

Peninsular Florida Landscape Conservation Cooperative October 27, 2010 Workshop Notes (2 attachments)

Introductions and Key Considerations – Perran Ross

- Will breakout into groups to answer key questions after morning session
- Agenda review and developing key questions to ask today

Welcome - Mark Nelson, Jonathan Dickinson State Park Manager

Overview of the LCC – Todd Hopkins/Thomas Eason

- LCC concept - tie in with existing Joint ventures and cooperatives; it is not a regulatory program
- Not a USFWS initiative anymore but a nationwide DOI initiative to change the tone of conservation to include cultural and social values
- Change – transformational conservation issue of our time
- Needs - invite climate science center member to next workshop for presentation and tie in

Questions (Q) – will the panhandle be part of the PFLCC?

Answer (A) – Short answer – yes. We plan or would like to integrate the panhandle component and change our name to the Florida LCC. The boundary is a fuzzy gradation to help us think about opportunities and issues but does not stop conservation. Cross membership is an important function and overlapping boundaries are central to LCC success.

Q – Would this come up in upcoming Tallahassee Green (?) meeting?

A - Don't know but will look into it.

Comments (C): PFLCC Boundary - the issue of the location of the boundary is well recognized and one that the Service is doing something about. Points to consider in national network of LCCs and with integration of neighboring LCCs:

- Don't stop at the Florida/Georgia line- look at info that pulls this coverage together. Need to figure out mechanisms to do this.
- Also consider the coastline, specifically the marine boundary of the LCC, and that there will be a Caribbean LCC to work with.
- Time sequences are important considerations too – different LCCs are not up to speed (baseline information) than others.

C - PFLCC is not yet 'stood-up'. A Coordinator has just been advertised and money has been allocated with 50% State and 50% Federal dollars.

Q - Need to clarify the difference between Gainesville workshop and today. In Gainesville meeting, LCC discussions seemed to promote the idea that all ideas for the LCC were wide open including incentives to landowners, scientific support etc. Now it appears were proposing more need for scientific support – is this the main purpose?

A - Not sure of the function of the LCC yet, but yes there will need to be scientific support. However, the Florida LCC remains open to all ideas and needs and is not intended to be focused on science support only. Florida is ahead of other LCCs in terms of foundation science. This group needs to help define that. Lack of landscape level science is the norm in other states. Each partner can bring something else to the table – initiatives, purpose, define what it looks like to you. The LCC would cover the whole cycle of conservation (SHC) which includes, as an element, science based decision making.

C - In order to be affective, the LCC needs to be that model.

C - Originally planning and design was the LCC focus. Now the focus has shifted to conservation delivery. There is an expectation that for the PFLCC, conservation delivery will be provided early in the process compared to other LCCs.

C - Incentive packaging needed for a successful LCC.

C - Need to change the messaging to reduce the level of science delivery. There is clear agreement that the LCC must be science based in order to deliver true conservation benefits for species and secure soundness of our own human environment. However, good science will not accomplish delivery alone. Goals and objectives for guidance, data, process/mechanisms and incentives to reward and facilitate participation of those who control and manage the natural landscape all will be essential to conservation delivery.

C - Need to incorporate acquisition in the strategy of LCC and a promise on conservation delivery.

C - The presentation does not have a whole lot of discussion about private landowners. More emphasis necessary on private landowners needed. The privately owned natural areas of high conservation value that still remain do exist because the private owners have maintained, managed and protected them as such. The economics of managing private lands in their natural conditions that continue to support species also is a powerful force that is affected by all that is contrary to private management of natural areas. Those who own and protect these landscapes do not need to receive a scolding or heavy-handed message of any kind, rather they need to be provided incentive options of economic, social and biological value that makes it possible for them to continue their management and conservation of high value landscapes and retain them in private ownership and responsibility rather than public.

C - Private lands critical and public lands are too. Public lands will be critical for our listed species – need to continue to provide safe and effective fire prescriptions for the management of scrub-jay.

Q – Who is not represented today/who else should be with us?

A - Breakout groups need to define this. Groups will help us figure out who needs to be here. Membership on the steering committee needs to be expanded by inviting broader participation and representation of private lands.

Q - How do you certify/ratify being in the cooperative?

A - Won't know until we define the goals/objectives and methods to deliver conservation.

C - What's expected of us?

