

SANTA CLARA VALLEY
HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN/NATURAL COMMUNITY CONSERVATION PLAN

Stakeholder Group Meeting | April 25, 2006 | Morgan Hill Community Center

IN ATTENDANCE:

Stakeholder Group Members:

Keith Anderson (South Valley Streams for Tomorrow)
Jack Bohan (Representative of general public)
Kevin Bryant (California Native Plant Society)
David Collier (Sierra Club)
Craig Edgerton (Santa Clara County Open Space Authority)
Justin Fields (Santa Clara County Cattlemen's Association)
Jan Hintermeister (Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Commission)
Virginia Holtz (League of Women Voters)
Lawrence Johmann (Guadalupe-Coyote Resource Conservation District)
Bob Loveland (Representative of general public)
Peter Mirassou (Representative of agricultural community)
Kenn Reiller (Pajaro River Watershed Council)
Bob Rohde (Natural Resources Conservation Service, San Benito and Santa Clara Counties)
Carolyn Tognetti (Save Open Space Gilroy)
Lloyd Wagstaff (The Nature Conservancy)
Kerry Williams (Coyote Housing Group)

I. WELCOME AND UPDATES

Stakeholders and members of the public introduced themselves. (New stakeholder Peter Marissou was introduced following the goals discussion.)

II. REVIEW REVISED DRAFT OF GOALS

Please refer to the attached goals summary sheet for this section of the minutes.

Ann Draper reviewed the edits to the goals, noting that the more in-depth comments had provided good direction for the goals. She noted that the group would not spend meeting time wordsmithing the goals. She also noted that many stakeholders needed more information about specific goal areas, so a goals chart has been provided to outline the categories, the preliminary goals, and the proposed changes.

Ann added that she would like confirmation from the group of the primary goal categories, since most proposed changes seemed to be around content. She also heard some suggested wording at the March meeting, and would like confirmation from the group that these suggestions have been heard and recorded correctly. Similarly, she needs confirmation on whether each goal is truly a goal, or a strategy instead. Ann underscored that the goals discussion is not a consensus process at this point—she is simply looking for affirmation of the recorded changes.

Category Headings

Are the bold categories okay as is?

“Multi-Purpose and Benefit Plan”

Larry Johmann noted that there is nothing here that addresses proper stream function and stream habitats, which is different from flood protection.

“Leveraging Public Assets”

The group agreed that this seemed fine.

“Public Participation”

The group agreed that this seemed fine.

“Effective and Efficient Implementation”

Carolyn asked about adding monitoring to implementation. Ann noted that monitoring is really part of implementation, so we’ll leave that for now.

“Economic Growth, and Development”

Delete comma.

Goals Wordsmithing

“Biological Resources and Conservation”

The fourth goal under “Bio Resources and Conservation” is phrased as a strategy, but it would be a good goal; perhaps this should just be rephrased as a goal versus as a strategy.

The group noted that goals should be clear on measures of success: they should not just facilitate conservation, for instance, but actually conserve. If you use “facilitate,” it implies that the action means the plan has succeeded—but really, the plan is only a success if the outcome is accomplished.

The group should also be cautious with meaning—e.g., recovery versus restoration. This is where the glossary really comes into play. Terms used in the goals should be consistent with the definitions of the glossary.

The goals should also be cautious with terms that have formal legal definitions—e.g., beneficial use. This can cause potential conflicts with organizations working in other planning processes. David Zippin’s recommendation is to avoid the term altogether, since we don’t mean the formal definition of this and it could lead to confusion.

“Multi-Purpose and Benefit Plan”

Keith added that SCV Streams for Tomorrow will never support a goal to increase recreation as part of the HCP. However, they would support a spin-off goal such as: “look for opportunities to increase recreation.”

Craige asked whether this was really a goal of the HCP. He strongly supports recreation and would like an explicit goal for public access.

David Zippin responded that recreation must be part of the final plan. However, it can be a secondary goal.

A member of the public (and representative of the county parks department) added that in order for some agencies to participate in the plan, there must be a public access element.

Keith asked if there might be a better definition of recreation to be clear on what it means. He felt that the plan should not be burdened with the responsibility of increasing recreation—it should be a side benefit. He wondered if agencies could still participate if the goal were to seek opportunities to increase recreation, rather than increasing it directly.

