



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 Program Working Group may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

June 13, 2006

1 to 3 p.m.

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

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

## AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- STATUS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM (EMP) MASTER AGREEMENT
- EMP 5-YEAR STRATEGY FOR MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING ACTIVITIES

*SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.  
 Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see [www.sdcommute.com](http://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.*

# ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM WORKING GROUP

Tuesday, June 13, 2006

<b>ITEM #</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (Vice Chair Tom Oberbauer, County of San Diego)	APPROVE
2. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS  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.	COMMENT
+3. MAY 9, 2006, MEETING SUMMARY (Vice Chair Tom Oberbauer)  Review and approve the meeting summary of the May 9, 2006, meeting.	APPROVE
+4. STATUS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM MASTER AGREEMENT (Shelby Tucker)  In March, staff distributed a memo from Chair Downey highlighting several of the issues covered by the EMP Master Agreement. Staff will provide an update on the status of the negotiations between SANDAG, Caltrans, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the California Department of Fish and Game.	DISCUSSION
5. REPORT FROM "OPPORTUNITIES" SUB-GROUP (Vice Chair Tom Oberbauer)  At the May 9, 2006, meeting of the EMP Working Group, a sub-group was formed to develop an "opportunities" map, which can be used to help identify areas for mitigation or outright purchase. The sub-group will give an oral report on its progress.	DISCUSSION
6. IDENTIFY PROBABLE REVENUES FOR THE REGIONAL HABITAT CONSERVATION FUND 5-YEAR STRATEGY (Janet Fairbanks)  At the May 9, 2006, meeting of the EMP Working Group, a map depicting the Mobility 2030 network and the habitat conservation plans was introduced, along with a draft matrix designed to illustrate numerically habitat impacts and likely mitigation requirements of these proposed transportation systems, and the opportunities these mitigation requirements can present to the preserve design. The matrix will be used to prepare a cash-flow analysis for the early action projects and the 5-year RTIP local transportation projects. Today, SANDAG staff will review with the Working Group progress made to-date on the draft matrix.	DISCUSSION

+7. EMP 5-YEAR STRATEGY FOR MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING ACTIVITIES DISCUSSION  
(Janet Fairbanks)

Attached is a matrix designed to assist the Working Group in identifying those tasks which should be a part of the Regional Habitat Conservation Fund 5-year strategy. The matrix lists the tasks identified in the Regional Preserve Implementation Assessment. The Working Group will be asked to review the matrix for accuracy: are all tasks listed, are the implementing entities correctly listed, and are regional tasks correctly identified. Then the Working Group will be asked to identify tasks for the 5-year strategy. Implementing agencies will need to be consulted to determine resources needed for each task.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment

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

June 13, 2006

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **3**

**Action Requested: APPROVE**

MEETING SUMMARY OF MAY 9, 2006

File Number 3002700

**Members in Attendance:**

Carrie Downey, City of Coronado, Chair  
Tom Oberbauer, County of San Diego, Vice Chair  
Craig Adams, S.D. Conservation Resources Network  
Bruce April, Caltrans  
Jeannette Baker, Army Corps of Engineers  
Kevin Mallory, East County Communities  
Karen Bane, Coastal Conservancy (Alternate)  
Michael Beck, Endangered Habitats League  
Pat Brindle, City of Poway  
Robert Fisher, USGS  
Keith Greer, City of San Diego  
Mike Grim, City of Carlsbad

David Mayer, Dept. of Fish and Game  
Deborah Ruddock (by phone), California  
Coastal Conservancy  
Kathy Viatella, The Nature Conservancy  
Susan Wynn, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Emily Young, The San Diego Foundation

**SANDAG Staff in Attendance:**

Bob Leiter  
Shelby Tucker  
Janet Fairbanks

Sue Carnevale  
Trisha Rominger  
Heather Werdick

**Others in Attendance:**

Clare Billett, SDCRN  
Andrew Malk  
Jerre Stallcup, CBI  
Megan Johnson, SCWRP  
Marilyn Pongeggi, City of Chula Vista  
Trish Boaz, County of San Diego  
Mark Tucker, Tucker & Assoc.

**1. Welcome**

Chair Carrie Downey welcomed the Working Group and began the meeting. Chair Downey introduced the new SANDAG Regional Planning Intern, Trisha Rominger. Chair Downey also informed the Working Group that the San Diego Taxpayer Association awarded SANDAG a Golden Watchdog Award for its EMP efforts.