- 1) We need to bring something (talent, ideas, funding) and contribute meaningfully;
- 2) We need to participate honorably and come to a consensus vision and do something with that;
- 3) None of these ideas are regulatory and mandatory for us to use, but we need to take products and use them to the extent that we can.
- 4) Example – incorporating landscape design for private landowners. Let's use what we can, perhaps designing your project - whatever it is - with your choice of portions of the LCC and add whatever you believe best suits your business decisions. In other words, use the LCC to the best that you can but know that none of us have to.

Q - How to measure success?

A – Through the Strategic Habitat Conservation (SHC) circle. Based on habitat conservation, perhaps basing it on what the product looks like now and what you want it to look like in the future. Define specific objectives. Evaluate current conditions relative to desired future conditions. This is not static a system – it's dynamic, moving, evolving, changing and the SHC circle helps conceptualize ways to adapt conservation direction. We talk about what we may want the future landscape to look like from a conservation perspective (i.e. where and what portions of the landscape are of high conservation value that we would want to be conserved), but it may be just as important to identify those landscapes of lower conservation value, but of high human residential, commercial and transportation value where conservation priorities would be lower in exchange for conservation action where the priorities would be high.

C - We need to agree on a governance structure – Need to identify how to become an LCC member/stakeholder and what does that involve? This may be the next stage of discussion - structure and function and nuts and bolts of the LCC.

C - As political parties have become more and more polarized, cooperative stakeholder partner groups that bring together a cross section of interest are deciding the fate of these issues. Realistic stakeholder working groups provide legislative entities with a trusted source of conservation information.

C - The LCC should provide us with the ability to provide more formal arrangements across borders (MOUs, equipment share, resource share) would be easier to share across boundaries with the LCC in place which inherently makes cooperatives important and valuable.

C - Equity and accountability are important for cooperative success.

C - Need to work through a consensus discussion to forward goals and objectives – we don't need to provide all the governance structure - we need to work together but let's start doing that and develop goals and objectives now.

Q - Can we get into the different modeling approaches for climate change (the handout)? We have an abundance of good GIS work already but not necessarily depicting exactly what's on the ground. We may or may not want to use this (MIT climate change model).

A - The MIT work is simply an example of science that we may or may not want to use.

Q - Is the LCC a way to move around and through questions about appropriate science needs?

A – Yes (short answer). And our cooperative will decide the science priorities for the Florida LCC.

Q - Will part of our effort be 1) to come up with the cooperative picture of what the State could/should be (consider both conservation and human growth needs) if we work together, and 2) what we can bring to make that happen?

A - Yes. This is an opportunity to come up with a consensus plan with strategies. There are no limits to the capacity to develop partnerships and what the LCC delivers. We define what is it or the why. Then we figure what capacity are subgroups about initiatives etc. will develop.

C – We need to get the right membership in place to better deliver cooperative goals and objectives.

Q - What is our next step in the process?

A - Look at the questions to give us information and begin defining goals, objectives and future partners.

Break

Breakout groups identified to define core issues, and answer key questions:

- What would it take for the LCC to be desirable to your group?
 - What particular concerns or issues do you have given your understanding of the LCC?
 - What would it take to get others from your group to participate?
- Describe Florida in the year 2060 as you would like to see it.
 - How can the LCC change the trajectory of FLs future to be more as we envision it
 - What specific achievements do you want from the LCC?

Breakout Groups organized by partner affiliation:

Groups	Number of members	Group Lead
Private Lands	10	Tom Logan
Science Based	6	Leonard Pearlstine
NGOs	5	Laurie MacDonald
Federal/State Land Mangers	10	Paul Tritaik

Private Landowners (P.L.)

Issues and Concerns

- Recommendations sometimes become regulatory
- Unknown impacts on land use/value for P.L.
- Concern over too many initiatives that affect P.L. Coordination among these related initiatives need to be coordinated.
- Lack of regulatory agency involvement (DCA, COE, DEP, NRCS, etc.)
- Lack of landscape level land use planning across regulatory boundaries
- Lack of regulatory certainty (process-related)
- May require regulatory reform
- May need regulatory process to support LCC
- Need to create a collective regional non-regulatory vision for land use
 - Conformity to regional vision could provide regulatory relief or streamlining
 - One-time review of project rather than multiple regulatory hoops
- “Don’t punish for doing something good”
- “Incentives, assurances, and certainty
- Maps being drawn prematurely that lead to regulation
- Use of data to set regulatory standards or restrictions
- Eliminate disincentives *I.D. obstacles
- Good faith participation by regulatory entities
- Integrate CCB & LCC coordination
- Expand membership on steering committee and active participation/representation of private lands ownership.

