

TABLE OF CONTENTS

11.0 HCP FUNDING11-1

11.1 COST ANALYSIS.....11-1

 11.1.1 Program Administration Cost Overview.....11-2

 11.1.2 Costs for Fee-Based Conservation.....11-3

 11.1.3 Costs for Monitoring and Adaptive Management.....11-5

 11.1.4 Contingency11-5

11.2 FUNDING SOURCES AND ASSURANCES11-5

 11.2.1 Fee Collection11-6

 11.2.2 Fee Adjustments.....11-6

11.3 FUNDING ADEQUACY11-7

TABLES

Table 11.1: Summary of Annual Monitoring Budgets by Implementation Phase 11-8

Table 11.2: Summary of Implementation Annual and Total Budget and Zone 1 Development
Application Fee Calculation 11-10



This page intentionally left blank



11.0 HCP FUNDING

This chapter addresses the current estimated costs (2012 dollars) and funding sources to implement the Solano Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). Most regional habitat conservation plans emphasize a fee-based system, that is, most reserve acquisition and management are achieved through a base per-acre fee charged for development and other Covered Activities. These fees are then pooled to cover the costs of administration, land or reserve acquisition and management, habitat restoration, long-term monitoring, reporting, and other associated costs.

The Solano HCP has, for the most part, adopted a different approach, one which requires applicants to obtain mitigation for Covered Activities in accordance with the applicable mitigation requirements identified in Chapter 6.0. Fees are still required; however, these fees address administrative costs associated with monitoring and reporting and implementation of broader, landscape-level or cumulative impact mitigation measures. The Plan Participants have adopted this approach for most Covered Species and Natural Communities because:

1. Many other regional conservation plans have had difficulty keeping the pace of conservation activities commensurate with development (e.g., development is occurring faster than fees can be spent or willing sellers for conservation can be found).
2. Land acquisition costs typically rise faster than fees, resulting in substantial shortfalls for funding land acquisition and the inability of Plan Participants to meet their conservation commitments through mitigation impact fees alone.
3. Fee collection systems and a centralized body to acquire and manage conservation lands require substantial increases in overhead costs and additional staff or new organizations to administer these fees and lands. Plan Participants wanted to minimize overhead costs and/or the creation of new entities to administer the program.
4. A number of commercial mitigation banks were/are in the process of being established within Solano County that would accommodate a substantial portion of the mitigation requirements associated with Covered Activities.

The following sections describe the costs (and assumptions supporting the costs) for administering and implementing the conservation program, funding sources and assurances, and an analysis of funding adequacy.

11.1 COST ANALYSIS

Tables 11.1 and 11.2 (provided at the end of this chapter) summarize the costs for implementing, monitoring, and reporting the conservation measures as described in this HCP. Administrative costs will be paid through a combination of general fund operating budgets (primarily for administrative expenses related to currently staffed positions) and user-based fees. Avoidance and minimization measures (Section 6.3), mitigation measures (Section 6.4), and adaptive management, monitoring and reporting (Chapter 7.0) will be funded by user funded/purchased habitat mitigation and user-based fees. Additional conservation and/or targeted studies above and beyond the specified goals and objectives of the Plan may be funded from grants from State, Federal, and other sources to the extent that such funds can be obtained.



The Solano HCP is mandatory for all Plan Participants and third-party applicants¹, and approximately 16,227 acres (ac) of habitat for Covered Species are expected to be converted to urban uses as a result of Covered Activities over the next 30 years (see Table 2.8), which is the term of the HCP. The annualized loss or conversion of habitat is approximately 540 ac per year. Actual development or habitat conversion rates are unlikely to occur at the same rate, resulting in variations in funding levels in any given year. Therefore, funds (from impact fees) will need to be carefully managed *to assure full funding of activities each year*. The amount of funds available in any given year will depend on the availability of funds derived from impact fees.

The following sections address the overall costs of the HCP and background or basis for fee-based mitigation measures and monitoring and adaptive management studies.