## **2. Meeting Summary of March 14, 2006**

Meeting Summary of March 14, 2006, was discussed.

Michael Beck brought up concerns he had about the minutes. Mr. Beck's concern was in regards to Item #3 (page 8) and its reference to "Allocation by Percentages". Mr. Beck asked for clarification on what the percentages reflected or meant. Bob Leiter clarified that in developing a 5-year program, they would be looking at the categories of land acquisition, land management, biological monitoring, and similar broad categories. It would then need to be decided of the available funding each year, what percentage of it would be applied to the mentioned categories. Then, within those categories, a decision would need to be made on how to allocate those monies—in other words, how to prioritize the expenditures. It was Mr. Leiter's assumption that the Working Group would take a step-wise approach to laying out the 5-year plan.

Craig Adams asked that a comment regarding the minutes be included. Mr. Adams brought up concerns he had regarding the minutes reflecting a conclusion differently than in the agenda. He felt that there was definitive conclusion in the minutes. He did not believe that the decision was made to use the Transportation Fund Allocation process as a model to develop a 5-year strategy. Mr. Adams stated that he didn't find that in the minutes, he found the 5-year strategy. As he recalls, there were many questions raised about the model. Mr. Adams added that he felt there was a disconnect between the conclusion reflected in the agenda and the minutes. Janet Fairbanks stated at the very end of the meeting that discussion items were scribed on the board. The chart attachment in the agenda packet reflects what was written up on the board. It was decided as a next step the Working Group would develop a 5-year strategy, which led to the discussion today.

Mr. Adams motioned to approve the minutes. Mr. Oberbauer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

## **3. 2007 Comprehensive Regional Transportation Plan Issue Paper on Environmental Mitigation Program**

Shelby Tucker presented this item. SANDAG has begun some of the preliminary work involved with the preparation of the 2007 Comprehensive Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

A list of issue papers has been identified to aid in the preparation of the RTP by stimulating discussion and gathering input from policy committees and working groups. The draft EMP issue paper was included in the agenda packet for review and comment. The issue paper provides the framework for developing the detail of how the EMP will be implemented.

A unique aspect of the issue papers, in general, is that they address some of the challenges associated with a program or project. Staff has identified three main challenges associated with implementing the EMP:

- Amendments to the project list
- Its uniqueness
- Distribution of Regional Habitat Conservation Fund monies

Ms. Tucker explained that since the list of projects identified in the *TransNet* extension were tied to MOBILITY 2030, which was the current RTP at the time of the passage of the ordinance, staff will be

working closely with the signatories to the Master Agreement to determine how to address changes that will be made to the list by subsequent RTPs, such as the 2007 Comprehensive RTP.

Additionally, this method of addressing project mitigation is unique and requires collaboration among many parties. The Master Agreement is the first step in implementing the EMP and the next step will be applying the process identified in the Master Agreement to the first set of projects, those laid out in the "Early Action Program." Parties to the agreement will work closely together to ensure early land acquisition opportunities are maximized in order to create the economic benefit funds in the Regional Habitat Conservation Fund.

Lastly, the distribution of monies in the Regional Habitat Conservation Fund needs to be determined. The EMP Working Group is responsible for making recommendations on the allocation of monies in the RHCF and providing guidance for allocation. Staff and the signatories to the agreement will be working closely with the Working Group on the distribution of these funds over several months and years, making recommendations to the Regional Planning Committee and ultimately the Board of Directors, relating to any coordination and implementation of the EMP.

Craig Adams asked Ms. Tucker to clarify the second paragraph on page 14 of the agenda packet. Mr. Adams said it needs to be made clear that the mitigation requirements were to be addressed comprehensively instead of on a project-by-project basis. Ms. Tucker stated she will review this section and add text for clarification if needed.

Michael Beck asked for clarification in the case of what would happen if a project were to come on or off of the RTP project list. Mr. Beck had asked Bob Leiter whether or not the mitigation funds were "zero-sum" with regards to mitigation costs, anticipations, etc. Mr. Leiter stated that this was an issue that was discussed while preparing the Master Agreement and, the way SANDAG staff is looking at it now, there is an allocation of \$850M for environmental mitigation and a portion of that is allocated to regional projects as defined in the adopted RTP. Updated RTP's reflect new project lists. It's SANDAG's view that it should be possible to transfer the mitigation money or mitigation credits to new projects. The idea being that the funding is to be spent on environmental mitigation activities related to the RTP and, as the plan is amended over time, the same amount of funding would be available to mitigate, perhaps a new set of projects, and would be addressed through the update of the RTP. Residual funds could be used to fund additional mitigation requirements of existing projects. There were, in Mr. Leiter's opinion, pretty conservative estimates on the amount of mitigation costs per project and there is a possibility that more mitigation will be required. If all \$450M cannot be spent on transportation project mitigation, then it would become a policy issue and it would then need to be revisited. Mr. Leiter stated that SANDAG interprets the ordinance to not allow any of the residual from the \$450M for regional projects to be rolled over to the Conservation Fund. This was listed as a challenge in the issue paper that is expected to generate discussion for clarification.

