

The background of the entire page is a map of a coastal region, likely the Chesapeake Bay area, showing a grid of roads and green spaces. Several orange circles are overlaid on the map, indicating specific locations of interest. A white rectangular box is centered in the upper half of the page, containing the title and subtitle.

# WILDLIFE CROSSING DATABASE PLATFORM

*DESCRIPTION OF THE TOOL AND SUMMARY  
OF RESEARCH/PRACTITIONER FEEDBACK*







**3.4 Data entry questions are heavily focused on transportation networks**, and in many ways, the beta version of WCDP presents landscape connectivity practices as a component of transportation development rather than a broader set of strategies and policies. Although transportation networks are critical considerations for connectivity, maintaining the focus solely on transportation networks can obscure other areas where wildlife passages and ecological connectivity are needed.

**3.3 Carefully consider financial cost information** in terms of the sources of this information and how it is communicated. If recommendations and cost estimates are based on academic sources, it would be worthwhile to consider whether crossing designs can be adjusted to a particular local case or context in a manner that reduces costs. In addition, cost estimates specifically associated with the wildlife aspects of infrastructure development should be clearly communicated, rather than just reporting the aggregate cost for infrastructure.

## 4. Landscape connectivity beyond wildlife crossing infrastructure

**4.1 Wildlife crossings are only one aspect of landscape connectivity**, and a broader view of connectivity would incorporate ecological components that facilitate animal movement, such as vegetation, ravines, parks, etc. In some ways, the use of points for representing data in the WCDP map interface can be limiting, as points can present wildlife passages as a series of separate and disconnected features.

**4.2 Non-wildlife infrastructure can facilitate wildlife movement**, examples being pedestrian tunnels, bridges, and rolled curbs that provide a gradual slope from street to sidewalk. Although not specifically built as wildlife passages, such multifunctional infrastructure can be equally significant for landscape connectivity. However, it is important to recognize that communicating information on how a variety of infrastructure can serve landscape connectivity purposes may unintentionally suggest that building crossing structures specifically for wildlife is unnecessary. It should be clearly conveyed that such uses of infrastructure should not preclude purpose-built wildlife crossings, particularly if potential issues exist with multifunctional usage (such as human-conflicts in pedestrian tunnels).

**4.3 A wider incorporation of data presents some practical challenges**, as including all landscape connectivity features would require significant data needs and would create difficulties in managing the tool and database. WCDP could instead be used to complement or enhance other landscape connectivity projects and communication efforts. The tool could focus on purpose-built wildlife crossings, and other organizations and groups can then use these data for more comprehensive mapping of landscape connectivity in their local areas.

The Wildlife Crossing Database Platform was developed as a part of the research project:  
*Safe Passage: Towards an Integrated Planning Approach for Landscape*

[www.ecologicaldesignlab.ca/projects/research](http://www.ecologicaldesignlab.ca/projects/research)