



401 B Street, Suite 800  
 San Diego, CA 92101-4231  
 (619) 699-1900  
 Fax (619) 699-1905  
 www.sandag.org

# MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

MEMBER AGENCIES

- Cities of
- Carlsbad
- Chula Vista
- Coronado
- Del Mar
- El Cajon
- Encinitas
- Escondido
- Imperial Beach
- La Mesa
- Lemon Grove
- National City
- Oceanside
- Poway
- San Diego
- San Marcos
- Santee
- Solana Beach
- Vista
- and
- County of San Diego

ADVISORY MEMBERS

- Imperial County
- California Department of Transportation
- Metropolitan Transit System
- North San Diego County Transit Development Board
- United States Department of Defense
- San Diego Unified Port District
- San Diego County Water Authority
- Mexico

## ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM WORKING GROUP

The Environmental Mitigation Working Group may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Tuesday, January 10, 2006

1 to 3 p.m.

SANDAG, Conference Room 7  
 401 B Street, Suite 800  
 San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contact: Janet Fairbanks  
 (619) 699-6970  
 jfa@sandag.org

*SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.  
 Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.*

*In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.*

*To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.*

**TRANSNET'S  
ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM  
WORKING GROUP**

Tuesday, January 10, 2006

| <b>ITEM #</b> |  | <b>ACTION</b> |
|---------------|--|---------------|
| +1.           | <p>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (Chair Carrie Downey, Councilmember, City of Coronado)</p> <p>An updated EMP Working Group Member Roster is attached.</p>   | WELCOME       |
| +2.           | <p>NOVEMBER 8, 2005, MEETING SUMMARY (Chair Carrie Downey)</p> <p>Review and approve the meeting summary of the November 8, 2005 meeting.</p>  | APPROVE       |
| 3.            | <p>APPOINT A SCREENING COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE PROPOSED LAND MANAGEMENT PROJECTS APPLICATION FORMS (Chair Carrie Downey)</p> <p>On December 16, 2005, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved expending up to \$750,000 for eligible land management projects, a process for allocating the funds, and the criteria and rating system for considering funding requests. On December 19, 2005, SANDAG staff distributed the application form to EMP Working Group members, and posted it on the Web site. Applications are due on January 19, 2006.</p> <p>The next step is to review the applications to make funding recommendations to the Regional Planning Committee. The Chair is recommending that a selection committee be appointed to review the applications against the eligibility and weighting criteria developed by the EMP Working Group. The Chair is recommending that she serve on the committee along with four EMP Working Group members who have scientific knowledge of the preserve system and the policy directives of the cities. She is recommending that the EMP Working Group consider appointing representatives from the wildlife agencies, Caltrans, and a jurisdiction. The selection committee's recommendations would be considered by the EMP Working Group at its February 14, 2006 meeting.</p> | APPOINT       |

| <b>ITEM #</b>  | <b>ACTION</b> |
|--|---------------|
| <p>+4. REGIONAL CONSERVED LANDS DATABASE (Sue Carnevale, SANDAG)</p> <p>On December 16, 2005, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved expending up to \$125,000 for development of a conserved lands database for the San Diego region. This requires defining “conserved lands” and identifying attributes that should be collected to make the database useful for land management, biological monitoring, land acquisition, NCCP preserve assembly tracking, and other EMP work efforts.</p> <p>Attached is a proposed definition for “conserved lands” and a list of proposed attributes for the conserved lands database. The definition and the list of attributes will be included in the scope of work between SANDAG and the USFWS. It is anticipated that contractual agreements between the two agencies will be signed in February or March of this year.</p>   | DISCUSS       |
| <p>5. STATEWIDE INFRASTRUCTURE BOND PROPOSALS (Bob Leiter, SANDAG)</p> <p>Several statewide infrastructure financing proposals are currently being discussed. SANDAG assessed regional infrastructure in the adopted Regional Comprehensive Plan which includes the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS). The IRIS is a systematic approach to addressing regional infrastructure needs and identifying existing and future revenue sources in eight regional infrastructure areas: transportation, water supply and delivery, wastewater, storm water management, solid waste collection, recycling and disposal, energy supply and delivery, education, and parks and open space.</p> <p>On January 13, the SANDAG Board of Directors will be discussing regional priorities for infrastructure funding and the relationship to pending statewide infrastructure financing proposals. SANDAG staff will provide the EMPWG a brief overview of the agenda for the Board of Directors meeting on January 13.</p> | INFORMATION   |
| <p>6. PUBLIC COMMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS</p> <p>Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the EMP Working Group on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Working Group. Speakers are limited to three minutes each.</p>   | COMMENTS      |
| <p>7. ADJOURNMENT</p> <p>The next EMP Working Group meeting is scheduled for February 14, 2006.</p>  |               |