Several members agreed that they looked forward to a more in-depth discussion of recreation’s role in the plan.

David Collier questioned the flood protection goal, noting that flood protection, done badly, can be at odds with conservation goals. He noted that it will be important to add “provide and maintain flood protection in keeping with goals...” etc. We don’t want flood protection to destroy critical habitat in the process.

One member noted that the last goal under “Multi-purpose...” mentions public lands—to broaden this meaning, perhaps this qualifier should be removed or “and private” should be added.

“Leveraging Public Assets”

In the “Leveraging” category, Jan wondered how public assets could be used as mitigation, since the public has separately put aside money for these uses. Ann noted that this might mean that future acquisitions can extend existing parks, for instance. Lloyd added that this isn’t clear in the goal—it must be clear to ensure that there’s no confusion over what the mitigation is.

Member wondered what the best way to preserve private land would be. Maybe this should be grass roots—once we understand the details, maybe we’ll understand the goals better.

On the second goal under “Leveraging,” the group noted that the word mitigation should be removed, per edits at March meeting. The group also requested that “local” be added to “private, state, and federal.”

One member asked how costs were split up to match the benefits. The response was that some partners have all of the assets but not many of the costs; there should be a balance between this.

On page 4, the phrasing isn’t obvious—leveraging outreach is unclear. The group clarified that it means that, for instance, you might have a tour that you could piggyback on, bring media on, etc.

The group discussed the need to integrate the findings of the HCP process by avoidance—e.g., setbacks from creeks. Regulatory ordinances can also protect people from triggering the requirements of the HCP.

“Economic Growth and Development”

Carolyn suggested that “allow appropriate...” be changed to “assist.” She doesn’t like what it means, since allow sounds like there’s a superior-inferior relationship. Assist has another meaning too, though. Jan has a concern with “assist”—maybe we should just be explicit about what we’re doing: simplifying the permitting process. Lloyd noted that consistency on process is important.

One member asked whether “local” precluded the county. It does not.

On the last goal under “Economic Growth”: In some cases, this may require a buffer to truly protect land (e.g., farmers need to spray, and spray can do damage).

“Regulatory Compliance”

On page 7, David Collier noted that the second goal down brought up the same concern about flood protection—protection must be compatible with other plan or conservation goals.

Virginia added that somewhere in the goals, we need the word stewardship.

III. INTRODUCE AND DISCUSS PROPOSED PERMIT TERM

David Zippin opened the discussion by noting that the permit term won’t be finalized till the very end of the planning process—this is just a preliminary discussion.

Some considerations for deciding on the permit term include:

- The time horizon of planning documents—how long will it be before plans are actually built?
- Agency guidance—e.g., FWS suggests considering the time to fund and build the reserve system.
- How much time do you need to refine your adaptive management plan?

Virginia recommended extending HCP permits for 60 years. David noted that HCP ranges tend to be from 50 to 100 years, and are often 75 years. He doesn't recommend 100 years.

Terms can be defined in different ways, as well, although David recommends a single permit term for the whole plan to avoid a lot of complications.

As far as the permits are concerned, an applicant might be a county, district, etc.

You can also extend the permit terms. In addition, a subset of the plan participants could also apply for an extension of the term.

David Collier added that there are twin goals to bring people to the table: 1) is to facilitate bringing development to the county, and 2) is to protect species within the county. After 30 years, he felt that it would be difficult to see whether we're really protecting the species. Projects can be phased—it's possible to mitigate some phases of them. What if 25 years down the road, we need to do something additional to save species? We need to protect the opportunity to do a mid-course correction if necessary.

David Zippin agreed, but noted that the way to do this isn't through the length of the permit term; it's something called "changed circumstances" that would modify or qualify the plan.

Ken wondered how David Collier's comment might relate to adaptive management. David Zippin added that at some later point, the group could revisit and decide whether or not to change the policies/mitigation strategies.

Keith noted that whatever the permit period is, we need to identify the covered activities that will occur in that period and the impact on covered species. If we're looking at general plans that are 20 years or less, how can we identify the covered activities that will be occurring in the county that far out?

Carolyn pointed out that on page 49 of the HCP guide, it says that permit terms will be 30 years or less, and that projecting species impact beyond 25 years is highly speculative.