Susan Wynn inquired how the issue papers will work. Ms. Tucker clarified that the papers served as information on challenges that are being experienced or anticipated. These issue papers will be reviewed by several working groups and committees and will ultimately provide input for inclusion into the RTP over the next year. Bob Leiter added that SANDAG has developed several issue papers related to the Regional Transportation Plan that will help refine the draft RTP. The RTP will contain solutions to resolve challenges addressed in the issue papers.

#### **4. Status of Contracts for Allocation of FY 06 Monies from the Regional Habitat Conservation Fund**

Shelby Tucker presented this item. In March, the Board approved the first allocation of Regional Habitat Conservation Fund monies. This \$1 million dollars will be used for the eight land management contracts chosen through a competitive process, the conserved lands database, and the post-wildfire monitoring project.

Specifically, two of the eight land management contracts have been drafted, reviewed by Susan Wynn at Fish and Wildlife, and are being prepared for internal routing and signature. Ms. Tucker stated that she met with the City of San Diego, who has been working on the logistics surrounding their project, and it is believed that a draft scope of work is close to being finalized. Ms. Tucker is awaiting contact from the other five grantees within the next couple of weeks so we can get their contracts drafted.

With regard to the conserved lands database and the post-wildfire monitoring contracts, Ms. Tucker reported both of the agreements have been signed and originals have been sent out to the appropriate agencies. Work may proceed as outlined in the scope of work. Ms. Tucker thanked Sue Carnevale and the members of the Working Group who worked on getting these contracts finalized.

#### **5. Status of the Environmental Mitigation Program Master Agreement**

Currently, SANDAG, the Fish and Wildlife Service, Fish and Game, and Caltrans are in negotiations on the Master Agreement, which identifies a process for implementing the EMP. The first meeting was held in April, revisions were made to the document based upon that meeting, and a second meeting was held last week. Additional refinements will be made based upon progress made at that meeting.

Things are moving forward with the negotiations; the parties to the agreement will continue discussions regarding the details of the Agreement. Once the signatories have finalized a draft of the Agreement, it will then be brought to the Working Group for review. Comments on the draft document can be made at that time. The Agreement will then go to the Regional Planning Committee for a recommendation, and the SANDAG Board for approval.

Keith Greer asked whether the local roads component would be included. Shelby Tucker stated that the local roads component would be included.

Chair Downey requested the *Status of the Environmental Mitigation Program Master Agreement* memo that was sent on May 15 be included in the distribution of this meeting's minutes and has been attached for the Working Group's information.

#### **6. Develop a Five-Year Strategy for the Expenditure of *TransNet***

Janet Fairbanks distributed an excel spread sheet titled "Mobility 2030 Habitat Impacts, Mitigation Needs, and the MSCP/MHCP Habitat Preserve Design." The purpose of the Excel spread sheet is to estimate habitat impacts of the transportation projects identified in Mobility 2030, estimate mitigation requirements; then summarize mitigation opportunities per watershed, assuming mitigation occurs within the watershed of impact. Then, the mitigation lands could be compared to

opportunities as defined by the MSCP/MHCP. By completing this exercise, the EMPWG would have information to help guide recommendations for the habitat conservation fund. This exercise by no means binds decisions on transportation project mitigation requirements. Ms. Fairbanks presented a map that included three major items—MSCP/MHCP Preserve Planning Areas, Watersheds, and Mobility 2030 projects. Information from the Excel spread sheet would be placed on the map to show graphically where mitigation could occur and where mitigation opportunities are located.

Rob Rundle provided an explanation of Attachment H titled “Estimated Allocation of Funds from the Transportation Project Mitigation Fund and Regional Habitat Conservation Fund”. Mr. Rundle explained how the calculations and estimates were generated and arrived at. Mr. Rundle explained that the Economic Benefit is proportioned on each project, based on the respective project’s portion on the whole.