How to get others (P.L.) to participate

- Re-cast descriptive materials to describe what we are doing in Florida
- I.D. venues to attend to give presentations
- Use Core Team as ambassadors for targeted outreach (FL. Cattleman’s Assoc., etc.)
- Need a set of specific goals and objectives
- Need a set on incentives to attract participation
- Safe harbor like programs

C - Need - Bring mining interests in to the private land group

Q - What type of incentives work and what types don't?

A - Flesh out for future meetings but there are examples of both

C – There are incentive programs in other states that could be utilized, public underutilized

Federal and State Land Managers

Issues and Concerns

- How will LCC work with CERP; avoid politics; emphasize inclusiveness (Tribes, etc.)
- Need internal buy-in
 - Can't distract from mandate; time constraints (complete w/data calls etc.)
 - Must add value; needs to be seamless
- Data exchange and priority locations
 - ROW
 - Mitigation opportunities
 - Wildlife crossings
 - Need to be able to drill down regional scale data to management units
 - ID key habitats and species and address gaps
- Model resembles National Estuarine Programs (different in every location)
 - Stress inter-relatedness; facilitate more focused coop. agreements etc; incentive
- Key goal of advancing conservation front and center & emphasis complementary goals (buffer, etc)
- Set example (carbon footprint)
- LCC should be tailored to unique aspects of Florida

How to get others to Participate?

- Florida local Environmental Resource Agencies, Regional Planning Councils
- Leverage resources b/w public and private (NRCS, etc)
- Show benefits, eliminate duplication

- Comprehensive planning (ID incompatible uses), i.e. hospitals, quarries, next to prescribed fire sites)
- Hydrology changes need to be communicated w/ all agencies (FDOT)
- Improve communication to public (show cost effectiveness – Ecosystem Services)
 - Difficult in current economic climate (swing of support for conservation in Keys)
 - Communicate success stories, tailored regionally (Osceola – GOAL)
 - Target private landowners , utilizing existing networks (prescribed fire, invasive spp., BMPs, recreational, FLES)
 - Improve public partnerships (RCWs)
- Perceptions w/ private landowners (top-down, regulatory) meeting needs for private landowners to incentivize
 - Info that could hurt (or protect them from consequences of species responding positively to management) landowners and provide options - Safe Harbor Agreements
- Meeting needs for private landowners to incentivize
 - Farm Bill geared more for Midwest

Vision for Florida in 2060

- Use existing data and maps: i.e. CLIP, GAP analysis, fire, multiple-use corridors (areas of landscape where a variety of conservation options exist for maintaining habitat and population connectivity and health)
- Need to get long-term view predominate short-term (local land use decisions)
- Mass transit in place and widely utilized (less need to widen roads through conservation lands)
- Highest quality areas (hi biodiversity) increase connectivity to these places
- Shared adversity, everything is connected
- Use prescribed fire tools, use biomass (wood) utilization strategies (pay producer to offset carbon reduce fossil fuels)
- Enough water and high quality
- Barriers to effective conservation removed

How can LCC help create that vision?

- Performance measurements for sustainable Florida
- Share information, communicate vision
- Complete inventory of resources on lands, magnify scale to local levels to improve land use decisions
- Measure right things in right places at right time
- ID how to create value
- Document success, LCC change trajectory of loss of biodiversity

What achievements do we want from the LCC?

- Work w/private landowners that rewards participation
- Hi biodiversity areas are secure
- Abate trend of T&E species - develop opportunities to reverse downward population trends.
- Benchmark an informed public
 - SharePoint to access data
 - one stop shop
 - info and technology sharing
 - hyper spectral imaging (2m resolution)
 - satellite dedicated to conservation
 - include NASA
- Long-term plan for landscape
- Delisting species

Partnerships to improve, refine, exploit

- Adjacent landowners (CISMAs)
- Mosquito control agencies
- Challenge Cost Share programs

C - How data are used is an important attribute. Private landowners are sensitive to data sharing and will need assurances of how data will be used and not used. Without these assurances, private

landowners will not have incentives to provide data that are readily available to send in a positive way and not against the wishes of the landowner.

