

Conservation and Transportation Planning Workshop

Hosted by Defenders of Wildlife

Report Contents

Workshop Purpose, Goals and Agenda.....	2
Group Reflections on Presentations.....	3
Benefits and Advantages to Integration.....	4
Barriers and Challenges to Integration.....	5
Emerging Barriers and Challenges.....	7
Integrating Conservation Needs into Transportation Planning.....	8
Schedule of Proposed Recommendations.....	13
Individual Workshop Commitments.....	14
Participant List.....	17
Participant Contact Information.....	18

ICOET 2005 Conference
August 31, 2005
San Diego, CA

Facilitation conducted by:

Aja M. Moerler, Planning Consultant
1361 W. 9th Ave. Unit 712 ~ Escondido, CA 92029
760.738.2027 Phone/ 760.738.2027 Fax
Email: AMoerler@sbcglobal.net

Workshop Purpose, Goals and Agenda

Workshop Purpose: Defenders of Wildlife hosted an interactive dinner workshop for representatives from California's local, state and federal agencies, conservation NGOs and interested parties. After hearing from California's resource and transportation agencies, participants helped develop a course of action to effectively integrate conservation considerations into the existing transportation planning process. These workshop products will be utilized to address California's unique transportation and conservation processes and needs.

Workshop Goals: By the time the workshop was over participants...

- A. Became familiar with CA's conservation and transportation planning efforts
- B. Acknowledged the benefits and the advantages of integrating conservation needs into transportation planning
- C. Identified potential obstacles for the integration of conservation needs into transportation planning
- D. Discussed how to effectively integrate conservation needs into existing transportation planning
- E. Developed a schedule for moving forward in a united effort to create an implementation process that takes advantage of the benefits/advantages while overcoming the obstacles

Workshop Agenda

- | | |
|---------|--|
| 6:00 pm | Dinner Served & Welcome Address
<i>Roman Czebiniak, California Representative, Defenders of Wildlife</i> |
| 6:05 pm | Introductions
<i>Trisha White, Habitat & Highways Campaign, Defenders of Wildlife</i> |
| 6:10 pm | California's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy
<i>Dave Bunn, U.C. Davis Wildlife Diversity Project</i> |
| 6:30 pm | California's Transportation Planning Process
<i>Jay Norvell, Chief Environmental Planner, Caltrans</i> |
| 6:50 pm | Florida's Efficient Transportation Decision Making Process (ETDM)
<i>Dr. Dan Smith, University of Central Florida</i> |
| 7:10 pm | Q & A for Presenters |
| 7:20 pm | Group Reflection on Presentations, facilitation begins <ul style="list-style-type: none">§ Identify Benefits/Advantages of Integration§ Identify Potential Challenges and Barriers to Integration |
| 8:00 pm | Breakout: Integration of Conservation and Planning Efforts |
| 8:30 pm | Develop Schedule of Proposed Recommendations |
| 9:15pm | Wrap-up and Next Steps, Adjourn 9:30 |

Group Reflection on Presentations

Thinking back over the three presentations you just heard, what stands out?

- The complexity of the transportation process
- A wide amount of information is needed
- Lack of incentives to coordinate
- Information currently available is too broad to be useful
- There aren't enough funding mechanisms to support integration efforts
- We need to work together
- We need access to consistent shared data layers
- We need a natural system plan in the context of economic expansion
- We need to convene the authorities to take a stand on this issue – it's obvious this is what really makes a difference
- Transportation planning seems to take place at the local level, not statewide

What was exciting or surprising about what you heard?

- It's about \$300 million a year to do this work (This is the amount spent annually on conservation by the State of Florida through the Florida Forever program).
- I saw the first slide show of what Florida was doing back in 1989 – and it's exciting to see it's still going
- The University element only was \$7 million dollars, that's not too much (but keep in mind this was just for data integration)
- There is a growing awareness of how important it is to be involved at the planning level among key stakeholders
- Florida's ability to work on a statewide level, going beyond a county-wide approach
- There was incredible coordination online
- The accessibility of the data in Florida is superb
- Using proven planning processes (e.g. Florida) as foundations for a California plan
- Caltrans and Fish & Game coming together to engage each other at this Workshop!

What concerns or alarms you?