Janet Fairbanks explained that this exercise is intended to be used to show the relationship between project mitigation and the preserve. The watershed component is a tool to show how much of the preserve could be conserved by project mitigation if it occurs at these locations. It will also show us where we may not have the right kind of vegetation needed to implement certain projects. The exercise is a learning opportunity and will provide information to those who may not know the preserve and the outcome of project mitigation.

Michael Beck stated that the Working Group should not exclude the East County when considering mitigation opportunities.

Tom Oberbauer requested that the map be footnoted to indicate that the MSCP North County Subarea preserve lines are a draft. He also suggested that we look at ecoregions as opposed to watersheds.

Jeannette Livingston stated that the exercise would provide helpful information for looking at wetland mitigation needs and opportunities per watershed.

Craig Adams said that we need to approach this from both directions—mitigation requirements of the transportation projects and mitigation opportunities as we know them to date through the work of the MSCP/MHCP and other conservation efforts.

Bruce April stated that we could develop an opportunities/constraints map.

Susan Wynn stated that she thought that the Working Group would be focusing on the Needs Assessment and talking about a 5-year plan. She did not believe the Working Group would decide how to mitigate. Ms. Wynn also added that she believed the Working Group needed to prioritize the tasks in the needs assessment.

Chair Carrie Downey stated that she was in support of the exercise because she had had questions about the spending estimates.

Janet Fairbanks explained that the exercise was only for informational purposes and that land acquisition was only one component of needs assessment. The exercise will show the group where mitigation is likely to occur, thus where the \$650 million is likely to be spent.



Keith Greer had stated that he believed that the Working Group was to come up with a 5-year strategy to avoid a case-by-case, year-by-year process.

It was decided that a subcommittee be formed to create an "Opportunity/Constraint Map". Bob Leiter suggested that the subcommittee could make a recommendation to the Working Group. The map would include opportunities for conservation as we know them today. The Opportunity Constraint Map Analysis should include East County. Tom Oberbauer has East County information that he can provide. Robert Fisher added that this map should identify real opportunities and goals in the respective areas. The subcommittee will consist of the following volunteers: Tom Oberbauer (Lead), Craig Adams, David Mayer, Susan Wynn, Bruce April, Keith Greer, Michael Beck, Kathy Viatella, and Karen Bane.

Craig Adams stated that if the development community would like to include a representative on this subcommittee, he would volunteer to step down.

Chair Carrie Downey clarified that only EMP Working Group members could be a part of subcommittees. Non-members would not be able to participate. Marilyn Pongeggi (City of Chula Vista) stated that she did not feel that there was proper representation from the affected jurisdictions. She suggested that a subcommittee be formed to meet with all of the cities to identify opportunities within their respective jurisdictions.

The subcommittee will report back at the next meeting. Also, the group will discuss the 5-year strategy.

**7. Public Comment and Communications**

None.

**8. Adjournment**

Carrie Downey adjourned the meeting at 3:05 p.m. The next meeting will be June 13, 2006.



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

March 15, 2006

File Number 3002700

TO: Members of the Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group

FROM: Councilmember Carrie Downey, Chair, Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group

SUBJECT: STATUS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM MASTER AGREEMENT

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

Over the last several months, SANDAG has been preparing a draft Master Agreement among SANDAG, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The purpose of preparing a Master Agreement (Agreement) is to clarify the roles of each agency in implementing certain provisions of the Environmental Mitigation Program as set forth in the *TransNet Extension* Ordinance and Expenditure Plan (*TransNet Extension*).

Specifically, according to the *TransNet Extension* Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) Principles, the EMP should include "...a funding allocation for the estimated economic benefits of incorporating specified regional and local transportation projects into applicable habitat conservation plans, thereby allowing mitigation requirements for covered species to be fixed, and allowing mitigation requirements to be met through purchase of land in advance of need in larger blocks at a lower cost."

The Agreement identifies a process for establishing mitigation ratios and several options for project mitigation, to help reduce mitigation costs and expedite processing of environmental documents and permits for local and regional transportation projects.

SANDAG has sent an administrative draft of the Agreement to the USFWS, CDFG, and Caltrans, and will be working with these agencies to finalize the draft Agreement over the next few weeks. Once consensus has been reached among the parties to the Agreement, it will be reviewed by the Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group (EMPWG) as well as the Regional Planning Committee and SANDAG Board of Directors (Board). Final approval of the Agreement will be through an action taken by the Board.

