Advance Mitigation Program Final Formal Guidelines
Summary of Responses to Comments on Draft Version

The Advance Mitigation Program’s (Program) Final Formal Guidelines (Guidelines) have been edited in response to

- Comment letters received on the Draft Formal Guidelines, dated November 2018.
- Comments received during two Workshops held in January 2019
- Comments received from the California Transportation Agency (CalSTA) on the draft Final Formal Guidelines.
- Progress made with the Program’s Implementation Plan, relative to the Guidelines’ topics.

In brief, the Program

- Added figures and text to the Guidelines’ Background section, illustrating how advance mitigation purchased or established through an advance mitigation project may accelerate transportation projects (SHC §800.6 (i)).
- Revised the Guidelines’ Planning and Delivery sections to describe advance mitigation planning and advance mitigation project delivery as different “phases.”
- Clarified roles and responsibilities regarding Caltrans engagement of, and interactions with, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO), Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPA), and other public agencies that implement transportation improvements.
- Incorporated State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)-eligible transportation projects where appropriate.
- Added text that addresses and recognizes the Program’s conservation-related goal, i.e. protecting natural resources through mitigation.
  - Modified verbiage so that conservation-related items are more easily identifiable.
  - Elaborated on outreach to interested parties during advance mitigation planning where appropriate.
  - Added a subsection on stakeholder engagement.
  - Included language regarding “avoid and minimize” to several additional subsections as compensatory mitigation for transportation projects is last in the mitigation hierarchy per conservation interests.
  - Clarified Regional Conservation Investment Strategy (RCIS) roles and responsibilities
  - Clarified that RCISs are an allowable expenditure from the Advance Mitigation Account.
  - Addressed conditions where programmatic mitigation plan requirements per 23 U.S.C. 169 and RCIS requirements per FGC 1800 et seq. overlap (SHC 800.9.)
• Edited document to improve consistency with the Program’s codifying language (SHC 800 language).
• Made definitions and acronyms internally consistent and consistent with SHC 800.
• Made the sequencing of planning, programming, implementation, delivery, and tracking consistent throughout document.