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Steps to Ensure Optimal Webinar Connection

This webinar broadcasts audio over the phone line and through the web room, which can strain some internet connections. To prevent audio skipping or webinar delay we recommend participants:

- Close all background programs
- Use a wired internet connection, if possible
- Do not use a Virtual Private Network (VPN), if possible
- Mute their webroom audio (toggle is located at the top of webroom screen) and use phone audio only
Steps of the Eco-Logical approach

1. Build and strengthen collaborative partnerships
2. Integrate natural environment plans
3. Create a Regional Ecosystem Framework (REF)
4. Assess effects on conservation objectives

5. Establish and prioritize ecological actions
6. Develop crediting strategy

7. Develop programmatic consultation, biological opinion, or permit
8. Implement agreements, adaptive management, and deliver projects
9. Update REF

Partner
Share Data
Analyze Effects

Identify key sites and actions

Document
Implement
Evaluate
When getting started, consider...

• What are the boundaries of your planning region?

• What types of expertise would be helpful to your organization or planning effort?
Step 1: Next…

• Using relationships your organization already has developed, identify potential partners.

• Approach new partners individually or through convening a team meeting with a shared goal.

• Think about a structure for your partnerships.
Step 1: Challenges

Step 1 necessitates cross-agency coordination but can often present challenges such as:

• Key people to reach out to
• When and how often to reach out to partner agencies
• Managing expectations for the level of coordination
Eco-Logical in Cross Agency Coordination

(Learn more about Eco-Logical at the FHWA website)

- **Roberta Gerson**, US Fish and Wildlife Service ([Roberta_Gerson@fws.gov](mailto:Roberta_Gerson@fws.gov))
- **Rich Muzzy**, Pike’s Peak Area Council of Governments ([Rmuzzy@ppacg.org](mailto:Rmuzzy@ppacg.org))
- **Judy Gates**, Maine Department of Transportation ([Judy.Gates@maine.gov](mailto:Judy.Gates@maine.gov))
- **Mike Ruth**, Federal Highway Administration ([Mike.Ruth@dot.gov](mailto:Mike.Ruth@dot.gov))
- **Heather Richardson**, Volpe Center/USDOT ([Heather.Richardson@dot.gov](mailto:Heather.Richardson@dot.gov))
Cross Agency Coordination –
California Regional Advance Mitigation Plan
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**Collaborative State and Federal partnership**

- Landscape level conservation-based mitigation
- Develop a process – RAMP
- Multiple State, Federal Agencies, NGOs
  - *State* Departments: Caltrans, Water Resources, Fish and Wildlife, Regional Water Quality Control Board
  - *Federal*: FWS, EPA, Corps, NMFS
  - *NGOs*: The Nature Conservancy, CA Strategic Growth Council

- MOU – commitment
- Statewide Advance Mitigation Initiative (SAMI)
Early Coordination

- **Defining**
  - Conceptual work at each stage moving towards implementation stage
  - Common needs
  - Best data sources
  - Finances/Funding – looking for ways to generate funding
Ongoing Coordination

- **Integration and Consistency with Other Efforts**
- **Financial Support**
- **Modifying and Implementing Actions**
  - Government structure
  - Defining draft agreements
  - Work products

Land acquisition recon
Challenges

- **Moving Forward**
  - Slower than expected
  - Many different State laws and regulations
  - Agency workloads and priorities

- **Assurances**
  - Infrastructure and regulatory agencies

State Laws include:
- CA Endangered Species Act
- CA Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
- Coastal Commission
Challenges, continued

- **Funding $$$$**
  - Ongoing monitoring and management of acquired lands prior to mitigation need
  - Lack of overlap of action agencies
  - Combining funding sources

Wetland restoration; monitoring for listed snake
Improvements

- Efficient use of time
  - Improve the decision process
  - Take small steps
  - Defining roles and responsibilities
  - Engaging government structure
  - External and internal coordination
Reality checks

- Willing to recognize when approach isn’t working.
- Trying to fulfill/satisfy too many agencies and their infrastructure projects.
- Must find ways to collaborate with money, and not just on planning.
- Analysis paralysis.
Contacts

- **Roberta Gerson**
  - Region 8 Regional Transportation Coordinator
  - Roberta_Gerson@fws.gov

- **Catherine Liller**
  - National Transportation Liaison
  - Catherine_Liller@fws.gov
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PPACG and Region Facts

- PPACG is the MPO for Colorado Springs Urbanized Area - responsible for development of Regional Transportation Plan
- Region has over 600,000 people
- Colorado Springs is Colorado’s second largest city
- Five military bases
- Climate: Alpine Desert
- Elevation - 6,000-14,000 feet
- Average Yearly Days of Sunshine: 300+
PPACG History of SHRP2 Projects

- **SHRP2 Pilot Test Project 2010 -2012**
  - Received funding to test the Transportation for Communities – Advancing Projects through Partnerships (TCAPP) process.
  - Process tested during development of PPACG’s Regional Transportation Plan (2035 Plan)

- **SHRP2 Development of Integrated Ecological Framework (IEF) 2013 – 2015**
  - Conduct Impact Analysis
  - Quantify Mitigation Needs – (2040 Plan)
  - Development of Google Earth Web based platform
  - Development of an Integrated Regional Mitigation Plan
Agency Involvement

- **State Agencies**
  - Colorado Department of Local Affairs
  - Colorado Parks and Wildlife
  - Colorado Open Lands
  - Colorado Department of Natural Resources
  - Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment

- **Federal Agencies**
  - United States Environmental Protection Agency
  - United States Fish and Wildlife Service
  - Housing and Urban Development
  - Bureau Land Management
  - Army Corps of Engineers
  - Colorado Department of Transportation
  - Military Installations - Fort Carson