For your information, several of the issue areas included in the Agreement are outlined below. Please feel free to contact SANDAG staff with any questions or concerns you may have. We look forward to discussing the draft Agreement at a future EMPWG meeting.

#### 1. Identifying Fixed Mitigation Requirements

The Agreement will identify a process for achieving fixed mitigation ratios for local and regional transportation projects. Mitigation ratios for projects may be fixed in either of the following ways:

- Inclusion of transportation projects in an applicable MSCP/MHCP document, specifically the pertinent Subarea Plan.
- Application of the standards set forth in an approved Subarea Plan to non-covered projects. For some transportation projects, participation in an MSCP or MHCP Subarea Plan is not a viable option. In these cases, a project-specific agreement would be entered into, allowing the mitigation ratios to be specified early in the project. These ratios would be the same as or similar to what is required by the Subarea Plan.

#### 2. Methods for Project Mitigation

Over the course of the 30-year buildout of various RTP projects and 40-year generation of *TransNet* revenue, individual projects will be proceeding at various times. There are several options, as outlined below, that would be available to mitigate projects:

- Establish a mitigation/conservation bank
- Purchase appropriate credits in an existing bank
- Perform restoration or habitat creation activities at a new or existing bank
- Purchase land for preservation outside of the formal bank

#### 3. Project Permitting Milestones and Regional Habitat Conservation Fund Allocation

Milestones are being proposed for the release of economic benefit monies. Once a milestone has been reached, it would trigger the release of a percentage of funds in the Regional Habitat Conservation Fund (RHCF). The release of the economic benefit funds would be based on the following milestones:

- establishing and fixing project mitigation ratios
- approval of mitigation methods (utilizing one of the options laid out above)
- receiving permits, allowing the project to be built

4. Local Share of the Transportation Project Mitigation Fund and Regional Habitat Conservation Fund

SANDAG, through its partnership with Caltrans, will mitigate impacts from local transportation projects using funds from the Transportation Project Mitigation Fund (TPMF). The accrual of the local share of economic benefit monies available in the RHCF would be tied to the completion of regional projects. When the regional projects meet each of the milestones outlined above, the economic benefit funds (both the local and regional share) would be allocated proportionally.

5. Changes to the List of MOBILITY 2030 RTP Regional Projects

The estimated allocation of funds from the TPMF and RHCF has been identified by project for all regional projects in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This list is tied to MOBILITY 2030, which was the current RTP at the time of the passage of the *TransNet Extension*. If one of the projects currently on the list was removed through adoption of a subsequent RTP, such as the 2007 RTP, the amount of money allocated in the TPMF and the RHCF would remain unallocated until the ten-year comprehensive program review, as outlined in the *TransNet Extension*.

6. Process for Funding Supplemental Staff

In an effort to achieve an economic benefit, SANDAG, USFWS, CDFG, and the ACOE may consider entering into separate contractual agreements under which SANDAG will fund supplemental agency staff assigned to work on RTP projects. The staff allocated as part of an agreement will provide for expedited and streamlined environmental technical assistance, consultation, and coordination services related to RTP projects.

SANDAG will be working closely with the parties to the Agreement to review and finalize the draft document. The final draft of the Agreement will then be taken to the EMP Working Group for their information, the Regional Planning Committee for a recommendation, and the SANDAG Board of Directors for approval.

ST/sgr

## Proposed EMP RHCF 5-Year Funding Strategy

TASKS	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY(S)	FY 05/06	FY 06/07	FY 07/08	FY 08/09	FY 09/10	FY 10/11	FY 11+	Regional Funding Responsibility	NOTES
<b>I. REGIONAL COORDINATION</b>										
1. Research alternative governance structures for a regional monitoring entity.									Yes	
2. Identify an organization or organizations (regional monitoring entity) to perform regional coordinating responsibilities.										
3. Establish an implementing structure and provide resources for its functions.										
4. Define the specific roles and functions of the regional monitoring entity.										
5. Identify specific partnerships that would facilitate functions of the regional monitoring entity.										
6. Oversee regional land management functions. <sup>1</sup>										
7. Identify responsible entities to own and manage land. <sup>1</sup>										
<b>II. REGIONAL DATA BASES</b>										
<b>A. HabiTrak Conserved Lands Databases (for NCCP permitted jurisdictions)</b>										
1. Define baseline conservation for each non permitted jurisdiction.	SANDAG/USFWS	*							Yes	
2. Input baseline conservation into HabiTrak for non permitted jurisdictions.	SANDAG/USFWS	*							Yes	
3. Input acquisitions, mitigation banks, conservation easements, and other conserved lands into HabiTrak and review for accuracy for non permitted jurisdictions.	SANDAG/USFWS	*							Yes	
4. Prepare jurisdiction's annual reports.	Permitted jurisdictions								No	