+ next to an agenda items indicates an attachment

**Craig Adams**

President  
San Diego Conservation Network  
sdrvc@msn.com  
(858) 755-6956

**Matt Adams**

Director of Government Affairs  
Building Industry Association  
matt@biasd.org  
(858) 450-1221

**Bruce April**

Senior Biologist  
CalTrans  
bruce\_april@dot.ca.gov  
(858) 616-6614

**ALT: Muggs Stoll**

Deputy District Director  
muggs\_stoll@dot.ca.gov  
(858) 616-6604

**Jeannette Baker**

Senior Regulatory Project Mgr  
Army Corps of Engineers  
jeannette.m.baker@usace.army.mil  
(858) 674-5385

**Michael Beck**

San Diego Director  
Endangered Habitats League  
beckehl@cox.net  
(619) 846-3003

**Craig Benedetto**

Executive Director  
Alliance for Habitat Conservation  
craig@bdpr-inc.com  
(619) 236-0203

**Patti Brindle**

City Planner, City of Poway  
North County Inland  
pbrindle@ci.poway.ca.us  
(858) 668-4604

**ALT: Barbara Redlitz**

Principal Planner, City of Escondido  
bredlitz@ci.escondido.ca.us  
(760) 839-4546

**John Donnelly**

Asst. Executive Director  
Wildlife Conservation Board  
jdonnell@dfg.ca.gov  
(916) 445-1085

**Carrie Downey, Chair**

Councilmember, City of Coronado  
carrieadowney@hotmail.com  
(619) 522-2040

**Robert Fisher**

Research Biologist, USGS  
rfisher@usgs.gov  
(858) 637-6882

**Keith Greer**

Deputy Planning Director  
City of San Diego  
kgreer@sandiego.gov  
(619) 236-7258

**Mike Grim**

Senior Planner, City of Carlsbad  
North County Coastal  
mgrim@ci.carlsbad.ca.us  
(760) 602-4623

**ALT: Patrick Murphy**

Director, City of Encinitas  
pmurphy@ci.encinitas.ca.us  
(760) 633-2600

**Kevin Mallory**

Senior Planner, City of Santee  
East County  
kmallory@ci.santee.ca.us  
(619) 258-4100 x173

**David Mayer**

Senior Biologist- Supervisor  
Department of Fish & Game  
dmayer@dfg.ca.gov  
(858) 467-4234

**ALT: Libby Lucas**

Environmental Scientist  
elucas@dfg.ca.gov  
(858) 467-4230

**Tom Oberbauer, Vice Chair**

Chief, MSCP Division  
County of San Diego  
thomas.oberbauer@sdcounty.ca.gov  
(858) 694-3701

**Deborah Ruddock**

SCC Project Manager  
California Coastal Conservancy  
druddock@scc.ca.gov  
(510)286-4168

**ALT: Karen Bane**

Project Manager  
kbane@scc.ca.gov  
(510) 286-0922

**Kathy Viatella**

Project Director  
The Nature Conservancy  
kviatella@tnc.org  
(619) 209-5830 Ext. 408

**ALT: Dave Van Cleve**

Project Director  
dvanclave@tnc.org  
(619) 209-5830 x407

**Mary Jo Wilson**

Principal Planner, City of National City  
South Bay  
mwilson@ci.national-city.ca.us  
(619) 336-4319

**Susan Wynn**

Fish and Wildlife Biologist  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
susan\_wynn@fws.gov  
(760) 431-9440 x216

**ALT: John Digregoria**

john\_digregoria@fws.gov  
(760) 431-9440 x208

**Emily Young**

Associate Vice President  
Community Partnerships  
Director, Env. Analysis and Strategy  
The San Diego Foundation  
eyoung@sdfoundation.org  
(619) 814-1318

San Diego Association of Governments  
**ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION  
PROGRAM WORKING GROUP**