- The complexity of transportation planning
- We need a lot of funding – \$300 million! (see comment above re: Florida Forever)
- We didn't hear about NGO participation and the role of independent science
- We're having a discussion as though the decision for integration does not include political buy-in and decision making, while this seems to be the one thing that truly moves integration forward
- It appears as though regulations are reactive not proactive
- The development of a system that will integrate all information
- We haven't discussed integration of water, air and flood control
- It appears as though the major catalyst for integration efforts in Florida were charismatic endangered species
- Earmarked funding requires constant updates – it's hard to sustain efforts over time
- We don't have money earmarked for management, monitoring and feedback
- It is difficult to create uniform protocols and performance standards for data gathering and management

Benefits and Advantages of Integration

What are the benefits and advantages of integration?

- We'll be able to make better decisions
- We'll avoid surprises – we won't find out after a transportation plan has been presented and approved that it impacts critical preservation areas
- Our efforts will be cheaper in the long run
- Information and efforts will be conducted in a more timely way
- We'd be better stewards of our natural resources here in California and we'd be promoting this concept
- Our communities would be more livable
- There will be more opportunities for regulation and collaboration among partners and key stakeholders
- We'd reduce litigation costs
- There would be less fragmentation across habitats
- We'd develop and implement plans for integration
- We will develop potential revenue sources for conservation planning and outcomes
- Common needs would be identified – such as a collective need for access to relevant data and information
- As more people like us get together to understand one another's points of view's on this issue there will be more people to champion the issue
- We'd be able to identify potential problems before so much money is spent and wasted on project development and transportation planning efforts
- We'll be protecting existing investments in conservation
- We'd have better predictability of resources in relation to transportation for county government and development interests and projects
- We'd be creating cleaner (and more cost effective) transportation systems statewide
- We'd stop wasting our money
- We'd stop damaging our habitats
- There will be opportunities for both conservation and transportation needs to influence land use issues
- Entities would begin working together better and stop efforts that are working against one another
- We'd develop a generation of broadly used data
- We could change our public value system and promote the idea of integrated thinking and planning

Barriers and Challenges to Integration

What are the potential challenges or barriers to integration?

Planning and decision making often takes place at the local level

- Transportation priorities are set and decisions are deferred to local level government
- We don't have a collective comprehensive vision for conservation on a statewide level, the vision is fragmented
- Land use planning is conducted at a local level by local government
- There can be an absence of regulation and consideration of environmental needs at the local planning level
- Land use projects are developed by local developers, then the projects receive buy in from local level government
- Local level planning may lack the bigger picture view of regional & statewide level
- Local levels of government may lack experience, resources, and the technical skill sets necessary for integrated conservation planning

When it comes to conservation planning, there is limited collaboration

- There is no incentive for critical partners, key stakeholders, and levels of government to collaborate with one another
- If there were some incentive available, there would be no convening authority to oversee operations and collaboration efforts
- People don't seem to recognize the savings we have if we take the time to do it right the first time
- There are a high number of entities that are involved in decision making processes that affect these issues
- These issues cross a very broad array of political environments
- There is a lack of resource agency input on local and regional plans
- Some have fear or suspicion of planning regulations
- There is high attrition of partners
- There is distrust between local, state, and federal governmental entities
- There are strained relationships and communications among entities that need to begin to work together to address these issues
- Partners need to participate in decisions about sharing, giving up, and utilizing money and resources
- Existing laws and policies, including reactive and project level regulations, offer a perverse incentive for early collaborative planning.

There is limited information among invested agencies and decision makers

- Information is not integrated or presented in a meaningful and relevant way
- There is limited information sharing
- There is no defined "green way"
- Local level governments are not provided with good information to help inform their decisions – relevant conservation-needs data is not easily accessible

Natural resources are undervalued and we have limited resources to address the problems and develop solutions

- Our natural resource agencies are understaffed
- In some places, natural resources might be viewed as liabilities instead of valuable amenities (this is not true of everyone; for example San Diego, Riverside County and Merced are examples to the contrary)
- The natural resource agencies don't have the necessary manpower to coordinate the collection and sharing of relevant information that could help planning efforts
- Resources are seen as something to work around, not viewed as a high priority
- There is no shared integrated understanding or vision of how to use our resources
- In terms of integration, a common ground has yet to be identified

Perceptions conflict with one another

- At times, there are competing/conflicting perceptions of what is good conservation
- We have contradictory public priorities
- Land resource conservation is seen as conflicting with growth and transportation
- There seem to be two mandates from the public; one is to protect rare species, the other is to develop better transportation systems
- Public says it wants conservation but those same people drive SUV's
- Public is unaware of integration factors
- Public awareness is low and conflicted around transportation and conservation
- There is a variety of perceptions of people around the topic of resources and there are many perceptions to deal with
- There are many different perceptions people have about resources that need to be dealt with
- Some counties would do great stuff if they had the data and resources to begin integration, other counties might have no interest at all

Emerging Barriers and Challenges

Focus Question: Given the barriers and challenges to integration we've identified, what appear to be the critical emerging themes, which we can take time to address together here today?