C – We have a need to examine from the public agency perspective (or whoever is doing the regulating) that there is a regulatory disconnect between agencies. This is especially true when regulatory rules within one agency trump or conflict with another agency and this specifically impacts private landowners. This needs to be fixed

C - Some agencies prevent layering together incentives – stacking or layering incentives. We need layering to provide extra incentives.

C - Different programs have different capacities and abilities – ‘09 Farm Bill and Wetlands Reserve Program allow for owner to retain credits as a layering on top of easements etc. – a recent ruling.

C – While LCC are not going to be a regulatory body, this group can make apparent the limitations of regulations, etc. and this will make us more effective.

Science Based

Issues

- Need to have monitoring and assessment throughout the process
 - Both large and fine scale required
 - No follow through, can't do adaptive management without it
- Need to have research or input on it
- Needs to help define and address what we should be paying attention to
- Is this going to be science based? Is so, how?
- Don't always have the metrics for this or a database for this info
- Species of concern /focus – is this useful? How will this work with climate change?
- Waterscapes
 - Plan on a broad scale but implement on a small scale
 - Water may constrain the development of LCC
- Develop a view of what it should look like in 2060 then you'll know what you need to understand and monitor it
- Economics needs to be included as part of the science basis
- Characterize current structures of habitat
 - How this is different from CLIP? Looking as a model level of connectivity, what would cause habitat shifts

What do partners need to bring to the table?

- Statistical design, data analysis

LCC Concerns

- Underfunded. Will they be able to meet their objectives?

- Not enough focus on science – could be overwhelmed with incentives for private landowners T
- Agencies need to finally deliver incentive options to reward private landowners for long-term commitments to conservation of habitat and species. Agencies have been promising delivery of such incentives since the early 1990s.
- Need a monitoring plan w/ a good statistical design
 - EMAP – environmental monitoring assessment plan (EPA)
- Needs to be strong central entity that does that work (e.g. climate centers)
- Need centralized location for data and information addressing special scale
- Standardization on a national scale LCCs so you can make broader statements about what's happening to certain species (e.g. impacts to amphibians)
- Decision support system necessary
 - Construct a database driven/constructed around the issues and questions you want to address
- Spatial scales – can we articulate what those scales are and what we need?
- Synthesis of current knowledge – who's doing what?
- Proprietary information? Benefits of pooling resources (e.g. SOFIA database)
- Process that drives communication of information needs and prioritization of information dissemination synthesis info to make decisions
- Put caveat with funding opportunities – e.g. how are you participating in this process?
- Integrate all of the data and information
 - How to communicate this with landowners?
- Social parameters included? Human economics (info science?)
- Proof of concept – test on a smaller scale
 - Statistical design
 - Conceptual modeling

Florida in 2060

- Maybe we don't all agree on this
- Higher density with large conservation areas, protecting water resources
- Clustered development with conservation area in common
 - increases value of everyone's property, but these large scale developments (150 200k houses) may be fragmenting habitat
- Marketing/business experience
 - may be based on shallow concepts
- Preserve diverse, connected landscapes for maintaining wildlife population connectivity, movements and interaction, rather than concentrating species movement through corridors to targeted landscapes?
- Include business majors for a different perspective on synthesizing information and making decisions

What do we want from the LCC? – Achievements

- Process
- Funding
- Centralized database and acquisition

- Benevolent dictator/Czar – science commissioner in place to make decisions
- Monitoring plan
- Strong growth management

C - Strong growth management and a process for that is? necessary

C - Conceptual model framework needed.

Q – Proprietary data? How to deal with data and who wants to use it is key. This needs more discussion and is not fleshed out.

A - Proprietary vs. non-proprietary model – need an interdisciplinary team to make the data more available.

C - There's a dilemma with the public needs of data vs. private data.

C - Data sharing – needs to be combined for a greater value – people who use the data need to know what to use it for and how to use it.

C - Two parts to use:

- data need to be understood in terms of what they don't represent – e.g. ungroundtruthed GIS data are valuable but shouldn't be used on a site-by-site basis in the regulatory world
- Is the data question unique or general and does it need to be answered by the LCC? If a general question, don't need to come up with it on our own.

C - Pick small projects and do those first then pick up bigger picture items later. We through (PFLCC) are better suited to deliver than other LCCs as we already have an array of baseline information to build from.