<sup>1</sup> *Italicized* task added since EMP Working Group review in November 2005

<sup>m</sup> Yearly funding needed to maintain information; Dollar amount yet to be determined

\* Task is part of the Conserved Land Database expenditure

Proposed EMP RHCFC 5-Year Funding Strategy  
(continued)

TASKS	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY(S)	FY 05/06	FY 06/07	FY 07/08	FY 08/09	FY 09/10	FY 10/11	FY 11+	Regional Funding Responsibility	NOTES
5. Compile all HabiTrak input and create updated, seamless conserved lands database.	SANDAG/USFWS	*							Yes	
6. Review HabiTrak inputs (spatial and non-spatial) for accuracy and distribute to jurisdictions, SANDAG, wildlife agencies, etc.	Wildlife Agencies								Yes	
<b>B. HabiTrak Annual Reporting Application</b>										
7. Maintain HabiTrak.	CDFG								Yes	
8. Recode HabiTrak to a web-based, centralized system.	CDFG									
9. Train jurisdictions in use of HabiTrak.	CDFG/SANDAG									
<b>C. Conserved Lands Database (for non-NCCP lands)</b>										
10. Determine and input conserved lands.	SANDAG/USFWS	*	m	m	m	m	m	m	Yes	
11. Combine NCCP conserved lands and non-NCCP conserved lands databases.	SANDAG/USFWS	*	m	m	m	m	m	m		
12. Prepare subregional and regional maps and reports.	Wildlife Agencies									
13. Provide conserved lands database to SANDAG to update land ownership database.	Wildlife Agencies									
<b>D. Habitat Preserve Planning Area Databases</b>										
14. Update and maintain subarea plan boundaries and regional habitat preserve planning area boundaries (MHPA/PAMA/FPA) due to subarea plan annexations/de-annexations, subarea plan refinements, boundary adjustments, and additions of major and minor amendment areas.										
15. Based on changes to the subarea and habitat preserve planning area boundaries adjust jurisdiction-specific conservation targets accordingly.										
16. Provide updated databases and conservation goals to jurisdictions, wildlife agencies, and SANDAG.										
<b>E. Ownership Database</b>										
17. Maintain land ownership database.	SANDAG		m	m	m	m	m	m		SANDAG funded

Proposed EMP RHCf 5-Year Funding Strategy  
(continued)

TASKS	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY(S)	FY 05/06	FY 06/07	FY 07/08	FY 08/09	FY 09/10	FY 10/11	FY 11+	Regional Funding Responsibility	NOTES
<b>F. Species Databases</b>	Wildlife Agencies									
18. Maintain USFWS/DFG endangered/sensitive species database.									No	
19. Maintain regional species database including covered species.									Yes	
20. Maintain GIS database of major exotic species locations.									Yes	
21. Maintain GIS database of covered species locations and population sizes, monitoring status, management status, etc.									Yes	
22. Develop protocols and a methodology for tracking species loss and gains and prepare summary maps and reports.									Yes	
<b>G. Vegetation Databases</b>	Jurisdictions, Wildlife Agencies									
23. Choose and agree on a regional vegetation classification system, hierarchy, and cross walk (Sawyer vs. Holland).									Yes	
24. Map vegetation and species distributions for conserved lands.									Partially	
25. Incorporate updated vegetation and species databases into regional database.									Partially	
<b>H. Other Databases</b>										
26. Map monitoring locations for all levels of monitoring.									Yes	
27. Maintain and update fire history database for conserved lands.									Yes	
28. QA/QC regional data layers (i.e., species, vegetation, fire history).									Yes	
29. Maintain copies of all GIS layers in consistent format at one location so all data from jurisdictions and agencies are compiled, updated, and accessible.									Yes	
30. Maintain and update BIOS.	CDFG								Partially	
31. Maintain GIS database of management units and land managers.									Yes	
32. Collect and input climate data to warehouse.										
33. Collect and input road-kill data to warehouse.										
34. Peer review regional database structures.										
<b>III. REGIONAL BIOLOGICAL MONITORING PROGRAM</b>										
<b>A. Plans, Protocols, Data Collection</b>										
1. Inventory existing species monitoring and research programs.	SDSU								Yes	
2. Continue the work begun in the pilot studies for remote sensing –									Yes	