Virginia asked if David Zippin could explain more about how to break the permit terms out into shorter and longer terms for different activities or parties. He will provide more information about this in the future.

Ken noted that if the permit term is short, you have less time to come up with funding and other implementation mechanisms. You won't be able to show the funding necessary to sustain a really robust conservation strategy. David agreed that a shorter term does limit your options in some ways. It will be important to settle this in the coming months (though not today necessarily) since it informs economic strategy, etc.

Keith wondered whether faster development meant faster revenue generation. The city and Coyote Valley Specific Plan seem to be on a wise path to analyze fiscal and land use policies over the long term.

Ann mentioned that it can take a long time to get funding for major infrastructure projects. The Water District wants the longest permit period possible given their funding need and realities.

One member asked what happens when the plan terminates—what are the obligations of property owners at the end of the term? Management and limited monitoring need to continue forever but other pieces don't need to continue.

There will be built-in mechanisms in the plan so that the reserve system mechanism tracks the impact. You must create reserve system at same pace as you use up your impact allowance.

Joan concluded the discussion by echoing that there are many different opinions on this; we'll revisit it in the future.

IV. PRESENTATION ON THE COUNTY'S COYOTE CREEK PARK MASTER PLAN

Mark Frederick of Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department presented the speakers on the Coyote Creek Park Master Plan. Patrick Miller, Principal, 2M Associates, a consultant on this project, outlined where the plan currently is.

In January 2007, the current schedule has the plan going before the Board of Supervisors. Coyote Creek Park is right in the middle of the HCP area, so the plan is particularly relevant to the Stakeholders Group.

Patrick presented an overview of the proposed plan and discussed trails and other public access opportunities in the park, especially as they might relate to the HCP mitigation strategies. They also brought up resource management actions around riparian habitat corridor, and noted that the parks department must undertake some of these in partnership.

The plan will also identify the riparian wildlife corridor and overlay that area on public uses. Potential partners include many of the NCCP/HCP agencies. Resource management actions may also inform actions in HCP. The Coyote Watershed Integrated Working Group, a regulatory staff-to-staff coordination group, has also served as a sounding board for all of the proposals.

One member asked how this plan related to the HCP. The intention is to cover the implementation of this master plan. The plan will have some short term take, etc. Also, this is a resource for conservation strategies for riparian areas.

Next steps

The draft master plan will start the CEQA process in June, and will be available for public comment in the summer. A mitigated negative declaration will be available in the fall—both will be publicly noticed.

Full details on the plan are available online at: <http://www.parkhere.org/>

V. INTRODUCE FISHERIES AND AQUATIC HABITAT COLLABORATIVE EFFORT (FAHCE)

Pat Showalter of the Santa Clara Valley Water District presented a brief overview of the Fisheries and Aquatic Habitat Collaborative Effort (FAHCE), which is formally listed in the NCCP Planning Agreement as an interim project.

Two of the three covered watersheds (Coyote and Guadalupe) are covered in the HCP, so there is an intersection but not complete overlap.

What is FAHCE?

FAHCE was triggered by a water rights complaint. In July 1996, the Guadalupe-Coyote Resources Conservation District (GCRCD) charged the Santa Clara Valley Water District with degrading fish wildlife water quality and other beneficial uses through the fourteen water rights licenses. The streams drain to San Francisco Bay.

This challenge to local water rights is very important. The GCRC and others determined that it would be better to work collaboratively with the Water District to develop a resolution. A number of agencies are participating: City of San Jose, Natural Heritage Institute, USFWS, CDFG, etc.

The group conducted joint fact-finding and major studies and models on temperature and other factors. FAHCE is primarily about balancing beneficial uses of water supply needs, fisheries protection, flood protection, and recreation.

The settlement agreement was negotiated to address factors that limit habitat suitability for Steelhead Trout and Chinook Salmon, and was initiated by all parties in 2003. All parties continue to participate in the process.

FAHCE is doing an HCP (but not an NCCP) and an EIR/EIS to satisfy state requirements. The Water District will spend \$42 million in each of three 10-year phases for planning, improvements, water quality, etc. in addition to ongoing monitoring and maintenance. The phases may be adjusted based on success. Phase 4 is perpetual.

Key benefits:

- Improves conditions for fisheries and aquatic resources
- Protects local water rights
- Provides clear operational guidelines
- Integrates with Santa Clara Valley Habitat Conservation Plan.

