk Grove). It is expected that Sacramento Regional Sanitation District and Sacramento Regional County Water Agency will not have a seat on the Board.	Anticipating 5-6 full-time staff; executive director, land manager, biologist, real estate specialist, admin. Will contract much of the monitoring and some management of conserv. lands	Approx. \$700k for administration per year.	374,000 acres