11.1.1 Program Administration Cost Overview

Section 10.2 describes the basic administrative requirements for each Plan Participant. The Solano County Water Agency (SCWA) is taking the lead role for administering and reporting the Solano HCP (see Section 10.2.1 for basic duties and responsibilities). The SCWA has committed the equivalent of one full-time position for the 30-year term of the HCP. That full-time equivalent position will fund a lead SCWA scientist, support staff, and supervision by the General Manager, and is valued at \$100,000 per year. Additional funding, which is to be obtained from users fees, will be required to maintain the comprehensive database and compliance reporting program. Table 11.1 projects the costs for annual report preparation and database management through the initial set-up and trial, baseline monitoring, and long-term monitoring periods. Background information and assumptions for these costs are provided in a Solano HCP Monitoring and Adaptive Management Cost Analysis and Assumptions memorandum (LSA 2012) to the SCWA.

The average annual cost to administer the HCP, conduct monitoring, and provide payments into the required endowments is estimated to be \$2,842,682 (Table 11.2). The average annual budgets for the various activity categories in Table 11.2 are presented in two broad categories. The first category summarizes the average annual costs and total budgets for activities during the planned 30-year term of the HCP. The second category addresses the costs and budgets for the long-term or “in perpetuity” requirements that will be funded through a non-wasting endowment.

While Plan Participants will have primary responsibility for determining mitigation requirements, assuring compliance, and granting third-party incidental take permits during the term of the HCP, these activities are already part of each Plan Participant’s responsibilities under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for review and approval of projects. As stated previously, each city is expected to administer the HCP through their respective planning departments. Standardized reporting, collection, and distribution of impact fees established by the SCWA Board of Directors (see Section 10.2.1), where applicable, and general HCP coordination and management will result in increased administrative costs for each Plan Participant. The level of increased costs will vary between Plan Participants. Each Plan Participant is expected to add these costs to the current fees charged for project review.

¹ Eligible third parties include individuals and public and private institutions and companies who fall under the direct regulatory control of one of the Plan Participants for a Covered Activity.



For the initial user fee assessment, \$150,000 per year for HCP administration and reporting is assumed (i.e., an average of \$25,000 per year per city). The annual budget also includes \$185,000 per year to fund part-time positions at the Sacramento and San Francisco District offices of the United States Army Corps of Engineers for their administration of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act permits related to HCP Covered Activities and participation in the Technical Advisory Committee. Additional administrative costs to implement the Good Neighbor Policy (see Section 10.5.6), operate the various Advisory and Regulatory Committees, employ periodic independent scientific review (if needed), provide general public education and outreach, and other miscellaneous implementation costs are also shown in Table 11.2.

Approximately 68.4 percent¹ of the total annual budget (\$1,945,200) will fund these ongoing activities: HCP administration, fee-based conservation actions, good neighbor assessments, monitoring and adaptive management, and compliance reporting. The remaining 31.6 percent of the average annual costs (\$897,482) will be placed in a reserved management endowment account to provide the “in perpetuity” funding for ongoing programs and management (e.g., post-term HCP in-perpetuity administration, management, monitoring, and mitigation costs) (see Table 11.2 and Section 11.1.3).

Over the 30-year permit duration, the 29 average annual payments of \$897,482 will provide an endowment of \$26,026,971 (in 2012 dollars). This endowment requirement is based on the amount necessary to generate the average annual budget equivalent of \$910,944 in 2012 dollars using a 3.5 percent capitalization rate (gross investment yield minus inflation minus management fees). The 29-year payment period for the endowment allows the endowment to be fully funded and garner interest for 1 year before funds are withdrawn for the in-perpetuity tasks.

11.1.2 Costs for Fee-Based Conservation

Several of the Solano HCP goals and objectives (Chapter 5.0) are implemented through a pooled, fee-based system. These objectives include:

1. Invasive species control, water quality, and Riparian, Stream, and Freshwater Marsh enhancement (Objectives RSM 2.1, GGS 1.1, and CM 1.1);
2. Potential need for several site-specific species occurrence acquisitions or new occurrence establishment (Objectives VPG 2.3 to VPG 2.10, VPG 2.12, VPG 2.13, and CM 2.3);
3. Swainson’s hawk and burrowing owl nesting habitat acquisition (1,000 ac) (Objectives SH 2.2 and BO 2.1); and
4. Protect known nests of Swainson’s hawk, burrowing owl, and tricolored blackbird impacted by Covered Activities (Objectives SH 2.2, BO 2.1, and RSM 2.5, and Mitigation Measures SH 4, BO 2, and RSM 13).