1. Communication and coordination among partners and key stakeholders
 - Relationships are fragmented
 - We have no mechanisms for early coordination
2. Information availability and sharing (data and technology)
 - Developing the necessary data
 - Sharing and gathering data and technology
3. Competing and conflicting priorities and interests
4. Bureaucratic and regulatory constraints
5. Limited capacity for local and regional planning and conservation efforts
6. No existing funding mechanisms are in place
7. There are no clear, strong, measurable and enforceable planning standards or guidelines
8. There is a lack of incentives for those that have the power to make land use decisions
9. There are no feedback loops in process and implementation to help us evaluate efforts
 - Distinguish the "shalls" from the "shoulds"
10. There are disconnected drivers for local decision making
11. There is a need to identify and share benefits with others
 - Information to raise public awareness
 - Benefits to increase political knowledge and awareness
 - Information to inform decision makers

Integrating Conservation Needs in Transportation Planning

Process: In groups, participants selected a barrier or challenge. Together group members discussed issues related to the barrier or challenge. The group then made recommendations and potential solutions to address the problem. The results are listed in the tables below:

1. Communication and Coordination Among Partners and Key Stakeholders	
Related Issues and Key Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need workshops • Maintain and improve relationships • Local government needs a forum to inform local planning agencies about planning interests
Recommendations and Potential Solutions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop standing committee technical review board: find wildlife expertise from other agencies i.e. F&G, FS, BLM, Universities, local contact report needs of region and build awareness 2. Develop workshop for wildlife community planners (TNC coordinate) 3. Host workshops to bring players together 4. Develop training and educational programs and provide education and outreach to agencies 5. Fund city liaison staff to help resource agencies (DOT funding) 6. Ongoing collaboration among stakeholders – identify resources for proactive sharing, local government inform resource agency about future, interactive planning and information sharing
Members of Table 2	William Ruediger, U.S. Forest Service Jeff Lerner, Defenders of Wildlife Juven Alvarez, Caltrans Jessamine Williams, The Nature Conservancy Marc Hoshovsky, California Department of Fish and Game Candice Steelman, MCAG (Merced) Ezra Neale, UC Davis Road Ecology Center

2. Information Sharing and Availability	
Related Issues and Key Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't have adequate resolution data • Incompatible standards and formats (currently) • Need a central (or regionalized) data clearinghouse • Don't share data; and we have data islands (currently) • Having something shared will save time and money (and reduce duplication)
Recommendations and Potential Solutions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop state/regional GIS clearinghouses/GEO Board/GIO 2. Develop legislative regulation on standards (sharing and availability) 3. Develop incentive for sharing 4. Capture CEQA electronically
Members of Table 1	Jay Norvell, Caltrans Dave Bunn, UC Davis Wildlife Diversity Project Daniel J. Smith, University of Central Florida Roman Czebiniak, Defenders of Wildlife Mike McCoy, UC Davis ICE Larry Eng, California Department of Fish and Game

Integrating Conservation Needs in Transportation Planning...

3. Competing and Conflicting Priorities and Interests	
Related Issues and Key Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different regulatory legal authorities and obligations • Issues of scale • Different desires and values • Follow the money (campaign and finance conflicts) • What is voluntary does not always equal what is best
Recommendations and Potential Solutions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Institutionalizing early coordination (prior to permitting) with money and incentives (coordination equivocates without dollars) 2. Permitting entities housed together as streamlining (if follow through then have satisfied all agencies) 3. Cross education and training – collaboration 4. Interest based negotiations
Members of Table 4	<p>Cynthia Wilkerson, Defenders of Wildlife Lynn Sadler, Mountain Lion Foundation Jill Terp, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Bruce April, Caltrans Alison Berry, UCD Road Ecology Center Banky Curtis, California Department of Fish and Game</p>