- **Local Agencies and Organizations**
  - Fountain Creek Watershed Flood Control and Greenway District
  - Sierra Club
  - Palmer Land Trust
  - Rocky Mountain Field Institute
Resource Agency Roles

- Identify potential project opportunities
- Review and identify critical areas
- Identify potential opportunities to collaborate with existing sponsors of other projects
- Identify potential regulatory and non-regulatory hurdles and barriers.
Project Purpose

- Identify potential conservation impacts and opportunities
- Provide a framework to collaborate on mitigation needs
- Conserve and connect important habitats
- Streamline permitting processes
- Integrate planning and decision making between agencies
- Consider both on-site and off-site mitigation opportunities
- Apply the regional ecosystem framework in decision making process
SHRP2 Analysis

This version dated October 27, 2014

- Basin Datasets
- Project Data:
- Green Infrastructure Data:
- CNHP Conflict Data:
- EPA Data:
- Southwest Regional GAP Project Data:
- Army Corps of Engineers Watershed Management Plan 2009:
- Fountain Creek Corridor Restoration Master Plan 2011:
- Basemap Data:

Legends:

- SWReGAP Land Cover Legend
- CVS Legend
- Small Area Forecast Conflict Values Legend
Potential Conservation Areas
Potential Conflict Areas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Impact Type</th>
<th>PROJECT_NAME</th>
<th>Grid Code 0: % of Total</th>
<th>Grid Code 1: % of Total</th>
<th>Grid Code 2: % of Total</th>
<th>Grid Code 3: % of Total</th>
<th>Grid Code 4: % of Total</th>
<th>Grid Code 5: % of Total</th>
<th>Grid Code 6: % of Total</th>
<th>Grid Code 7: % of Total</th>
<th>Grid Code 8: % of Total</th>
<th>Grid Code 9: % of Total</th>
<th>Total Project Areas Grid Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21st St. Over Bear Creek Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21st St. over Fountain Creek Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26th St. over Fountain Creek Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30th St Corridor Improvements</td>
<td>17.81%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>52.74%</td>
<td>6.16%</td>
<td>13.70%</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8th St. over Fountain Creek Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SHRP2 Data Attributes

#### 8th St. over Fountain Creek Bridge Rehabilitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XLS_ID</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT NA</td>
<td>8th St. over Fountain Creek Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT DE</td>
<td>Deck Replacement and substandard road section. Project will replace deck; maintain travel lanes; and add bike lanes as they don't currently exist today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPONSORING</td>
<td>Colorado Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
<td>$1600000,00000000000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING_CA</td>
<td>Bridge-Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATUS</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODELING R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benefits Using Regional Ecosystem Framework

1. Provides a framework to develop and prioritize projects that incorporates economic, community and environmental interests
2. Allows for better collaboration, improved understanding and buy in, and increased trust
3. Leads to integrated projects and improved outcomes
4. Provides a structure to identify and address complex issues early on in the planning process
5. Allows for streamlined permitting process for transportation projects
Lessons Learned Using Regional Ecosystem Framework

1. Make sure all interests are represented
2. Encourage agency representatives to attend meetings – use web based conferencing
3. Define the roles of participants and goals of the project during kick off meeting
4. Learn from past mistakes
5. Consider hiring a facilitator for meetings
6. Identify milestones and decision points
?? QUESTIONS ??
Implementing Eco-Logical in a World of Schedules and Salmon
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Integrity ~ Competence ~ Service
Atlantic salmon
Schedule (>85% on time) & budget (< 20% vs. award) are two of MaineDOT’s “Capstone” performance measures.

Approximately 25% of stream projects per work plan year (~50) require consultation for Atlantic salmon.

Of those 50, about 10 require formal consultation.

Section 7 is critical path on 100% of projects intersecting with Atlantic salmon.

Expectations vary widely; design & construction methods do not.

~98% of projects qualify for Categorical Exclusions.

Where salmon are an issue, 100% of projects have missed their original target date for completing consultation.
АХНННННН!!!!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable/Activity</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft modified REF</td>
<td>8/2013 – 9/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft work flow map</td>
<td>9/2013 – 10/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and construction BMPs</td>
<td>7/2013 – 1/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Agreement</td>
<td>1/2014 – 9/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final work flow map</td>
<td>9/2014 – 12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documented benefits/efficiencies</td>
<td>9/2014 – 11/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation schedule for full work plan</td>
<td>11/2014 – 12/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So how are we doing?
1. Build/strengthen collaborative partnerships

2. Integrate natural resource, transportation, and land use plans

3. Create a regional ecosystem framework

4. Assess effects on conservation priorities

5. Establish and prioritize ecological actions

6. Develop a crediting strategy

7. Develop programmatic agreements and consultations

8. Implement agreements and deliver projects
“Priority” Crossings
Maine Conservation Priorities
1. Build/strengthen collaborative partnerships

2. Integrate natural resource, transportation, and land use plans

3. Create a regional ecosystem framework

4. Assess effects on conservation priorities

5. Establish and prioritize ecological actions

6. Develop a crediting strategy

7. Develop programmatic agreements and consultations

8. Implement agreements and deliver projects
Things we’ve learned from the wise (or not so wise) salmon...

- The stream less traveled is that way for a reason
- And we don’t always get to know why
- Once you’re in the turbulence, it’s hard to see where you’re going
- Some people focus on the lipstick, some focus on the pig
- Sometimes throwing money at a problem is helpful, if distasteful
- Even a village can get discouraged
- A step in any direction is progress