Major components:

- Fish passage improvement
- Habitat restoration studies and implementation
- Facility reservoir operation changes
- Modification studies and implementation where feasible
- Explicit facility modifications
- Governed by adaptive management
- 92 total components in the settlement

Next steps

FAHCE will begin implementing the plan at the end of 2008—the group must amend water rights first.

Keith noted that the group needs to schedule a time to talk about the integration of FAHCE into the HCP/NCCP to address concerns some members may have.

Pat agreed that this was probably a good idea for all of the major projects going on right now.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT AND NEXT STEPS

Lloyd asked for clarification of meeting dates: is it the fourth or the last Thursday? It's the fourth, so the next meeting will be Thursday, May 23, 2006.

Keith requested that the group return to the discussion of covered activities at some point in the future.

SANTA CLARA VALLEY
HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN/NATURAL COMMUNITY CONSERVATION PLAN

Original Goals	Comments	Suggested Wording
Biological Resources and Conservation		
<i>All goals</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-purpose benefits for the plan. 	
Protect, enhance, and restore ecosystem integrity and functionality for threatened and endangered species in the Study Area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defined as true goal 	
Establish a comprehensive biological resources conservation planning and implementation program that also helps to preserve the diversity of plant and animal communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defined as a strategy, not a goal 	
Conserve habitat and contribute to the recovery of species listed under federal and California ESAs and reduce the likelihood of additional species listings under federal and California ESAs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defined as true goal Modify “conserving/restoring” language to suggest rehabilitating species rather than restoring them. 	Conserve habitat and contribute to the <i>restoration</i> of species under federal and California ESAs and reduce the likelihood of additional species listings under federal and California ESAs.
Establish programs to facilitate improved conservation and restoration of habitat on private lands by private landowners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defined as a strategy, not a goal 	

Multi-Purpose and Benefit Plan		
<p>Preserve and enhance watersheds to protect the vital water supply and flood protection for Santa Clara County.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define whether flood control protection is focused on trying to protect development or protect flooding itself. • Plan should not prevent natural flooding. • Consider using “beneficial uses of water” in place of “water supply.” • Consult with dictionary or Water District glossary to define terms listed above. • Add “and riparian corridors and stream channels” • Address preserving the stream channel function to allow the channel to function properly while continuing to protect the aquatic habitat. 	<p>Preserve and enhance watersheds, and <i>riparian corridors and stream channels</i> to protect the vital <i>beneficial uses of water</i> and <i>provide or maintain</i> flood protection for Santa Clara County.</p>
<p>Increase the opportunities for high-quality and multi-use rural recreation in Santa Clara County that includes a sense of remoteness, accessible areas, and helps to satisfy educational and interpretive needs in ways compatible with resource conservation. [Adapted from the 2003 Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation System Strategic Plan]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefit of the HCP should be recreational access to lands. • Interface between urban and natural areas is important. • Plan should not prevent the public from accessing lands, but should encourage safe use. Establish controls to determine when access is appropriate and when it is not. • Goal should increase opportunities to include wildlife on public lands and increase access by coordinating with county plans. • Concern around purpose of goal and whether funding will be available to evaluate areas for recreational opportunities. Constraints can add complication. • Recreational opportunities could include guided tours, which provide benefits in addition to ecological/biological benefits. 	
<p>Increase opportunities to create and link regional trails within Santa Clara County to help implement the 1995 Countywide Trails Master Plan, consistent with resource conservation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefit of the HCP should be recreational access to lands. • Interface between urban and natural areas is important. • Plan should not prevent the public from accessing lands, but should encourage safe use. Establish controls to determine when access is appropriate and when it is not. • Goal should increase opportunities to include wildlife on public lands and increase access by coordinating with county plans. • Concern around the cost associated with the goal and who would pay for the necessary activities. • Concern around purpose of goal and whether funding will be available to evaluate areas for recreational opportunities. Constraints can add complication. 	