4. Bureaucratic and Regulatory Constraints	
Related Issues and Key Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing transportation planning process • Conflicting agency missions • Regulations alone are not enough • There is no vision, no responsibility (fragmented), no integration • Rubber stamping/conformity • Existing regulations are behind the curve of our knowledge with both resources and transportation • Funding is aimed at existing regulations that are deliberately vague • Definitions
Recommendations and Potential Solutions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create an inter agency liaison, MOU/MOA, loans, “walk a mile” in my boots” with an intentional review of overlap, shared vision 2. Develop political will and vision (multi level) 3. Don’t change regulations – provide creative reinterpretation 4. Develop NGO participation
Members of Table 3	<p>Stephanie Stoermer, FHWA Deborah McKee, Caltrans Sandra L. Jacobson, USDA Forest Service Dale Steele, California Department of Fish and Game Trisha White, Defenders of Wildlife Jonathan Snyder, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (Carlsbad) William Boarman, Univ. of California at Riverside</p>

Integrating Conservation Needs in Transportation Planning...

5. Capacity for Local and Regional Planners for Conservation Efforts	
Related Issues and Key Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of access to information • Staff constraints • Lack of expertise and training • No incentive to act without regulatory trigger • Variation in constituent values • There is a lack of funding for conservation
Recommendations and Potential Solutions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agencies and NGO's redirect priorities and staffing to communicate effectively with local agencies 2. Local agencies and elected officials need to engage in statewide conservation strategies 3. Local staff need to be dedicated to this work and paid for by general agency money
Members of Table 5	<p>Amy Pettler, Caltrans Raymond Sauvajot, National Parks Service Michael Beck, Endangered Habitats League Tim Vendlinski, U.S. EPA John DiGregoris, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Gail Patricelli, UC Davis Karen Scarborough, Cal Resources Agency</p>

6. No Existing Funding Mechanisms are in Place	
Related Issues and Key Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There's no funding for planning, research, maintenance, information collection/sharing, etc. • There is no organization to coordinate funds
Recommendations and Potential Solutions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leveraging public and private funds at (and towards) the local level 2. Pass local sales taxes for transportation improvements/conservation packages
Members of Table 5	<p>Amy Pettler, Caltrans Raymond Sauvajot, National Parks Service Michael Beck, Endangered Habitats League Tim Vendlinski, U.S. EPA John DiGregoris, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Gail Patricelli, UC Davis Karen Scarborough, Cal Resources Agency</p>

Integrating Conservation Needs in Transportation Planning...

7. Planning Standards or Guidelines	
Related Issues and Key Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No common vision, no objectives • Varying missions • Inconsistent science in planning process • Lowest common denominator • Decision makers are often influenced by money, not people • There is a lack of time • Lack of knowledge to set standards
Recommendations and Potential Solutions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More independent science (early on) 2. Develop a technology transfer, develop a synthesis, make it accessible 3. Develop standards that reflect goals 4. Develop an interagency group
Members of Table 3	Stephanie Stoermer, FHWA Deborah McKee, Caltrans Sandra L. Jacobson, USDA Forest Service Dale Steele, California Department of Fish and Game Trisha White, Defenders of Wildlife Jonathan Snyder, US Fish & Wildlife Service William Boarman, Univ. of California at Riverside

8. Lack of Incentives for Those With the Power to Make Land Use Decisions	
Related Issues and Key Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competing priorities • The public cares about recreation • Hold projects hostage
Recommendations and Potential Solutions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include "green planning" as RTP guideline 2. Create a payback system for local participation in regional plans (provide project planning funding)
Members of Table 1	Jay Norvell, Caltrans Dave Bunn, UC Davis Wildlife Diversity Project Daniel J. Smith, University of Central Florida Roman Czebiniak, Defenders of Wildlife Mike McCoy, UC Davis ICE Larry Eng, California Department of Fish and Game

Integrating Conservation Needs in Transportation Planning...

10. Disconnected Drivers for Local Decision Making	
Related Issues and Key Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep updating general plans • Variance • Economic drivers understand that system tax (transportation only if compact fee) • Lose money per house • Property rights, income for land sale • Revenue for the city • Conservation planning stand point • Fragmented land use authority
Recommendations and Potential Solutions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop multi county examples – pilot studies integrate regional transportation with conservation efforts 2. Statewide and regionally try to get countries to work in this context 3. Export to other arena market regions – negotiation agreement 4. Grants to work with other associations and governments 5. Build an awareness and education program – provide recognition for conservation efforts (tie recognition above the county level to this) 6. Regions mapped; regional workshops for trans & cons planners 7. Market other county peer sharing
Members of Table 2	<p>William Ruediger, U.S. Forest Service Jeff Lerner, Defenders of Wildlife Juven Alvarez, Caltrans Jessamine Williams, The Nature Conservancy Marc Hoshovsky, California Department of Fish and Game Candice Steelman, MCAG (Merced) Ezra Neale, UC Davis Road Ecology Center</p>