¹ Note the percent annual budget and percent total budget figures vary slightly as a result of the 29-year payout term for the in-perpetuity management and monitoring endowment versus the 30-year permit term.



Fees to fulfill the objectives described in line items 1, 2, and 3 above will be assessed to all projects on a per-acre basis. The amount of annual funding will vary depending on the pace of the development.

- Fees for protecting known nests site for Swainson's hawk (Mitigation Measure SH 4, Section 6.4.8), burrowing owl (Mitigation Measure BO 2, Section 6.4.9), and tricolored blackbird colonies (Mitigation Measure RSM 1Objective CM 2.3 calls for the establishment of at least one new occurrence each of Suisun thistle and soft bird's-beak, which are both Coastal Marsh covered plant species. Finally, Objective RLF 1.4 calls for the translocation of California red-legged frogs between isolated populations at least three times (once every 10 years) during the effective time frame of the HCP. The SCWA has established an initial budget of \$25,000 per plant species occurrence (\$500,000) and \$10,000 per animal occurrence/translocation event (\$220,000) over the life of the HCP for species reintroductions, establishments, or translocations. Most of these occurrences are expected to be preserved through the normal establishment of the reserve system (e.g., species will be present on approved reserves); however, some extremely rare species such as Solano grass may need to be reintroduced to established reserves. As an incentive for mitigation or conservation bank operators to establish new occurrences of these Covered Species on their banks, the SCWA may credit banks the money set aside for the establishment of that occurrence. SCWA may also decide to use the money to directly fund species re-introductions on established reserves or directly conserve occurrences through land purchases or conservation easements. The SCWA and Resource Agencies will approve funding requests for species relocation/establishment projects (see Section 10.5.4.2).
- **Swainson's Hawk and Burrowing Owl Nesting Habitat Acquisition:** The SCWA will preserve 1,000 ac encompassing active and known nest sites and associated foraging for one or both species (Objectives SH 2.2 and BO 2.1). The extent of nesting habitat preserved for each species will be based on need, land availability, long-term suitability of nesting habitat, etc., as determined by the SCWA and Resource Agencies (see Section 10.2.6). Lands will be preserved through direct acquisition and/or conservation easements from public and private landowners. Costs for acquisition and management are based on an assumed conservation cost of \$10,000 per acre. Costs include acquisition (fee title or conservation easement), administrative and management costs, and compliance monitoring costs. The base fee includes Irrigated Agriculture land prices ranging from \$6,250 to \$8,700 per acre in the Dixon Ridge/Winters area for 80+ ac parcels (various real estate listing sources 2010; Mutters et al. 2007). Based on the assumed conservation cost of \$10,000 per acre, the total cost for preserving 1,000 ac would be \$10,000,000. Spread over the projected 16,227 ac of development, this program costs approximately \$616 per developed acre.
- **Swainson's Hawk, Burrowing Owl, and Tricolored Blackbird Active Nest Protection:** The SCWA has established an initial fee of \$12,000 per active Swainson's hawk or burrowing owl nest or tricolored blackbird breeding colony directly or indirectly lost as a result of development. The \$12,000 fee is based on \$10,000 for nest protection plus an additional \$2,000 for added administration and compliance costs for an interim program. The \$10,000 nest protection fee will be used as a direct payment for protection of nests/breeding colonies where the nest/colony can be protected in perpetuity (e.g., at an approved mitigation bank or other HCP approved reserve) or in cases when such preserved nest sites are not available, the full fee will be placed in an endowment-type account and the resulting net interest (gross yield minus inflation and management fees) used to provide payment (\$350 per nest site per year)



and compliance (\$70 per year for compliance) for the interim nest protection program described under Objectives SH 2.2, BO 2.1, and RSM 2.5 without diminishing the principal.

11.1.3 Costs for Monitoring and Adaptive Management

Monitoring and adaptive management costs are summarized in Table 11.1. Costs/budgets are provided for: (1) the initial implementation and trial period (HCP authorization, Years 1 through 5); (2) the 10-year baseline inventory period (Years 6 through 15); and (3) the long-term compliance monitoring period (Years 16 through 30 and continuing in perpetuity). The Solano HCP Monitoring and Adaptive Management Cost Analysis and Assumptions memorandum (LSA 2012) provides a basis of these costs (e.g., labor costs, study periods, and associated assumptions).