Proposed EMP RHCFC 5-Year Funding Strategy  
(continued)

TASKS	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY(S)	FY 05/06	FY 06/07	FY 07/08	FY 08/09	FY 09/10	FY 10/11	FY 11+	Regional Funding Responsibility	NOTES
develop feasible remote sensing/monitoring protocols and implement at a larger scale.										
3. Identify needs for and acquire imagery based on results from pilot studies.									Yes	
4. Refine monitoring protocols for preserve-level and regional-level monitoring based on peer review.	Wildlife Agencies; Land Managers								Yes	
5. Train regional managers, technicians, and volunteers on how to collect monitoring data.									Yes	
6. Revise MSCP Monitoring Plan for plants, animals, and habitats.	USGS, USFWS, SDSU								No	
7. Review and revise MHCP Monitoring Plan, as necessary.	MHCP cities								No	
8. Write MSCP North Monitoring Plan.	County of San Diego								No	
9. Write MSCP East Monitoring Plan.	County of San Diego								No	
10. Create and maintain a San Diego regional monitoring plan; revise subregional monitoring plans as necessary.									Yes	
11. Coordinate San Diego Monitoring with the South Coast Ecoregion and the Border region.									Partially	
12. Update and revise monitoring plans as needed (goals, objectives, protocols, sampling design, indicators, stressors, etc).									No	
13. Sponsor regional and ecoregional monitoring workshops.	Wildlife Agencies								Partially	
14. Determine attributes/structure for climate database and input data.									Yes	
15. Determine attributes/structure for road-kill database and input data.									Yes	
16. Develop data warehouse to store and display monitoring data (BIOS).									Partially	
17. Create and maintain a digital library of all monitoring documents (eg., reports; studies) (BIOS).									Partially	
18. Coordinate field data collection for biological monitoring across the NCCP lands in San Diego County.									Yes	
19. Maintain a master schedule of monitoring efforts, and annually identify monitoring priorities.									Yes	
20. Implement monitoring plans and protocols.	Land Managers								No	
21. Conduct post catastrophic event monitoring (e.g. wildfires, flooding).	USFWS	\$125k							Yes	
<b>B. Science Advisors</b>										
1. Establish and fund a scientific review group.									Yes	



Proposed EMP RHCF 5-Year Funding Strategy  
(continued)

TASKS	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY(S)	FY 05/06	FY 06/07	FY 07/08	FY 08/09	FY 09/10	FY 10/11	FY 11+	Regional Funding Responsibility	NOTES
2. Review and comment on monitoring protocols.										
3. Provide technical input on short-term and long-term management and monitoring priorities.										
4. Review and comment on monitoring reports.										
5. Assist in identifying outside funding sources.										
6. Based on monitoring results, recommend modifications to management policies.										
7. Develop a process for compiling and analyzing data at the subregional and NCCP regional scales.										
8. Develop conceptual ecological models to help identify monitoring components, stressors, and management responses.										
9. Use baseline data and conceptual models to identify spatial and temporal scales relevant for monitoring.										
10. Contribute data from research projects, and direct students to research projects that contribute to the monitoring and management program.										
11. Identify methods for restoring degraded habitats and ecological processes through independent research.										
12. Using a regional perspective, make recommendations regarding priorities for management and monitoring. These recommendations may form the basis for management directives issued by the wildlife agencies.										
13. Make recommendations for prioritizing funds for management and monitoring, consistent with the management and monitoring priorities above.										
14. Provide relevant information for the wildlife agencies and EMP technical and policy committees to use in prioritizing acquisitions.										
<b>IV. DATA STORAGE AND ANALYSES</b>										
<b>A. Centralized Data Warehouse</b>										
1. Develop process to input and maintain the regional databases.										
2. Develop QA/QC protocols and assign QA/QC responsibilities.										
3. Input existing monitoring data (BIOS).										
4. Establish guidelines for submittal of annual data, including data forms/digital files and digital or hard copy maps.										
5. Maintain archive (hard copy, electronic) of field notes, data forms,									Yes	

Proposed EMP RHC 5-Year Funding Strategy  
(continued)