11. Need to Identify and Share Benefits with Others	
Related Issues and Key Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trust considerations • Opportunities for mutual gain • Cross education and training
Recommendations and Potential Solutions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building trust processes – i.e. interest based negotiations 2. Continual feedback and engagement 3. Outreach for benefits and process 4. Curriculum in schools
Members of Table 4	<p>Cynthia Wilkerson, Defenders of Wildlife Lynn Sadler, Mountain Lion Foundation Jill Terp, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Bruce April, Caltrans Alison Berry, UCD Road Ecology Center Banky Curtis, California Department of Fish and Game</p>

Note – Participants did not have time to address the following issue:
 (9) Feedback loops in process and implementation to help us evaluate efforts

Schedule of Proposed Recommendations

A	B	C
Recommended Actions that can begin over the next 1-6 months...	Recommended Actions that can begin in 6-12 months from now...	Recommended Actions that can begin 12 months from now...
<p>Develop "Walk in my shoes" liaison, rotations, review of overlapping responsibilities</p> <p>Develop creative interpretation for regulations (don't change regulations)</p> <p>Include NGO participation (regulations)</p> <p>Conduct outreach on methods and experience to share advantages/benefits</p> <p>Institutionalize early coordination (prior to permitting money with association)</p> <p>Conduct outreach of benefits of integration (both public and political)</p> <p>Leverage public and private funds at the local level (and towards the local level)</p> <p>Agencies and NGO's redirect priorities and staffing to communicate effectively with local agencies</p> <p>Conduct more independent science early on (standards)</p> <p>Hold workshops for planners to discuss regional needs</p> <p>Accessible technology transfer synthesis</p> <p>Develop state/regional GIS clearing house GEOBOARD/GIO</p>	<p>Conduct cross education and training (individual collaboration interest based negotiations)</p> <p>Local sales taxes tying increased conservation with transportation improvements</p> <p>Develop standards that reflect goals – interagency group</p> <p>Include "green planning" as RTP guideline</p> <p>Building trust processes i.e. interest based negotiations (ongoing)</p> <p>Develop an ongoing collaborative group that works regionally</p> <p>Local agencies and elected officials need to engage in statewide conservation strategies</p> <p>Resource agencies get involved in CEQA at general and planning level (and courts to develop precedents)</p>	<p>Ongoing enforcement as it relates to compliance</p> <p>Capture CEQA electronically</p> <p>Stewardship of resources to monitor land and long term management</p> <p>Workshops for eco-regional planning, invite all transportation and resource agencies</p> <p>Permitting entities housed together to encourage streamlining (leading to one permit)</p> <p>School curricula emphasizing collaboration and interest-based negotiation</p> <p>Develop political will and vision at multiple levels (regulations)</p> <p>Pilot studies for multi county examples</p> <p>Local staff need to be dedicated to this work and be paid for by general fund money</p> <p>Grants for COG's to work across boundaries</p> <p>Market success county to county peer sharing (or region to region)</p> <p>Fund local government liaison from natural resources/wildlife agencies (funding from DOT)</p> <p>Training/educational outreach between agencies that deal with and influence planning</p> <p>Create "payback" for local participation in regional plans</p> <p>Legislative with regulation on standards (data)</p>

Individual Workshop Commitments

Participants made a personal commitment to the following...

Individual Commitment	Participant
Include HCP summary in our RTP guidelines (disclaimer: need major management approval) and/or take a rotation position with a city or county to learn "local work" and share "caltrans work"	Juven Alvarez, Caltrans
Work to solve the lack of long term management and ownership of habitat lands.	Bruce April, Caltrans
Make myself available to discuss and work through the issues identified in this workshop relevant to our experience with the San Diego NCCP	Michael Beck, Endangered Habitats League
Help provide knowledge base for planning. Help facilitate interactive processes and public education through UC Davis Road Ecology Center	Alison Berry, UCD Road Ecology Center
Make independent science and technological transfer and synthesis more available as opportunities arise	William Boarman, Univ. of California at Riverside
Better coordination with Caltrans on a statewide basis	Dave Bunn, UC Davis Wildlife Diversity Project
Continue building momentum among committed transportation and conservation planners on a regional and statewide level. Push for necessary legislation, regulation, and policy changes as needed. Educate local advocates regarding the importance of this issue.	Roman Czebiniak, Defenders of Wildlife
Work collaboratively on landscape level conservation biology	John DiGregoria, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Share with all EPA folks and others from Federal Transit Administration and the Federal Railroad Administration about section 6001 and comprehensive wildlife conservation plans. Implement in NEPA too. (Connell, Nancy, and Tim)	Connell Dunning, U.S. EPA
Work with staff to increase coordination on regional transportation and conservation with Caltrans and local government	Larry Eng, California Department of Fish and Game
Continue to reach out, seek collaborative solutions, and help people visualize the potential benefits for the people and environment of California.	Gregg Erickson, Caltrans
Explore the possibilities from new federal transportation legislation ("consulting with resource agencies") for building bridges between transportation and conservation agencies	Marc Hoshovsky, California Department of Fish and Game