During Phase 1 of the monitoring program, a total budget for each element (Years 1 through 5) is provided. In this initial 5-year period, most studies will be conducted once as a trial to assess Covered Species detection and the effectiveness of study procedures, and to establish appropriate parameters/sample sizes for desired confidence levels. Long-term budgets are projected on an annual basis; however, most monitoring will be conducted once every 3 years, making the costs for the 3-year rotation studies three times the annual budget. Section 7.4 describes the requirements for the Biological Effectiveness Monitoring Program to be administered by the SCWA.

Research is an important component of adaptive management. Targeted studies to address unknowns and data gaps will be funded through a grant program. The initial budget for this program is estimated at \$50,000 per year for the first 5 years, \$75,000 per year for Years 6 through 15, and \$85,000 per year for the remainder of the HCP.

In perpetuity monitoring and management will be funded through a non-wasting endowment. As projected in Table 11.2, the total endowment (in 2012 dollars) is \$26,026,971 and will yield on average \$910,944 per year for in perpetuity monitoring and adaptive management activities as well as other ongoing mitigation (also see discussion in Section 11.1.1). Endowment funds will not be utilized until the endowment is fully funded for at least 1 year (e.g., the end of the term for the HCP).

11.1.4 Contingency

A 20 percent contingency fee has been included in the overall base fee program to address unexpected costs and to provide additional funds if remedial actions are required.

11.2 FUNDING SOURCES AND ASSURANCES

Primary funding for establishing reserves will result from the land acquired for project-specific mitigation and the fees paid to commercial and institutional mitigation banks. These actions include the purchase or protection of lands through conservation easements and management and monitoring in perpetuity. The Plan Participants or third-party applicants, seeking coverage under the Solano HCP/2081 Incidental Take Permits will be responsible for compliance on these reserve lands. Funding sources for administration of the Solano HCP/2081 Incidental Take Permits and the comprehensive Monitoring and Adaptive Management Program under the HCP will be obtained through Plan Participant general fund and user-based fee commitments.



In addition to administrative/mitigation fees and general funds, the Plan Participants will also seek outside grant funding from State and Federal governments and private institutions and organizations. Grant funding would augment reserve acquisitions and fund directed studies to help resolve uncertainties in Covered Species and the Natural Community's ecology and management. The current base funding does not include any monies from outside sources.

11.2.1 Fee Collection

Fees for administrative cost reimbursements (excluding SCWA's general fund commitment), adaptive management and monitoring, and contingencies for fee-based conservation programs (see Section 10.9.1.2) will be collected by the individual Plan Participant serving as the Lead Agency for the proposed action. That Lead Agency will retain the applicable portion of the administrative fee due to that agency. The remainder of the funds will be forwarded to SCWA as the Lead Agency for implementation of the HCP.

The current recommended base application fee to address these various costs is currently \$5,200 per developed acre¹ (in 2012 dollars) (see Table 11.2 for breakdown) and is based on the total projected costs of \$84,382,971 divided by the projected 16,227 ac of development impacts. Certain in-fill projects with limited direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts to Covered Species are eligible for exemption from compliance with certain HCP avoidance, minimization, and mitigation requirements (see Section 10.4.3). Such projects may be eligible for reduced fees consistent with the project's specific impacts. The minimum preliminary reduced fee is \$1,050 per acre. This minimum reduced fee includes costs for administrative and reporting costs (e.g., review of exemption applications, reporting requirements), contributions to water quality and invasive species control programs related to urban runoff mitigation, and a fair-share contribution to the long-term endowment.

The basis for the user fee will be assessed again once the HCP is fully adopted and adjusted to account for projects approved during the HCP review and approval process. While this fee is substantially lower than other regional conservation programs, most of the costs for implementing and managing the conservation program, including land acquisition are being borne directly by the users (Covered Activity applicants) through purchase of credits at established mitigation banks, direct acquisition of lands, and payment of fees for required management and monitoring programs on established reserves.