NGOs

LCC concerns and issues

- Make it all Florida based – include panhandle making it easier to participate and integrate data and actions
- LCC is a group in which we strive for consensus
- Looking for real results – lot of mapping work ongoing on the broader vision
- Communicate with public and decision makers and this info needs to be put to work
- Work should be made more efficient and climate challenges and conflict that occur – e.g. make regulation more efficient and not counter productive
- Comprehensive long term view – e.g. water resources from source to marine environment all along chain needs to be considered
- Facilitate and result in connectivity across landscape and connections among people
- Main issues – climate change, invasive species, water resources

C - LCC a way to further develop connection with people and relationships – very important – ‘regions and relationships’

Q – What are the mechanisms to reconcile State political boundary with ecosystem boundaries – we have a well defined boundary (State of Florida) with ecosystems that overlap and three LCCs over both?

A - State Wildlife Action Plan, Blueprint – LCC needs to tie in with these products then Florida is a whole and it doesn’t matter which LLC we’re in. This is how Florida can contribute to the goals and objectives of any LCC. Dovetail with the SWAP – boundaries are not absolute.

C – Coordinator for PFLCC needs to be part of other LCCs.

C – Perhaps we should identify a transition zone and change boundaries – where it makes the best sense (ecological, regional, service leadership)

C – How the LCC adapts and adjusts to the worst case scenarios (climate change) if they take place is critical - can this be done?

C - Major threats and changes:

- Climate change, people migration, new and vigorous storms, species migration
- Conservation land acquisition – leases vs. ownership

Synthesis

C – Need to bring transportation and LCC together at the same time. Base off of existing 2060 plan for transportation. Additional sustainability components should be built-in to the statewide vision model and base vision on regional perspective.

C – Need to address LCC boundary’s and should adopt a common plan to aid in rational – e.g. SWAP to coordinate across LCCs

- Get LCC coordinators talking to each other – need cross LCC membership which would facilitate providing science and data across boundaries
- Change boundary through mutual agreement
- Accept boundary is flexible and fuzzy

C - Water relationships – urban water supply demands will be a major threat in identifying conservation strategies. LCC should call attention and include WMD perspective on water resources.

C - Utilize Heartland 2060, specifically Central Florida coordination area and new rulemaking by WMDs to figure ground/surface water issues. Potential additional entry point for LCC to work with water managers.

C – LCC to compliment, contribute – how?

- Sharing data, sharing information, common barriers, share expertise. LCC could facilitate this and be the platform by which information moves. The data sharing platform.
- Issues identified – who is working on these. This sets up our network – perhaps working groups that keep things together?
- keep optimistic viewpoint
- doesn't solve all problems for all agencies – coordinate and develop framework for creating and implementing a long term conservation strategy. LCCs pull together a cooperative conservation strategy for Florida
- what media to use to educate? Need to develop a proper communication strategy

C – Tangible objectives to achieve with an LCC

- Some are political and cannot be solved with the LCCs
- Utilization will help us achieve certain projects - but need to be judicious b/c cannot solve all
- Perhaps avoid political issues
- web presence? What should this look like? National website, regional website. Need to beef up the existing website

C – Another existing platform to build from – USF water atlas

C – Everglades Coalition Conference in January plenary session is on the larger initiatives in the system. Provide numerous outlets to provide information

Next steps for Core Team

- Workshop notes out
- Break-out group reports to Bill
- Update PowerPoint
- Create consolidated LCC Report
- Hire LCC Coordinator
- Better articulated “Regulatory” concept
- Develop draft Guiding Principles
- Send FL LCC Issues up LCC/FWS chain - e.g. Great America Outdoors tie-ins
- Make 10-15 slide PP available for use
- Reach out to other potential participants
- ID how LCC fits with SWAP
- ID and work on difficult issues/challenges for LCC participation

Closing remarks – Tim Breault

- Good start on the foundation
- Group coalesced well today
- Develop working groups
- Active participation necessary
- LCC provides a lot of promise

Attachment 1: Additional Comments from the Private Lands Group

Disincentive for Stewardship – The biologically rich landscapes that continue to exist on private lands for reasons that include the fact that owners and managers have chosen to protect them as such. There is a real concern that entering into conservation partnerships with government may make those lands vulnerable if not subject to disincentives or penalties for practicing good stewardship of the land.