Individual Workshop Commitments, Continued

Individual Commitment	Participant
Work with Defenders Of Wildlife to receive California Connectivity Project – Good job Defenders of Wildlife!!	Sandra L. Jacobson, USDA Forest Service
Communicate results of other state wildlife planning efforts to California agencies. Help promote regional workshops on integration.	Jeff Lerner, Defenders of Wildlife
Share with all EPA folks and others from Federal Transit Administration and the Federal Railroad Administration about section 6001 and comprehensive wildlife conservation plans. Implement in NEPA too. (Connell, Nancy, and Tim)	Nancy Levin, EPA
Find out what is going on at UC Davis. Continue to press for CEQA change favoring regional planning	Mike McCoy, UC Davis ICE
Share workshop product with North County Transit District Agency Executive Director and board members	Aja Moerler, Defenders of Wildlife Facilitator
Hold multi stakeholder planning meetings at Road Ecology Center	Ezra Neale, UC Davis Road Ecology Center
Conduct and facilitate basic research needed to develop effective performance standards regarding noise impacts on wildlife	Gail Patricelli, UC Davis
Contribute thoughts and ideas on ways of incorporating CA conservation strategies into transportation and planning projects in Los Angeles and Ventura County. Share local planning efforts and experience.	Amy Pettler, Caltrans
Help agencies develop habitat connectivity plans or training	William Ruediger, U.S. Forest Service
Keep promoting corridors in funding measures for land acquisition.	Lynn Sadler, Mountain Lion Foundation
Commit my staff to conduct more outreach among local organizations and jurisdictions about ecological needs for regional planning and cross jurisdictional approaches	Raymond Sauvajot, National Parks Service
Consult/ assist with development of GIS (Geographic Information Systems) systems/models identifying and prioritizing resource hot spots (integrate conservation priorities with transportation planning)	Daniel J. Smith, University of Central Florida

Individual Workshop Commitments, Continued

Individual Commitment	Participant
Work with Caltrans and other resource agencies to make the planning process better (more efficient, accomplish the goals that may not be directly addressed by existing rules and regulations, and incorporate SAFTEA provisions)	Jonathan Snyder, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (Carlsbad Office)
Share results of workshop at the next HabCon Supervisors meeting (or when available)	Dale Steele, California Department of Fish and Game
Invite one of the permitting agencies to make a presentation to the standing committee of planners and city managers. Apply for a grant to either organize a collaborative group or enlarge GIS data layer collection which we would then share with resource agencies.	Candice Steelman, MCAG (Merced)
Network more effectively regarding integration planning	Stephanie Stoermer, FHWA
Continue and expand the close interagency coordination between federal, state and local NGO entities that are ongoing in Southern California.	Jill Terp, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Increase direct involvement in at least one or more emerging transportation projects in California to help integrate strategic planning and permitting. Much of this work is delegated to my staff and my work is mostly related to those projects that are controversial.	Tim Vendlinski, U.S. EPA
Work with Defenders of Wildlife California office to identify our facilitation role. Talk with my SACOG friend about this workshop. Figure out how to communicate this workshop to US Corps of Engineers (about permitting streamlining). Integrate with Solano County HCP/NCCP efforts.	Cynthia Wilkerson, Defenders of Wildlife
Another meeting to further refine this groups ideas and plans. Maybe use this group as a starting point for a statewide Advisory Committee, working group, or round table with a leading logistical organizing group. Could TNC (the Nature Conservancy) be the ongoing logistical source? Probably, but would need to investigate funding options.	Jessamine Williams, The Nature Conservancy