11.2.2 Fee Adjustments

Fees for administrative costs and conservation actions will be reviewed and adjusted once a year by the SCWA or as necessary if unexpected changes in costs arise. Fees will be adjusted to account for inflation and changes in land values. Fee changes will be based on a review of various indices such as the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the San Francisco Bay area. Fees, particularly for

¹ For the purposes of the fee calculation, a developed acre will typically be equivalent to the total development project/parcel size and includes all landscaping, general public open space, roads, utility easements, etc. The only lands excluded from the impact fee calculation are lands avoided per HCP requirements and which are established, funded, and managed as reserves per Section 10.5.



reserve land acquisition, if needed, will be further reviewed and adjusted based on factors such as changes in median prices for home sales in Solano County. This index better reflects land prices that, at least in recent times, have risen faster than the CPI for this region.

11.3 FUNDING ADEQUACY

The Plan Participants will annually review ongoing costs for administration and management of the HCP. This annual review will include a review of the adequacy of fees and the status of reserve system development with respect to the pace of urban development/habitat loss. The Plan Participants will also annually review the costs of ongoing reserve management with respect to the cost assumptions contained in the required management plans and endowment funds established for long-term management. As stated above, mitigation bank sponsors or private entities proposing to dedicate mitigation lands will be primarily responsible for the cost of developing management plans and funding the endowments. If significant shortfalls in funding are anticipated, alternative sources of funding, including increased base fees or reallocation of impact fees, may be required.

The amount of funding available each year depends on the amount and extent of development because the primary source for HCP funding is a development/user fee. The budget assumes a constant average of 540 ac of development per year for all applicants. In reality, development rates will vary with more development occurring in some years and little to no development occurring in others. Administration of the HCP anticipates such fluctuations in available funding. Many of the initial monitoring trials anticipate 2 to 5 years for completion following adoption of the HCP. This time frame allows sufficient impact fees to accumulate for funding required studies/plans. Similarly, the full baseline monitoring program is scheduled to begin in Year 5 in order to allow preliminary trials to be completed and funds to be accumulated. Any fees acquired in excess of annual costs will be banked in secure, interest-bearing accounts.

All collected funds will be earmarked for designated activities and deposited in special interest-bearing accounts. An annual financial review of the funds will be prepared, and the results will be used for the annual review of the adequacy of fees. If insufficient funds are available in any given year, it may be necessary to skip a monitoring or full funding cycle for directed studies. Any such schedule changes will be made in consultation with the Resource Agencies and Advisory Committee. In years when excess funds are collected, additional funds will be banked to offset years when funding falls below average projections. Although monitoring or directed study budgets may be periodically postponed or modified, all habitat conservation actions will be implemented prior to or concurrent with impacts (e.g., the “stay ahead” commitment [see Section 10.5] will remain in effect).

As described in Section 10.5.1, each established reserve (mitigation bank or private land dedication for mitigation) must have an approved management plan and funding mechanism for long-term management and monitoring. The minimum standards for reserves require that long-term funding be determined through use of a standardized procedure such as a Property Analysis Record (PAR; Center for Natural Lands Management 2004). To ensure proper funding and consistency, Plan Participants will provide basic standards for PAR costs, including minimum labor rates, materials costs, monitoring costs, and interest rate return. Plan Participants will also periodically review reserve management expenses to ensure actual costs are consistent with those included in the PAR. If discrepancies are identified, adjustments in the endowment will be required.