January 10, 2006

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **2**

**Action Requested: APPROVE**

MEETING SUMMARY OF NOVEMBER 8, 2005

File Number 3002700

**Members in Attendance:**

- Councilmember Carrie Downey, City of Coronado, Chair
- Craig Adams, Conservation Resources Network
- Matthew J. Adams, Building Industry Association
- Jeannette Baker, Army Corps of Engineers
- Michael Beck, Endangered Habitats League
- Patti Brindle, City of Poway
- Keith Greer, City of San Diego
- Mike Grim, City of Carlsbad
- Kevin Mallory, City of Santee
- David Mayer, California Department of Fish and Game
- Thomas Oberbauer, County of San Diego, Vice Chair
- Mary Jo Wilson, City of National City
- Emily Young, San Diego Foundation
- Deborah Ruddock, Coastal Conservancy
- Craig Benedetto, Alliance for Habitat Conservation
- Susan Wynn, Fish and Wildlife Service
- Bruce April, Caltrans

**SANDAG Staff in Attendance:**

- Janet Fairbanks
- Bob Leiter
- Rob Rundle
- Josh Schiffer
- Sue Carnevale

**Others in Attendance:**

- Kathy Viatella, The Nature Conservancy
- Jonathan Hardy, Senator Denise Ducheny
- Trish Boaz, County of San Diego
- Mary Niez, County of San Diego
- Libby Lucas, Department of Fish and Game
- Ann Hix, City of San Diego
- Andrew Malk, San Diego Foundation
- Scott Grimes, Endangered Habitats League
- Alfredo Gonzalez, The Nature Conservancy

## **1. Welcome**

EMPWG Chair Carrie Downey, City of Coronado, welcomed the EMPWG.

## **2. October 11, 2005 Meeting Summary**

The EMPWG unanimously approved the October 11, 2005 meeting summary.

## **3. Report from the Sub-Group on the draft Needs Assessment**

Tom Oberbauer, County of San Diego, introduced the sub-group's redraft of the Needs Assessment and funding recommendations for the EMPWG's approval. The sub-group recommends changing the document's name from "Needs Assessment" to "Regional Preserve Implementation Assessment." The sub-group recommends approval.

Chair Downey asked if there are any legal restrictions from calling it a "Regional Preserve Implementation Assessment." Are there conserved lands that do not qualify as a preserve? Michael Beck, Endangered Habitats League, answered that the sub-group discussed this issue and if we change the name, it is important to have an asterisk clarifying we are not excluding lands that do not qualify as a preserve.

Mr. Oberbauer announced the first three things that we would spend FY 05-06 money on:

1. A database of conserved lands for the San Diego region;
2. Conduct post-wildfire monitoring in response to the 2003 wildfires; and
3. Fund on-site land management, utilizing the flow chart that the EMPWG generated at the last meeting. SANDAG generated weighting criteria for the Working Group's consideration.

Craig Benedetto, Alliance for Habitat Conservation, said that climate change is beyond the scope of this group's funding responsibility and we should not fund it.

A request was made to have the conserved lands database and post-wildfire monitoring available to the public and the Working Group agreed.

Matt Adams, Building Industry Association, agreed with Craig in stating that we should be careful not to expand our scope of duty under the ordinance that was passed by the voters. He asked if the \$100,000 to \$150,000 in post-wildfire monitoring would augment or replace the existing funding by the Fish & Wildlife Service.

Susan Wynn, Fish & Wildlife Service, stated that this funding is adding to existing funding for fire monitoring and it will probably be matched with additional funds.

Matt Adams stated that the Regional Preserve Implementation Assessment states, "Post-burn monitoring should become a priority for several years within this preserve." Mr. Adams asked what is meant by post-burn monitoring being a "priority"?

Susan Wynn, FWS, said since there is only a small window in which to conduct post-fire monitoring, it becomes a priority.

Mr. Adams further asked if the group could define "several years" in the statement.

Tom Oberbauer answered that after about five years the vegetation gets to a stable level. Mr. Adams asked if we could change that "several years" to "approximately three to five years," in order to be more specific. The group agreed.

Michael Beck made a comment regarding one-time expenditures. He said that we should never fund something one year, then not fund it the next year. We have to be strategic about how we spend the money. As we spend money, we are committing ourselves to maintain conservation that is being supported through the expenditures of that money.

