

# AGENDA

## Agenda

- Review of February meeting, other core team meetings, and first full working group webinar
- General Reminders
  - Next meeting on 5/21/2013
- Review of past meeting notes
- Guidance Doc Questionnaire compilation review
- Final team Goals and Objectives review
- Draft Reptile and Amphibian Crossing Structure BMP review
  - Volunteer Way scenario example
- Economic Feasibility Analysis, Cost-Benefit discussion

# HOUSEKEEPING

- Notes
- Recent/upcoming meetings related to connectivity:
  - ✓ **DEP Commissioner update** - - March
  - ✓ **Division of Fish and Wildlife regional meetings** - - March
  - ✓ **NJ Land Conservation Rally** - - March
  - ✓ **Resiliency Initiative** (based on TNC Terrestrial Resilience) – Open Space Institute - - March; webinar
  - ✓ **Habitat Connectivity Full Working Group update** - - April; webinar
  - ✓ **New Jersey Chapter of The Wildlife Society** - - April
  - **NJ Open Space and Farmland Preservation Coordinators' Roundtable Discussion** (DVRPC; NJCF)
    - April 19, 2013
  - **ICOET**: [http://www.icoet.net/ICOET\\_2013/](http://www.icoet.net/ICOET_2013/)
    - June 23-27, 2013 in Scottsdale, Arizona, USA.
  - **ICCB**: <http://www.conbio.org/mini-sites/iccb-2013>
    - Connecting Systems, Disciplines and Stakeholders
    - July 21-25, 2013 in Baltimore, MD, USA
- File sharing site – DEP has possibilities with Microsoft Office 365
- Zotero

## Mapping Core Team Meeting Three

February 22nd, 10 am - noon

Assunpink Wildlife Management Area, Main Office

**Meeting attendees:** Bob Allen, Rick Brown, Patrick Carr, Margaret Conroy, Gretchen Fowles, Dave Golden, Heidi Hanlon, Dave Jenkins, Amy Miller, Tanya Nolte, Lisa Stern, Nellie Tsipoura, Dane Ward, Pete Winkler, Patrick Woerner, Brian Zarate

- Reviewed and finalized goals/objectives of NJ Connectivity Mapping
- Reviewed set of GIS layers that will likely be relevant to mapping (lulc, riparian, hydrology, topography, roads)
- Hands-on mapping exercise in 2 regions
- Reviewed attributes needed for

### Tasks:

- Draft goals/objectives of NJ Connectivity Mapping
- Gather relevant GIS data to review at February meeting

## Communication Core Team Meeting Three

January 24th, 10 am – noon

Assunpink Wildlife Management Area, Main Office

**Meeting attendees:** Gretchen Fowles, MacKenzie Hall, Andrea Kornbluh, Bill Pitts, Brian Zarate, Kelly Triage

- Researched materials developed by other states to support connectivity projects
- Discussed team goals/objectives
- Brainstormed task ideas

### Tasks:

- Populate annotated bibliography of materials
- Draft team goals/objectives
- Organize and prioritize task list
- Review working group website

## Guidance Document Core Team Meeting Three

February 22, 1-3 pm

Assunpink Wildlife Management Area, Main Building

**Meeting attendees:** Joe Bilinski, Gretchen Fowles, Heidi Hanlon, Dave Jenkins, Paula Scelsi, Lisa Stern, Joe Sweger, Nellie Tsipoura, Dane Ward, Brian Zarate

- A quick review of the previous GD meeting and Mapping and Communications team meetings. Each group did outreach to other states in support of their respective needs.
- We did a brief review of some additional projects ongoing that complement the work of the overall habitat connectivity initiative: The TNC culvert inventory, the Wildlife Guardian project by Montclair State University, and the road mitigation BMPs.
- At the end of the previous meeting, members volunteered to contact states to gather information on the development of other connectivity project guidance documents. We heard back from Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Massachusetts, Maine, New York, and Washington.
- We reviewed draft language of core team goals and objectives and made suggestions and edits.

# **REGIONAL ADVANCE MITIGATION PLANNING: A PILOT STUDY INTEGRATING MULTI-AGENCY MITIGATION NEEDS AND ACTIONS WITHIN A COMPREHENSIVE ECOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK**

Authors: Patrick R. Huber\*<sup>1</sup>, D. Richard Cameron<sup>2</sup>, James H. Thorne<sup>1</sup>, Ted M. Frink<sup>3</sup>

Affiliation: <sup>1</sup> Department of Environmental Science and Policy, University of California, Davis, CA 95616; <sup>2</sup> The Nature Conservancy, 201 Mission St. 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, San Francisco, CA 94105; <sup>3</sup> California Department of Water Resources, 901 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

This study reports an ongoing process in California, USA, that brings together two public infrastructure agencies – the California Departments of Transportation (Caltrans) and Water Resources (DWR) – with the regulatory agencies that oversee their mitigation requirements – the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and United States Army Corps of Engineers (ACE). In addition The Nature Conservancy (TNC), University of California, Davis (UCD), Resources Legacy Fund Foundation (RLFF), and EDAW/AECOM (a consulting firm) are participating in a technical advisory capacity. This collaboration will produce a framework for bundling mitigation requirements of multiple projects at a large regional scale (1000's of square kilometers). The framework will include identified processes for upfront approval by the regulatory agencies, that will permit the mitigation planning process to occur earlier, or even in advance of, project implementation than is usually the case. The goal is to increase the positive ecological impact of offsite compensatory mitigation while reducing the overall cost of infrastructure project implementation.

# **REGIONAL ADVANCE MITIGATION PLANNING: EXPEDITING INFRASTRUCTURE WHILE PROVIDING ENVIRONMENTAL AND COMMUNITY BENEFITS**

## **LIMITATIONS OF THE CURRENT SYSTEM**

The current project-by-project, species-by-species mitigation approach has limitations and can often result in:

- small, unconnected, and poorly protected mitigation sites;
- infrastructure project delays when suitable mitigation land can't be found;
- high compensation ratios required, adding to mitigation cost, when the infrastructure project has a temporal impact on affected species and habitats;
- limited or no connection to regional or statewide conservation priorities;
- more costly and challenging management of protected or restored mitigation land
- additive administrative or support costs associated with requirements to develop separate agreements and implementation mechanisms for each individual project.

# **REGIONAL ADVANCE MITIGATION PLANNING: EXPEDITING INFRASTRUCTURE WHILE PROVIDING ENVIRONMENTAL AND COMMUNITY BENEFITS (Continued)**

## **CHALLENGING ISSUES**

Despite the time savings, reduced costs, and improved environmental and community benefits of regional advance mitigation, it is often difficult to put into practice. The challenges include:

- uncertainty about obtaining assurances from state and federal regulatory agencies that natural resources secured and conserved for mitigation in advance of project-specific environmental review will ultimately be acceptable;
- uncertainty about which projects will mature beyond planning infancy to reality (thereby justifying the cost and effort of proactive mitigation acquisitions);
- providing ongoing monitoring and management of environmentally sensitive lands for any lengthy period of time in advance of a specifically identified mitigation need;
- obtaining funding, because mitigation dollars are usually tied to specific infrastructure projects, and advance mitigation projects usually have to compete for funds with infrastructure projects.