Group 1: Land managers, land acquirers, and land owners

What do you want to see in the map?

- Strong agreement with the ideas expressed in the survey that the map must be GIS-based, accessible on line, and transparent.
- Also provide a GIS layer with (a) all currently protected areas, and (b) all areas anticipated to be protected (e.g., NCCP) or prioritized for protection (e.g., Areas of Conservation Emphasis, including those on private land). Important to depict the larger such areas as wildland blocks, and also to depict smaller areas that might lie in matrix. CDFG indicated that their ACE map was completed, that they had some sensitivity about releasing the map, but that we could probably get permission to use it in a sensitive way. Be aware that the ACEs were delineated by experts – they are not defined on the basis of clear criteria.
- Be careful that our depiction of Wildland Block (even if based on protected area boundary) is flexible so that the map can recognize important internal barriers that might fragment the Wildland.
- Several persons wanted a GIS layer showing zoning or Land Use Plans of each county. Other persons pointed out that some counties do not have LUP in digital format, or won't release it.
- Linkage designs should be designed for climate change: add a buffer, or increase diversity of elevation, topography.
- Be sure to include linkages to OR, NV, AZ, MX.
- There should be clear guidance on what management actions are appropriate or inappropriate in each area mapped as a linkage.
- Describe each mapped linkage in terms of degree of urbanization, degradation.

What do you want to see in the Strategic Plan?

- Over half of the participants mentioned that they strongly desired our report to include a "cookbook" they could use to create detailed linkage designs in particular areas. * * * * *
- The plan should include a section on data management and updating. It is not enough to say that this will be a living document – we must include a plan on how new information will be added, who will house the database, what it will cost to maintain the data, and who should pay for it (life cycle accounting).
- The rollout plan should not be "a" rollout plan, but should be at least 2 or 3 rollout plans, each targeted at a specific audience, e.g., technical staff, policy people, and others. Make a special effort to provide information to (and get info from) tribal government.
- It is important that the plan's title page have the actual signatures of high level persons in CDFG and Caltrans. This will get agency personnel to actively consider the map and plan in their work.
- A couple participants wanted the SP to include *forecasting* of threats.
- The SP should have a section titled "next steps."

GROUP 2 (Transportation And Land Use Planners)

What do you want to see in the MAP/MODEL

- A standardized process that can be repeated
- A map that is updateable
- It needs to relate to regional/local models for transportation, land use, HCP's, etc. and either incorporate them or reference them, both current and proposed, as well as local existing corridors/plans/maps
- It should also relate to new/expanded infrastructure projects i.e. highway widening
- Although it will be a statewide map, there was a lot of interest in allowing the map to be zoomed down as fine a scale as we can do within the project scope – Can we make it as scalable as possible
- We should keep in mind aquatic connectivity and also recognize that infrastructure is not just highways, but also energy transmission, water canals, etc.
- Need to make sure it doesn't just end at the end of a region, but includes intersections of regions, both within and bordering CA

What are areas that are important for the PRIORITIZATION scheme?

- There was a bit of discussion on the Desert Region, and that efforts may be focused on it due to the large extent of renewable energy development occurring or planned, as well as the planned Desert-wide NCCP
- We should use future land use/transportation plans to help prioritize areas

What would you like to see in the STRATEGIC PLAN

- A lot of participants wanted to see some type of Regulatory hook in the strategic plan – whether adopted by regulator agencies or recommended by them – some way to get additional funding to acquire and protect the identified corridor areas or increase mitigation in those areas (political tools) – or at least guidelines for regulatory agencies on the importance of corridors**
- They would like to see some type of recommendations or guidelines for implementation if there are no clear regulations i.e. for a road widening project, how do you mandate a crossing in an important corridor area if there are no listed TE species?
- Want to see a standardize process that can then be adopted and streamlined for local/regional efforts, that can also be endorsed by state/federal agencies & regulators (i.e. if local agency uses recommended approach/process it will be easier for them to get regulatory approvals)
- Produce on example or pilot study down to a corridor level to show locals how to replicate
- Include Literature study
- Should include some type of uniform recognition of HCP's or linkages and a standard definition of regional conservation plan
- Describe how to tie into Blueprint planning process/funding

- Describe how to incorporate into technical documents
- Include existing examples of local/regional plans
- Lesson learned-best practices
- Describe who will have ultimate responsibility for maintaining linkages? Recommend a Resource agency or DFG (not CalTrans)**
- Describe how to increase communication between stakeholders
- Include a section on funding, with a focus on how mitigation funds could support connectivity**
- Address the cumulative impacts of multiple infrastructure projects and neighboring land use**

GROUP 3 (Regulators)

What do you want to see in the MAP/MODEL

- Map/Model documents and products must be transparent, scientifically accurate, and compliment existing efforts
- Species experts should be involved in focal species selection
- GIS data should be of the highest integrity and inputs and results made available
- Good documentation what is- isn't accessible to agency, consultants, etc.
- Map/Model should provide enough information to help planners identify areas that need more detailed local analyses

What are areas that are important for the PRIORITIZATION scheme?