Participant List

1. Juven Alvarez, Caltrans
2. Bruce April, Caltrans
3. Michael Beck, Endangered Habitats League
4. Alison Berry, UCD Road Ecology Center
5. William Boarman, University of California at Riverside
6. Ryan Broddrick, California Department of Fish and Game
7. Dave Bunn, UC Davis Wildlife Diversity Project
8. Banky Curtis, California Department of Fish and Game
9. Roman Czebiniak, Defenders of Wildlife
10. John DiGregoria, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
11. Connell Dunning, U.S. EPA
12. Gregg Erickson, Caltrans
13. Larry Eng, California Department of Fish and Game
14. Marc Hoshovsky, California Department of Fish and Game
15. Sandra L. Jacobson, USDA Forest Service
16. Jeff Lerner, Defenders of Wildlife
17. Nancy Levin, EPA
18. Mike McCoy, UC Davis ICE
19. Deborah McKee, Caltrans
20. Aja Moerler, Defenders of Wildlife Facilitator
21. Ezra Neale, UC Davis Road Ecology Center
22. Jay Norvell, Caltrans
23. Gail Patricelli, UC Davis
24. Amy Pettler, Caltrans
25. William Ruediger, U.S. Forest Service
26. Lynn Sadler, Mountain Lion Foundation
27. Raymond Sauvajot, National Parks Service
28. Karen Scarborough, Cal Resources Agency
29. Daniel J. Smith, University of Central Florida
30. Jonathan Snyder, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (Carlsbad Office)
31. Dale Steele, California Department of Fish and Game
32. Candice Steelman, MCAG (Merced)
33. Stephanie Stoermer, FHWA
34. Jill Terp, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
35. Tim Vendlinski, U.S. EPA
36. Trisha White, Defenders of Wildlife
37. Cynthia Wilkerson, Defenders of Wildlife
38. Jessamine Williams, The Nature Conservancy

Participant Contact Information

<p>Juven Alvarez Associate Transportation Planner Office of Regional and Interagency Planning California Department of Transportation 1120 N Street, Room 5300 Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 653-2978 juven_alvarez@dot.ca.gov</p> <p>Bruce April Chief, Environmental Stewardship Branch Caltrans District 11 (San Diego) California Department of Transportation PO Box 85406, MS 46 San Diego, CA 92186-5406 (858) 616-6614 bruce.april@dot.ca.gov</p> <p>Michael Beck Endangered Habitats League 560 La Cresta Blvd. Crest, CA 92021 (619) 846-3003 beckehl@cox.net</p> <p>Alison Berry Director, Road Ecology Center University of California at Davis One Shields Ave Davis, CA 95616 (530) 752-7683 amberry@ucdavis.edu</p> <p>William Boarman University of California at Riverside 2522 Ledgeview Place Spring Valley, CA 91777 (619) 861-9450 conservation-science@cox.net</p> <p>L. Ryan Broddrick Director, California Dept. of Fish & Game 1416 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 653-7667 director@dfg.ca.gov</p>	<p>Deborah McKee Senior Environmental Planner California Department of Transportation P.O. Box 942874 Sacramento, CA 94274-0001 (916) 653-8566 deborah_mckee@dot.ca.gov</p> <p>Ezra Neale UC Davis Road Ecology Center John Muir Institute of the Environment One Shields Avenue Davis, CA 95616 (415) 971-0753 ecneale@ucdavis.edu</p> <p>Jay Norvell Chief, Division of Environmental Analysis California Department of Transportation 1120 N Street Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 653-7136 jay_norvell@dot.ca.gov</p> <p>Gail Patricelli Section of Evolution and Ecology University of California One Shields Avenue 2320 Storer Hall Davis, CA 95616 (530) 752-3622 GPatricelli@ucdavis.edu</p> <p>Amy Pettler Associate Environmental Planner California Department of Transportation 100 S. Main St. Suite 100 Los Angeles, CA 90012 (213) 897-8081 Amy_Pettler@dot.ca.gov</p> <p>William C. Ruediger 1216 Creek Crossing Rd Missoula, MT 59802 (406) 721-4868 wildbill@montana.com</p>
---	---