Table 11.1: Summary of Annual Monitoring Budgets by Implementation Phase

| Monitoring Element | Monitoring Budget | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | Total Budget, Years 1-5 Set-up and Trials ¹ | Annual Budget, Years 6-15 Baseline Period ² | Annual Budget, Years 16 - In Perpetuity (Long-Term Monitoring) |
| Landscape Level Management and Monitoring | | | |
| Climatic Variables ³ | \$26,250 | \$5,250 | \$5,250 |
| Extreme Events ³ | \$5,250 | \$5,250 | \$5,250 |
| Vegetation Community/Habitat Condition Assessment | \$26,250 | \$5,250 | \$5,250 |
| Land Use | \$10,500 | \$2,100 | \$2,100 |
| Valley Floor Grassland and Vernal Pool Natural Community | | | |
| Vegetation Monitoring | \$69,000 | \$83,500 | \$27,800 |
| Invasive species monitoring | \$9,450 | \$14,700 | \$4,900 |
| Contra Costa Goldfield Population Monitoring | | \$46,000 | \$15,500 |
| Covered Vernal Pool Plant Surveys | \$57,000 | \$74,000 | \$24,600 |
| Delta Green Ground Beetle | \$17,500 | \$13,300 | \$4,500 |
| Vernal Pool Crustacean Population Monitoring | \$38,500 | \$50,000 | \$16,700 |
| California Tiger Salamander Surveys | \$37,200 | \$40,000 | \$13,300 |
| California Red-Legged Frog | | | |
| California Red-Legged Frog Monitoring | \$33,500 | \$21,700 | \$8,000 |
| Establish New or Augment Existing Breeding Populations | \$2,100 | \$420 | \$420 |
| Hydrology Monitoring | \$5,120 | \$3,430 | \$1,140 |
| Callippe Silverspot Butterfly | | | |
| Johnny Jump-Up Monitoring | \$24,150 | \$31,500 | \$10,500 |
| Adult Nectar Plants | \$1,225 | \$1,600 | \$550 |
| Callippe Silverspot Butterfly Population Monitoring | \$19,000 | \$17,000 | \$6,200 |
| Riparian, Stream, and Freshwater Marsh Natural Communities | | | |
| Hydrology and Water Quality Monitoring | \$11,000 | \$4,750 | \$1,435 |
| Riparian Habitat Quality | \$58,000 | \$7,500 | \$7,500 |
| Invasive Species Monitoring | \$65,000 | \$3,300 | \$3,300 |
| Fish Passage Barriers | \$29,500 | \$5,040 | \$- |
| Salmonid Water Quality | \$5,250 | \$2,730 | \$910 |
| Salmonid Surveys | \$19,800 | \$7,700 | \$2,600 |
| Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Monitoring | \$7,800 | \$3,450 | \$1,150 |
| Tricolored Blackbird Population Monitoring | \$26,150 | \$26,150 | \$8,700 |
| Giant Garter Snake | | | |
| Habitat Monitoring | \$16,400 | \$1,800 | \$1,800 |
| Population Monitoring | \$- | \$20,160 | \$6,700 |
| Contingency Monitoring | \$78,400 | \$15,680 | \$15,680 |
| Coastal Marsh | | | |
| Water Quality Monitoring | \$4,200 | \$12,000 | \$6,000 |
| Invasive Species Monitoring | \$1,400 | \$280 | \$280 |
| Suisun Thistle and Soft Bird's-Beak Monitoring | \$22,680 | \$13,440 | \$4,480 |
| California Black Rail and California Clapper Rail Monitoring | \$21,000 | \$16,800 | \$5,600 |
| Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse Monitoring | \$83,475 | \$79,275 | \$26,425 |
| Delta Smelt and Longfin Smelt Habitat Monitoring | \$13,900 | \$1,200 | \$1,200 |
| Swainson's Hawk | | | |
| Swainson's Hawk Population Assessment | \$55,650 | \$51,450 | \$17,150 |
| Nest Tree Monitoring | \$16,600 | \$12,400 | \$4,150 |
| Burrowing Owl | | | |
| Burrowing Owl Population Assessment | \$55,650 | \$51,450 | \$17,300 |
| Burrowing Owl Nest Monitoring | \$18,500 | \$14,300 | \$4,800 |



Table 11.1: Summary of Annual Monitoring Budgets by Implementation Phase

| Monitoring Element | Monitoring Budget | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Total Budget, Years 1-5 Set-up and Trials ¹ | Annual Budget, Years 6-15 Baseline Period ² | Annual Budget, Years 16 - In Perpetuity (Long-Term Monitoring) |
| Database Development | | | |
| Database Development | \$45,000 | | |
| Database Maintenance | \$30,000 | \$40,000 | \$30,000 |
| Annual Report | | | |
| Preparation | \$150,000 | \$75,000 | \$30,000 |
| Targeted Studies | | | |
| Years 1 through 30 only | \$50,000 | \$75,000 | \$85,000 |
| Total | \$1,267,350 | \$955,855 | \$434,120 |
| Annualized Cost | \$253,470 | \$955,855 | \$434,120 |
| Total Cost | \$17,337,700 | | |
| Average Annualized Cost | \$577,923 | | |

¹ Set-up and trial period budgets represent costs for the 5-year period. Certain landscape studies such as climatic monitoring are conducted annually while other studies will be conducted once during the initial 5-year period.