- Overlay proposed projects with resulting Map/Model (e.g., infrastructure projects to identify projects that could provide mitigation to improve connectivity)

What would you like to see in the STRATEGIC PLAN

- Written for multiple audiences involved in planning and implementation
- Provide guidance on tools for land use planners
- Improves lack of awareness and discourse among agencies biologists/planners
- Specific measures and guidance in document on multiple forms of implementation
- Guidance on ways agencies can integrate connectivity plans early into their projects to improve connectivity
- Identify specific ways that products can be institutionalized by various agencies
- Identify specific measures to alleviate impacts appropriately
- Identify ways that regulatory agencies and planners can work on products together
- Focus on the future 75% intraregional (MPO) plans
- Clearly state partnership and consensus building key to implementation
- Guidance on early consultation on purpose and need for projects to include connectivity
- Provide details on what local analyses should include in terms of field verification and monitoring
- Comprehensive distribution list should be included in plan

GROUP 4 (Cons. Science/Planners)

What are the main considerations related to the Statewide Map?

There was an overarching concern by many participants that any attempt at a statewide map could be misread or misapplied, and that the relationship between the statewide map and regional maps may be difficult to define or to interpret. In general, participants seemed to feel that a more bottom-up approach would be more appropriate than starting with a state-wide map (e.g., map linkages for different sets of focal species within each ecoregion, and then stitch ecoregions together to form statewide map). Also, there was a general concern about the goals/objectives of a statewide map: Is it more to streamline planning and get past regulatory barriers (for Caltrans) or actually to conserve biological diversity? The map could look quite different depending on the goal.

Specific breakout session notes related to the above included:

- The goals of the statewide map should be clearly state (e.g., is it driven by science or policy or both?)
- The map must have a clear disclaimer so it won't be misused
- The link between the state map and the regional map needs to be clearly stated and defined. That is, we must clearly explain the layered, hierarchical process.
- The state map should clearly state that it is a broad-brush assessment, and part of a hierarchical process. It should be clearly stated that the strategic plan and regional planning may use different criteria (if that is the case).
- We should consider that the criteria and the maps of linkages may change as we move up or down in the hierarchy (e.g., local to regional to state). There is a concern that we will therefore lose or gain different linkages at different scales (like features that appear or disappear when zooming in Google Earth), creating inconsistencies among scales.
- We should consider not starting with a statewide map. We should consider starting with a regional approach (or look at both scales at the same time).

Participants also suggested the following considerations in relation to "what is being linked" and how to delineate regions:

- The map should <u>not</u> focus on linking the largest protected areas (large enough to support most species on their own), but rather the "second tier" cores that must be linked together or to larger areas to retain the most area-dependent species (especially wide-ranging carnivores).
- We should consider mapping overall landscape permeability and barriers rather than blocks of core habitat (patches) and connecting habitat for focal species. That is, focus on identification of barriers, and consider what proportion or type of species each particular barrier (or barrier type) would affect.
- The map should consider proposed conservation areas.

- The mapping process should consider/ask how each region contributes to the state-wide goal.
- Geographically, it might be good to base the map on the Ca. Wildlife Action Plan (ecoregions, priorities, criteria, etc.).

Participants also suggested the following in relation to how linkages are identified, as well as general recommendations:

- We should specify whether the map focuses on specific species or on biodiversity. Can single map answer both?
- We should clearly state and describe species choices and criteria for choosing species (if appropriate).
- T&E species are often drivers, but this should be evaluated. Is this appropriate?
- The map should address biodiversity
- If biodiversity is the goal, there may be complications, because we'll need to address multiple key species; different species in different regions.
- We could consider using the state biodiversity atlas to help guide criteria

What are the main considerations related to prioritization?

Participants offered the following recommendations regarding prioritization:

- Before starting the process of prioritizing, we must clearly state and explain what the State map is depicting.
- The process of prioritization needs to be explicitly stated.
- We should state whether, and how, ecoregions will be prioritized among themselves. We could consider each region's contribution to state goals (e.g., presence of biodiversity hot spots)
- The process should consider biology and policy needs/criteria
- Threats (present & future) should be included as criteria
- The process should consider cumulative effects

What are the main considerations related to the Strategic Plan?

Participants offered the following recommendations regarding the strategic plan:

- The plan must explicitly state how its goals and methods were influenced by science versus policy.
- In the transition from the State map to the regional level (if this is the chosen direction), we should consider doing linkage planning in one region, as a case study,
    - to show relation to state wide map.
    - as a proof of concept step.