Chair Downey expressed concern about committing to something beyond this year because we do not know the funding levels and funding distribution procedures for future years.

Patti Brindle, North County Inland, asked for clarification on task V.C., "Management Plan Implementation." Are the tasks under the management plan implementation broad enough to include training of staff?

The sub-group answered that they discussed that issue and placed training of staff under V.B., but we do not have it under C. The Working Group suggested adding "train biological monitors" to V.C. and writing "Yes" under its Regional Funding Responsibility.

Craig Adams, San Diego Conservation Network, asked a follow up question. Since "Partially" is identified, does yes mean 100% and no other regional funds? What exactly does "yes" mean for "Regional Funding Responsibility"?

Tom Oberbauer, San Diego County, answered that "yes" means that other sources of funds would be sought, but they would not have to rely solely on these other sources for the task. Susan Wynn, FWS, added that "partially" means that jurisdictions hold some responsibility for certain things, whereas "yes" falls into the over-arching pieces that link everything together. However, receiving a "yes" does not exclude the EMP from getting additional funding elsewhere. The Working Group agreed to further clarify the meaning of "yes" and "partially" somewhere in a glossary. Janet Fairbanks, SANDAG, said that a glossary was already being created.

Chair Carrie Downey suggested changing the column title rather than defining "yes" and "partially." Susan Wynn, Fish & Wildlife Service, suggested changing the column heading from "Regional Funding Responsibility" to "Eligibility." The group agreed to change the column heading to "Eligibility."

Action: Tom Oberbauer motioned to accept the name change from "Needs Assessment" to "Regional Preserve Implementation Assessment" and to use this assessment in our future review of requests for funds. This motion includes all changes that were agreed upon at this meeting, including: changing the column title from "Responsibility" to "Eligibility," adding "train biological monitors" to task V.C., making the conserved lands database and post-

wildfire monitoring available to the public, and changing the line “several years” to “approximately three to five years” under item 2 of the requested expenditures on 05-06 funds. The motion was seconded.

Motion Discussion: Kevin Mallory, East County, expressed concern about voting on the motion today because East County has agencies that may be interested in the changes that occurred at this meeting that they are unaware of. He is wondering if the motion can be tabled until next time.

Chair Carrie Downey said that we could, but since we have a need to expedite this process and the fact that this is only a recommendation to SANDAG, we should have the motion at today's meeting. Tom Oberbauer added that members represent their community, subregion, or organization, and are entrusted to make decisions for them because there is not the opportunity to send everything back to the various organizations before each decision is made.

The motion passed with one opposed and one abstention. Kevin Mallory, East County, opposed and Jeannette Baker, Army Corps of Engineers, abstained.

Next, the EMPWG discussed the three recommendations for 05-06 expenditures.

Bruce April asked if item number two, where it now reads “three to five years,” is three to five years from today or from when the catastrophic event occurred? Tom Oberbauer, San Diego County, said that it is three to five years from when the catastrophic event occurred.

Action: The motion was made and seconded to adopt the three 05-06 expenditures. The motion passed with one abstention. Jeannette Baker, Army Corps of Engineers, abstained from voting and said that the Army Corps of Engineers will abstain from voting on all matters from here forward.

#### **4. Report from the sub-group on funding for “Management and Monitoring Implementation” activities for FY 06**

Since the EMPWG approved the sub-group's FY 05-06 funding recommendation (item 3), the Working Group needs to make recommendations on the land management component to the SANDAG Board based upon the approved criteria.

Janet Fairbanks stated that SANDAG's executive management team suggested we include quantitative criteria. Janet created a draft that was distributed at the meeting. In the last box on the page, entitled “Eligible Projects,” she added six criteria by which to score and rank all eligible projects. On the scoring grid she applied a weight to each criterion's score based on its relative importance. Staff recommends that the EMPWG amend the last page to add these six weighted criteria to the last box.

Michael Beck had two questions regarding the process. First, is this a process where the Working Group would review projects either individually or collectively, then rank them



using the criteria with the highest score winning? Second, is there any place for somebody to argue the project?

Bob Leiter used the Smart Growth Incentive Program process to answer the question. In the Smart Growth Incentive Program, SANDAG put out a call for projects and received many more projects than we had funding for. SANDAG then created a group that included a number of members from the Stakeholders Working Group that received presentations on the projects. The individual members went back and did independent rankings, and then brought their rankings together, had a discussion, and came to a consensus on the projects' rankings. They formulated recommendations that went up through the Regional Planning Committee for final action. There were a couple of different places for input through the process and the adoption of the funding plan was done at a public hearing. Mr. Leiter said that the process for the program worked very well.