Increase opportunities to improve wildlife habitat on public lands.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal should increase opportunities to include wildlife on public lands and increase access by coordinating with county plans. • Concern around the cost associated with the goal and who would pay for the necessary activities. 	
		Suggested additional goal: <i>Providing flows for functional stream habitat and channel.</i>
Leveraging Public Assets		
<i>All goals</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be consistent in use of terms as there is room for confusion with terms used in each goal. • This is a long process and opportunities will come and go. The HCP goals should be usable throughout the process. • Conservation efforts is a board term; it may not always be an HCP/NCCP. The plan should be mindful of any work that has already been done. 	
Use the habitat assets of the partners as key elements of the mitigation and conservation strategies of the Plan to the extent possible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to leverage existing assets. Some, if not all, of the partners have habitat assets. • Habitat assets could be key elements of the conservation strategies, rather than mitigation and conservation strategies. 	
Integrate the conservation strategies of the Plan with those of local, state and federal potential partners to the extent possible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCP should be mindful of strategies developed by federal and state partners. • Prevent “double-dipping” or layering mitigation on existing protected land. Be mindful of adding on to what is already in place. 	
Seek private, state and federal resources to implement the plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop blended approach to where funding comes from. • Establish priorities for how federal funds will be applied to a project. Funding should be a collective effort; otherwise one party receives a break by finding alternate funds, while others bear the full burden of mitigation and other HCP requirements. • “Seek” implies that finding additional funding is voluntary. • An economic consultant will be coming into the process to assist with determining how the HCP will be financed. • This goal could be tied to following goal. 	

<p>Provide for the equitable allocation of the cost of implementation of the conservation plan based on relative benefit.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop blended approach to where funding comes from. • Establish priorities for how federal funds will be applied to a project. Funding should be a collective effort; otherwise one party receives a break by finding alternate funds, while others bear the full burden of mitigation and other HCP requirements. • Important that funds be applied across both public and private sectors. Benefit and costs need to be allocated equitably. • Goal of HCP should be to make sure that good development moves forward. All parties should pay a reasonable equitable share, as HCP is good for the county and developers. • Consider “equitable allocation is between the partners.” • Including private development community is important. • An economic consultant will be coming into the process to assist with determining how the HCP will be financed. 	<p><i>Provide for equitable allocation between the partners for the cost of implementation of the conservation plan based on relative benefit.</i></p>
		<p>Suggested additional goal that describes: <i>No double dipping of conservation assets.</i></p>
<p>Balance competing public objectives.</p>		
<p>Integrate the HCP/NCCP with the Southern Alameda County HCP currently under preparation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Integrate” is not the correct word as it implies a higher level of coordination. Consider using “cooperate and coordination”, noting that using one without the other is not enough. • Plan should not name a particular HCP, but rather refer to cooperating with other HCP efforts outside the county. Some of the covered species are mobile and will not stay within the county limits. • Goal should be broad and the strategy should be coordinated with specific HCPs. 	<p><i>Cooperate and coordinate with other conservation efforts including other HCPs/NCCPs.</i></p>

Public Participation		
<i>All goals</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effort seems to be an outreach program, consider including this more explicitly in the goals. • There are many opportunities to leverage outreach simultaneously for several projects. Consider developing a table or schedule of projects that are happening and how this could affect the plan. 	
Provide an open public process in developing and implementing a regional Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan that addresses the needs and concerns of various interests within the Santa Clara Valley and state and federal regulatory agencies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Open public process” can mean a lot of things. Consider making the phrase more specific. • Public process is meant to refer to specific strategies – listserv, community workshops (probably twice a year), stakeholder group, etc. • Consider how to include individuals living adjacent to lands to be protected. • Breakdown goals and objectives down to development and implementation of the plan. 	Add outreach goal, such as “ <i>Leveraging public involvement and coordinate with other activities in project area.</i> ”
Provide access to information for those interested in the Plan, with an emphasis on obtaining input from a balanced variety of public and private interests including State and local governments, landowners, conservation organizations, agricultural interests, and the general public. [Source: Planning Agreement]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCP needs to be more evident on the county web site. • Involvement of the public outreach consultant will help with increasing ease of access and use of information for the HCP, including the development of a new website. 	