<p>David Bunn Director, Wildlife Diversity Project U.C. Davis School of Veterinary Medicine Wildlife Health Center One Shields Ave. Davis, CA 95695 (530) 752-3122 dabunn@ucdavis.edu</p> <p>Banky Curtis Deputy Director, Habitat Conservation Div. California Department of Fish & Game 1416 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 653-1070 bcurtis@dfg.ca.gov</p> <p>Roman Czebiniak Defenders of Wildlife 1303 J St., Suite 270 Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 313-5800 x108 rczebiniak@defenders.org</p> <p>John Di Gregoria U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (Carlsbad Office) 6010 Hidden Valley Road Carlsbad, CA 92011 (760) 431-9440 x208 john_digregoria@fws.gov</p> <p>Connell Dunning U.S. EPA, Region 9 75 Hawthorne Street, CED-2 San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 972-4161 dunning.connell@epa.gov</p> <p>Larry Eng Regional Manager, South Coast (Region 5) California Department of Fish & Game 4949 Viewridge Avenue San Diego, CA 92123 (858) 467-4210 leng@dfg.ca.gov</p> <p>Gregg Erickson Chief, Biological Studies & Technical Assistance Office California Department of Transportation</p>	<p>Lynn Sadler President and CEO, Mountain Lion Foundation P.O. Box 1896 Sacramento, California 95812 (916) 442-2666 x101 lynnsadler@mountainlion.org</p> <p>Raymond M. Sauvajot Chief, Planning, Science, and Resource Mgmt. Santa Monica Mountains Nat'l Recreation Area 401 West Hillcrest Drive Thousand Oaks, CA 91360 (805) 370-2339 ray_sauvajot@nps.gov</p> <p>Karen Scarborough Undersecretary of Resources California Resources Agency 1416 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 653-5227 Karen.scarborough@resources.ca.gov</p> <p>Daniel J. Smith Department of Biology University of Central Florida 4000 Central Florida Blvd Orlando, FL 32816-2368 (352) 213-3833 Djs3@ufl.edu</p> <p>Jonathan Snyder U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (Carlsbad Office) 6010 Hidden Valley Road Carlsbad, CA 92011 (760) 431-9440 jonathan_snyder@fws.gov</p> <p>Dale Steele Supervising Biologist, Species Conservation & Recovery Program (HCPB) California Department of Fish & Game 1416 9th Street, 12th Floor (Suite 1260) Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 653-3444 dsteale@dfg.ca.gov</p> <p>Candice Steelman Public Affairs Manager Merced County Ass'n of Governments (MCAG)</p>
--	--

<p>1120 N Street Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 654-6296 gregg_erickson@dot.ca.gov</p> <p>Marc Hoshovsky Integrated Resources Conservation Planning Habitat Conservation Planning Branch Department of Fish & Game California Resources Agency 1416 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 322-2446 mhoshovs@dfg.ca.gov</p> <p>Sandra L. Jacobsen USDA Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station 1700 Bayview Drive Arcata, CA 95521 (707) 825-2985 sjacobson@fs.fed.us</p> <p>Jeff Lerner Defenders of Wildlife 1130 17th Street, NW Washington, DC 20036 (202) 772-0291 jlerner@defenders.org</p> <p>Nancy Levin U.S. EPA, Region 9 75 Hawthorne Street, CED-2 San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 972-3848 Levin.nancy@epa.gov</p> <p>Mike McCoy Co-Director, Information Center for the Environment (ICE) University of California at Davis One Shields Ave Davis, CA 95616 (530) 754-9171 mcmccoy@ucdavis.edu</p>	<p>369 West 18th Street Merced, CA 95340 (209) 723-3153 x308 candice@mcag.cog.ca.us</p> <p>Stephanie Stoermer Archaeologist/Senior Env. Protection Specialist Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) 650 Capital Mall, Suite 4-100 Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 498-5057 stephanie.stoermer@fhwa.dot.gov</p> <p>Jill Terp U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (Carlsbad Office) 6010 Hidden Valley Road Carlsbad, CA 92011 (760) 431-9440 x221 jill_terp@fws.gov</p> <p>Timothy Vendlinski U.S. EPA, Region 9 (WTR-3) Wetland Regulatory Office 75 Hawthorne Street San Francisco, CA 94105-3901 (415) 972-3464 vendlinski.tim@epa.gov</p> <p>Patricia White Defenders of Wildlife 1130 17th Street, NW Washington, DC 20036 (202) 772-0236 twhite@defenders.org</p> <p>Cynthia Wilkerson Defenders of Wildlife 1303 J St., Suite 270 Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 313-5800 x110 cwilkerson@defenders.org</p> <p>Jessamine Williams The Nature Conservancy 201 Mission Street, 4th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 281-0489 jgwilliams@tnc.org</p>
--	---