Janet Fairbanks, SANDAG, requested that the EMP Working Group vote on the proposed weighting. The proposed timeline suggests that the sub-group rank the projects prior to December 13. This Working Group would then discuss and vote on the projects at the December 13 meeting.

The criteria and the process would be considered by the RPC on December 2; the projects would not go forward until January, pending final board action on December 16.

Action: A motion was called, which was seconded, to adopt the "EMP Criteria for Eligible Management Projects (FY 06 Funding)" with the weighted "Project Evaluation Criteria."

Chair Carrie Downey called for any further discussion before voting.

It was requested that SANDAG staff prepare an application form. Staff agreed to do so.

A member asked if the group wants to discuss dispersing the money regionally. Chair Downey said that the criteria are biologically based. But, perhaps after the first year we could look back at how we spend the money to see if we want to add a regional factor.

Emily Young, the San Diego Foundation, asked two questions about the criteria. First, in the third bullet down which states, "Success of management activities likely," how would you define "success"?

Susan Wynn, FWS, answered that it means long-term success. That being said, Chair Carrie Downey proposed changing "success of management" to "long-term success of management."

An additional correction was made to the fifth category down in the weighted scoring grid, where it reads "Dedicated staff (agency, jurisdiction, NCO) willing to assume long-term management," "NGO" should replace "NCO." In addition, in the weighted scoring grid that reads "Lack of management on the site may affect continued coverage of species," the Working Group agreed to remove the word "continued."

Chair Carrie Downey clarified the motion. We have a motion to approve the evaluation criteria for 2006 land management requests starting with our criteria and then adding the weighted scales to evaluate the eligible projects. The motion includes the schedule; the requestors can only be members of the EMP or people represented by members of the EMP. Susan Wynn proposed moving the request deadline from November 15 to December 1 and that the hearing be open to the public, both of which the Working Group agreed to do.

The motion was approved, with one abstention from the Army Corps of Engineers.

The subcommittee scheduled a meeting on Tuesday, December 6, starting at noon, that will last a few hours.

## **5. Public Comment**

Janet Fairbanks said that some people have still not turned in their Form 700s and their Declaration Concerning Conflicts. If you have not completed and turned in both documents to SANDAG by next meeting, you cannot participate in the meeting proceedings.

Chair Carrie Downey announced that she was approached by representatives from Senator Denise Ducheny's office proposing 1,800 acres of land owned by Potrero that they wish for us to consider purchasing. Currently, there are efforts to preserve it for cultural, archaeological, and environmental reasons. Chair Carrie Downey explained to Senator Ducheny's office that we are not in the land acquisition portion of the funding initiative, but she wanted the Working Group to be aware that we have received that proposal.

## **6. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

January 10, 2006

File Number 3002700

TO: EMP Working Group  
FROM: Sue Carnevale, SANDAG; Susan Wynn, U. S. Fish and Wildlife  
SUBJECT: CONSERVED LANDS DATABASE

One of the first steps in developing an inventory or database of conserved lands is to define what is meant by conserved lands and to define the land unit upon which the information will be compiled. In addition, we need to know the desired types of information (attributes) that should be collected to make the database useful for land management, biological monitoring, land acquisition, NCCP preserve assembly tracking, and other EMP work efforts.

Attached are a description of the proposed objectives of the conserved lands database, a proposed definition of the conserved lands to be included in the database, a description of the proposed mapping unit for each conserved land area, and a draft list of information for consideration for the data collection effort.

Please review the attached materials prior to the EMP Working Group meeting and be prepared to discuss each of these. It is important that we get your input at the meeting so that we can begin preparing the scope of work and required contractual agreements. Before actual data collection efforts can begin, these items needs to be finalized. We would like this group to recommend these materials for approval at the February 14 EMP Working Group meeting. The contractual agreement will go to the SANDAG Board in February or March.