² All studies are conducted annually.

³ Landscape monitoring of climatic conditions and extreme events are conducted annually. All other studies are conducted once every 5 years.



Table 11.2: Summary of Implementation Annual and Total Budget and Zone 1 Development Application Fee Calculation

| Budget Task | Average Annual Budget | % of Average Annual Budget ¹ | Total Budget (30 years) | % of Total Budget |
|---|----------------------------|---|-------------------------|-------------------|
| HCP Lifetime Costs (Years 1 to 30) | | | | |
| Administrative Cost, SCWA General Fund Budget | \$100,000 | 3.5% | \$3,000,000 | 3.6% |
| Plan Participant Administrative Costs ² | \$150,000 | 5.3% | \$4,500,000 | 5.3% |
| United States Army Corps of Engineers WRDA Funding ³ | \$185,000 | 6.5% | \$5,550,000 | 6.6% |
| Good Neighbor Assessments, Advisory Committee, Independent Science Review | \$50,000 | 1.8% | \$1,500,000 | 1.8% |
| Public Outreach and Education | \$25,000 | 0.9% | \$750,000 | 0.9% |
| Species Establishment | \$24,000 | 0.8% | \$720,000 | 0.9% |
| Swainson's Hawk and Burrowing Owl Nest Protection | \$334,000 | 11.7% | \$10,020,000 | 11.9% |
| Water Quality/Invasive Species Mitigation | \$175,000 | 6.2% | \$5,250,000 | 6.2% |
| Monitoring and Adaptive Management/Targeted Studies | \$578,000 | 20.3% | \$17,340,000 | 20.5% |
| Contingency (20%) | \$324,200 | 11.4% | \$9,726,000 | 11.5% |
| Subtotal | \$1,945,200 | 68.4% | \$58,356,000 | 69.2% |
| In-Perpetuity Costs (Year 31+) | | | | |
| Administrative Costs | \$50,000 | 1.8% | | |
| Monitoring and Adaptive Management | \$349,120 | 12.3% | | |
| Water Quality/Invasive Species Mitigation | \$175,000 | 6.2% | | |
| Swainson's Hawk and Burrowing Owl Nesting Habitat Management | \$35,000 | 1.2% | | |
| Adaptive Management | \$150,000 | 5.3% | | |
| Contingency (20%) | \$151,824 | 5.3% | | |
| Subtotal | \$910,944 | 32.0% | | |
| Endowment Required to Generate Annual Budget at 3.5% ⁴ | | | \$26,026,971 | 30.8% |
| Annual Contribution to Endowment ⁵ | \$897,482 | 31.6% | | |
| Total | \$2,842,682 | 100.0% | \$84,382,971 | 100.0% |
| Average Cost Per Acre of Anticipated Development ⁶ | | | \$5,200 | |
| Additional Project-Specific Costs | | | | |
| Swainson's Hawk, Burrowing Owl, Tri-colored Blackbird Nest Impacts | \$12,000 per occupied nest | | | |

NOTE: All costs reported in 2012 dollars. All costs subject to annual review and increase.

¹ The percentage average annual budget and percentage total budget figures vary slightly because of the 29-year pay-off period for the endowment (see footnote 5 below.)

² Preliminary budget assumes \$25,000 per city. Actual administrative costs to be determined by individual Plan Participant Jurisdiction.

³ Funding for part-time staff positions for United States Army Corps of Engineers participation under the WRDA.

⁴ Endowment necessary to provide the \$910,944 in average annual fees in perpetuity. Assumes a capitalization rate (gross return minus inflation minus fees) of 3.5%.

⁵ Average annual payments in Years 1 through 29. Provides for full funding of endowment for 1 year prior to withdrawals. Amount equals 31.6% of Annual Budget.

⁶ Based on projected 16,227 acres of anticipated development over the life of the HCP or approximately 540 acres per year average. Actual growth rates will vary. Final fee calculation will be based on developable land at the time of the HCP implementation. Fee calculation excludes SCWA general fund commitment for HCP Administration.

HCP = Habitat Conservation Plan

SCWA = Solano County Water Agency

WRDA = Water Resources Development Act