Economic Growth, and Development		
<p><i>All goals</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define two key elements, “public assets” and “private assets.” • Group should not ignore regulatory abilities in crafting strategies. Plans need to mesh and integrate as well; such as land use agencies could be instrumental in helping pass ordinances to increase conservation. • Goad need to be tweaked to avoid overemphasizing controversial points. • Address issues concerning eminent domain and the importance of willing buyer, willing seller. • Clarify issues by looking at past scenarios in other HCP, which partner agencies have eminent dominant, and if the eminent domain right is extended to HCP through partnership. • Section should be more thought out and given more weight. • Ensure that the HCP does not negatively impact adjacent landowners; focus on ideas that “minimize and manage” impact on adjacent lands. • Will plan ensure that ranch and other agricultural uses continue, or will it enhance these uses? • It is important to establish the benefit of land being in someone else’s hand, not to empower an agency or individual to take land as a result of the HCP. • It is possible to have an HCP without eminent domain? • Consider a separate bullet to deal with eminent domain. • Add statement about working farms and ranches. 	
<p>Allow appropriate economic growth compatible with approved local land-use plans.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider using “assist” instead of “allow.” 	<p><i>Assist</i> appropriate economic growth compatible with approved local land-use plans.</p>
<p>Use the land use regulatory powers of partners as key elements of the conservation strategies of the Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider using “local controls” increase of “powers.” 	<p>Use the <i>local</i> land use regulatory <i>controls</i> of partners as key elements of the conservation strategies of the Plan.</p>

Reduce conflicts between protecting threatened and endangered species and the conduct of economic development activities by integrating land-use planning and management with species and habitat conservation provided by this Plan.		
Respect the rights of private property owners throughout the Study Area.		
Seek regulatory assurances that the creation of new preserves will not restrict the activities on adjacent private lands.		Seek regulatory assurances <i>from agencies</i> that the creation of new preserves will minimize restrictions <i>on</i> activities on adjacent private lands.
Regulatory Compliance		
Have consistent and reliable federal, state, and local regulatory processes, which provide the basis for clear and integrated mitigation measures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCP will reduce delays, and make the public and private development process faster and less costly. 	
Provide a comprehensive means to coordinate and standardize mitigation and compensation requirements of federal ESA, CEQA, NEPA, NCCPA and other applicable laws and regulations relating to biological resources so that public and private actions will be governed equally and consistently, thus reducing delays, expenses and regulatory duplication. [Source: Planning Agreement]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work to avoid federal agencies coming in and changing biological resource related designations. 	

<p>Provide a less costly, more efficient project-review process, which results in greater conservation values than the current project-by-project, species-by-species review and regulatory regime. [Source: Planning Agreement]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at additional methods to reduce and streamline permitting for both public and private agencies. • There will be a limited set of surveys and some incorporation of avoidance measures to develop a single permitting process, rather than multiple processes. 	
<p>Provide the basis for plan participants to obtain permit authorization pursuant to federal ESA and California NCCPA and CESA for a variety of public projects and on-going activities including uninterrupted water supply, flood protection, and watershed activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at additional methods to reduce and streamline permitting for both public and private agencies. • There will be a limited set of surveys and some incorporation of avoidance measures to develop a single permitting process, rather than multiple processes. 	
<p>Provide the basis for private applicants to obtain permit authorization pursuant to federal ESA, California NCCPA, and CESA through local land-use agencies rather than through the state or federal government.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at additional methods to reduce and streamline permitting for both public and private agencies. 	
<p>Provide long-term conservation and mitigation to offset any incidental impacts to federal or state listed species and non-listed species that may become listed in the future.</p>		
<p>Minimize or avoid the need for the federal government to designate new critical habitat within the HCP/NCCP study area by addressing the conservation needs of listed or potentially listed species.</p>		

Effective and Efficient Implementation		
<i>All goals</i>	<p>Overall, these goals need to be addressed when the team has more information, the economic consultant is onboard, and the group had determined the status of issues such as adaptive management. In addition, the team will need to determine what entity will oversee the purchase and management of land, as well as how the entity will be supported. In addition to the issues listed above, the team needs to address the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to establish an effective, fiscally sound process for the HCP. • Identify the implementation entity • Identifying habitat areas and creating outreach programs for landowners to identify willing sellers in habitant areas. 	
Create an effective monitoring and adaptive management program.		
To maximize the availability of funding, build the monitoring and adaptive management program on existing programs operated by the partners, to the extent possible.		
Allow the option for monitoring and adaptive management requirements related to projects approved prior to the adoption of the HCP to be incorporated into this program.		
Create an effective multi-faceted funding program for acquisition, restoration, preservation and management of habitat preserves.		