TASKS	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY(S)	FY 05/06	FY 06/07	FY 07/08	FY 08/09	FY 09/10	FY 10/11	FY 11+	Regional Funding Responsibility	NOTES
maps, etc.										
6. Provide maps, as needed, for management and monitoring efforts.										
<b>B. Data Analysis and Reporting</b>										
1. Determine how data will be analyzed.	Wildlife Agencies									
2. Review and analyze data both at the preserve-level and the regional level.										
3. Establish guidelines for data access.										
4. Compare relative costs of designs and how designs differ in spatial coverage, revisits over time, and over sampling to estimate error rates and make recommendations.										
5. Compile annual monitoring summaries from jurisdictions in a consistent format.										
6. Prepare 3-yr monitoring summaries.	Wildlife Agencies									
<b>C. San Diego Region Conservation Website</b>										
1. Develop Regional web site.										
2. Manage and update website.										
3. Annual report summaries, including updated conserved land and preserve assembly maps, monitoring results, and management actions made available on website.										
<b>V. LAND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM</b>										
<b>A. Management Plan Preparation</b>									Yes	
1. Develop guidelines for preparing subarea framework and area-specific management plans.	Wildlife Agencies									
2. Develop and standardize preserve level monitoring guidelines to direct area-specific management plans.	Wildlife Agencies									
3. Identify responsible agency(s) for management and monitoring of each preserve area.	Jurisdictions									
4. Identify conserved lands lacking baseline surveys.	Jurisdictions, Wildlife Agencies									
5. Identify conserved lands lacking habitat management plans.	Jurisdictions, Wildlife Agencies									
6. Identify conserved lands lacking habitat managers.	Jurisdictions, Wildlife Agencies									

Proposed EMP RHCf 5-Year Funding Strategy  
(continued)

TASKS	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY(S)	FY 05/06	FY 06/07	FY 07/08	FY 08/09	FY 09/10	FY 10/11	FY 11+	Regional Funding Responsibility	NOTES
7. Conduct baseline surveys and prepare area-specific management directives for conserved lands.	Jurisdictions, Wildlife Agencies								Partially	
8. Incorporate baseline survey information into regional databases.										
9. Identify and implement measures to monitor use of conserved lands (eg. #'s of hikers, bikes, horses, # miles of trails, etc.) to direct area-specific management plans.										
10. Conduct compatibility studies to determine appropriate uses for each unit of the conserved lands.										
<b>B. Adaptive Management Coordination</b>										
1. Identify potential causes of species declines and appropriate management responses.									Yes	
2. Identify preserve level priorities for monitoring and management.									Yes	
3. Coordinate regional priorities among jurisdictions.									Yes	
4. Prioritize equipment needs and coordinate among jurisdictions.									Yes	
5. Identify/train biological monitors.									Yes	
6. Identify critical data gaps and prioritize them for funding.									Yes	
7. Coordinate monitoring roles and priorities with land managers.									Yes	
8. Summarize preserve-specific management actions in annual reports.									No	
9. Compile and summarize jurisdictional management summaries into a regional report.									Yes	
<b>C. Management Plan Implementation</b>										
1. Fund on-site land managers and law enforcement.	Jurisdictions	\$750k							Partially	
2. Manage trails if approved and designated.										
3. Control exotic and domestic species, both plant and animal.										
4. Control erosion.										
5. Fund preserve level monitoring.										
6. Establish and maintain protective barriers (e.g. fencing).										
7. Identify and install necessary signage.										
8. Restore/enhance native habitats.										
9. Prevent and clean up illegal dumping.										
10. Address off-site impacts to conserved lands.										
<b>VI. LAND ACQUISITION PROGRAM</b>										
									Yes	

Proposed EMP RHCF 5-Year Funding Strategy  
(continued)

TASKS	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY(S)	FY 05/06	FY 06/07	FY 07/08	FY 08/09	FY 09/10	FY 10/11	FY 11+	Regional Funding Responsibility	NOTES
1. Determine land acquisition needs.										
2. Develop land acquisition priority criteria.										
3. Identify key acquisition sites for transportation mitigation and habitat conservation fund.										
4. Develop criteria for determining parcels available for mitigation, conservation, acquisition, etc.										
5. Develop a database of parcels available for mitigation and conservation.										
6. Identify available acquisition opportunities and recommend purchase to decisions makers.										
7. Identify land manager, purchase land, convey land										
<b>VII. PUBLIC EDUCATION AND OUTREACH</b>									Partially	
1. Identify and fund educational opportunities.										
2. Install educational signs, kiosks, interpretive centers.										