Protection from Penalty for Conservation – Private landowners must be provided assurances and certainty regarding future outcomes before considering long-term planning and commitments. Assurances that include Safe Harbor Agreements need to be developed and tailored for the PFLCC.

Improper Use of Data – Conservation action must be science-based to assure true conservation value will be achieved by the PFLCC. Sharing or pooling of data also is necessary to assure management decisions and agreements are based upon best available data. However, there are too many examples of otherwise sound scientific data being misinterpreted and improperly use, especially by regulators, with results being consequence to the private landowner and compromised, if any, conservation value achieved.

Goals and Objectives - Goals and objectives must be developed for the PFLCC; otherwise, it will remain only a concept with no direction or tangible substance for stakeholder buy in and implementation. Most importantly, stated goals and objectives are necessary for the private landowner to know what is proposed and evaluate the benefits and risks of participation as an active partner. The private lands members look forward to assisting in the development of achievable goals and objectives when appropriate.

Incentives – Incentives of biological, social and economic value must be developed to facilitate participation of private landowners and their commitment to long-term conservation of the biologically rich landscapes within their holdings in combination with comparable commitments that must be made for the vast lands already held in public trust. Incentives must be varied and flexible, as every incentive will not have application for every circumstance or ownership. The private lands members have a valued perspective regarding the types of incentives that best facilitate conservation of privately owned landscapes, and we look forward to assisting in the development of realistic incentives for the PFLCC.

Regulatory Reform – Some important incentives may require agency policy and/or regulatory reform to make possible and facilitate implementation of LCC and deliver conservation value and the incentives necessary for private participation.

Complete Agency Buy In – Just as representation of private lands interests must be broadened to assure the private landowner is appropriately represented in the successful development and implementation of the PFLCC, it is equally essential that representation of the regulatory agencies must be complete to assure that delivery of incentives to private lands is achievable. Therefore, regulatory agency participation must be expanded to agencies that include the ACOE, DCA, RPCs, DEP, NRCS and WMDs.

Attachment 2: Peninsular Florida Landscape Conservation Cooperative Private Lands Stakeholders Conference Call Preparation for Friday (10/08/10) LCC Meeting - October 6, 2010

Comments regarding draft PFLCC *Development and Operations Plan* and *Charter* presented to Core Team on behalf of Private Lands Steering Committee Members during Friday (10/08/10) LCC meeting.

The PFLCC conceptually has the potential to be one of the more significant conservation efforts ever planned for Florida wildlife and the natural areas they depend upon as functional habitat. However, the successful development and implementation of the LCC will be largely dependent upon the conservation that occurs on private lands and the participation of the private owners of those lands. As such, the PFLCC, whatever it is or becomes, has tremendous implication to private land ownership, management and their future conservation and economic value. Therefore, private land owners must be meaningfully engaged to provide essential input to the design of a supportable PFLCC; otherwise, the effort will likely fail.

The stakeholders presently representing private lands interests for the PFLCC have reviewed the draft *Development and Operations Plan and Charter* and generally find the documents lacking for private participation and support. We constructively provide the following specific comments.

- Although purpose is discussed in the Charter, the documents do not define clear goals and objectives for the PFLCC, nor is intent discussed for development of goals and objectives. The guiding principles need to be revised to include a robust process for expanded participation of private landowners for assistance in development of clear and understandable purpose, goals and objectives and guiding principles of the PFLCC.
- There must be a clear commitment to a non-regulatory, incentive-based program.
- Private landowners cannot participate and support the PFLCC without a clear understanding of what we collectively want to achieve. The private landowner also cannot evaluate the risks and consequences of participation.
- No process is described for how participation of private landowners will be engaged for necessary input to the design of the PFLCC.
- The design of the PFLCC must reflect that representation of private interests is truly representative; current private stakeholder representation does not and should not be assumed to adequately represent private interests.
- Incentives for participation in conservation activities are essential to the success of the PFLCC and will only be of value if identified and defined with private input. The private landowner knows best what constitutes an incentive of economic or other value.
- Conservation must maintain or improve, not reduce the asset value of private property.
- The collection and sharing of data are discussed extensively without identification of purpose or objective for collecting those data. Objectives must be identified to provide purpose for collection, analysis, use and confidentiality of data; otherwise, those data may not be readily obtainable cannot properly contribute to landscape conservations or provide a scientific or factual basis for decision.