SC

Attachments

**Regional Conserved Lands Database  
for both NCCP Permitted Areas and Non-NCCP Permitted Areas  
for the San Diego Region**

**Objectives of the conserved lands database:**

- To provide a comprehensive inventory of land in the region that is conserved for the purpose of protecting open space and natural habitats;
- To provide a complete, up-to-date, and comprehensive inventory of how much land has been conserved inside the regional NCCP habitat preserve system and how the conservation goals are being achieved;
- To assist in identifying gaps in conservation and in prioritizing land acquisition funds to acquire critical areas not conserved;
- To provide general information on the status of land management and preserve-level biological monitoring to assist in determining NCCP permit compliance;
- To assist in identifying land areas in need of funds for land management activities; and
- To provide information to assist with regional-level biological monitoring activities.

**Definition of conserved land to be included in the regional database:**

*Conserved lands are those lands that are legally conserved to:*

- *Protect natural habitats, species, and open space (including agricultural lands that are important components of the regional habitat preserve design);*
- *Contribute to the existing and planned regional habitat preserve system; and*
- *Manage open space or natural resources into the future.*

The conservation occurs through public or private acquisitions, conservation easements, land dedications, mitigation, mitigation banks, covenants, or other mechanisms that ensure the land will not be developed. In order to be part of the regional conserved lands database, lands must meet two of the three criteria identified above.

**Definition of conserved lands mapping unit:**

The geographic extent of each unit of conserved land to be mapped and tracked will be defined by the primary land owner.

**DRAFT**

**Proposed Attributes for Conserved Lands Database**

**Bold text** indicate proposed information (attributes) to be collected for each conserved land area.  
*Italicized text* indicate the valid values for the attribute, a pick list, no free form entry of information.

**Status** (*Conserved, Pending, Undergoing Restoration/Revegetation*)

**Tracking Number/Unique ID**

**Name of Conserved Land Area**

**Owner**

**Date of Conservation**

**Type of Conservation** (*Acquisition, Easement, Dedication, Covenant, Mitigation Bank, Restoration/Revegetation, In-Lieu Fees*)

**Management Responsibility** (*Federal, State, Local, Private, Non-Profit, Mixed, Unknown, Other*)

**Management Agency**

**APNs of Project**

**Acres** (*automatically calculated from spatial data*)

**Date Information Entered** (*automatically generated by computer*)

**Date Information Modified** (*automatically generated by computer*)

**Information Source**

**Other Land Owner(s)**

**Other Management Agency(s)**

**Generalized Land Ownership** (*City, County, Other Local (Water/Sewer), State, Federal, Non-Profit, Land Conservancy, Homeowners Association, Other*)

**Acquisition Cost**

**Acquisition Funding Source(s), and Dollar Amounts** (*Federal, State, Local, Private, TransNet, Regional*)

**Status of Management Plan** (*Finalized and Approved, In Progress, None, Not Applicable*)

**Date Management Plan Finalized**

**Management Status** (*Fully Managed, Partially Managed, Not Managed*)

**Source(s) of Management Funds and Dollar Amounts** (*Federal, State, Local, Private, TransNet, Regional*)

**Type of Management Funding** (*Endowment, Annual Appropriation, Other*)

**Total Funds Available for Management**

**Annual Funding Required for Management**

**Status of Management Funding** (*Appropriated, Pending, Unfunded*)

**Proposed Attributes for Conserved Lands Database**

**Bold text** indicate proposed information (attributes) to be collected for each conserved land area.  
*Italicized text* indicate the valid values for the attribute, a pick list, no free form entry of information.

**Primary Management Objective** (*Habitats/Species/Natural Resources, Recreation, Cultural Resources, Multiple Objectives, None, Other*)

**Management Issues**

*Signage (Yes, No, Expected)*

*Fencing/Gates (Yes, No, Expected)*

*Trash (Yes, No, Expected)*

*Fire (Yes, No, Expected)*

*Recreational (Yes, No, Expected)*

*Erosion Control (Yes, No, Expected)*

*Trail Maintenance (Yes, No, Expected)*

*Habitat Restoration (Yes, No, Expected)*

*Type(s)*

*Invasive Species Removal (Yes, No, Expected)*

*Type(s)*

**Date of Monitoring Plan**

**Access to Property Allowed** (*Yes, No, Limited*)

**Date of Baseline Species Surveys**

**Date of Baseline Vegetation Surveys**

**Contact Name of Land Manager**

**Contact Address of Land Manager**

**Contact Phone Number of Land Manager**

**Contact E-mail Address of Land Manager**