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Agency:
“To restore, protect and manage the state's natural, historical and cultural resources for current and future generations using creative approaches and solutions based on science, collaboration and respect for all the communities and interests involved.”

Program:
“To track and assess the outcomes of resources-related projects using performance-based criteria to inform California’s past, present and future investments in communities and nature.”
Kickoff Event Objectives

- Share MSU’s purpose and proposed strategy to track the performance of CNRA bond-funded projects.

- Gain shared commitment on the development of the tracking system and incorporate feedback on next steps.
Key Terms

✓ Monitor – observe or check on the progress or quality of something over a period of time.

✓ Evaluate – form an idea of the amount or value of something; assess the progress or quality.

✓ Management Question – questions driven by the goal of improving management decisions.
Zach Stacy
DOF, Office of State Audits and Evaluations

Zach Stacy is a Manager Financial and Performance Evaluator with the California Department of Finance (Finance), Office of State Audits and Evaluations (OSAE). He has been with Finance for 19 years and currently manages OSAE’s Resources bond accountability team. This responsibility includes ensuring Finance meets its bond oversight responsibilities pursuant to former Governor Schwarzenegger’s January 2007 Executive Order S-02-07. To this end, Zach coordinates OSAE’s efforts to complete performance audits for state, local, and private entities who either administer or receive Resource bond funds. In addition to bond oversight, Zach’s responsibilities include overseeing the wind-down of former redevelopment agencies, coordinating the Office of Traffic Safety audits, and managing other non-bond related audits.
Bond Accountability
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Agenda

• Finance’s Role in Bond Accountability
• Common Audit Issues
• Monitoring and Bond Accountability
The Office of State Audits and Evaluations (OSAE) assists Finance in completing its mission through independent audits, objective evaluations, and other related services.

One of OSAE’s primary responsibilities is performing audits of bond funds and providing trainings to enhance Bond Accountability.
Finance’s Role in Bond Accountability

Executive Order S-02-07
“Departments shall be accountable for ensuring that bond proceeds are spent efficiently, effectively, and in the best interests of the people of the State of California.”

- Increased bond accountability & transparency to ensure bond funds are spent efficiently by state government.
- All bond proceeds subject to audit.
Finance’s Role in Bond Accountability

Examples of bond proceeds OSAE has audited.

- Natural Resources Agency
  - Propositions 12, 13, 40, 50, 84, 1E, and 1
- Department of Transportation
  - Proposition 1B
- Office of Public School Construction
  - Proposition 1D
Since January 2015 OSAE has audited:

- Nine grantors under Natural Resources – All had audit findings.
- 116 grantees - 60 percent of grantees had audit findings.
Common Audit Issues (Grantors)

1) Fiscal Controls Need Improvement
2) Project Oversight Needs Improvement
3) Both 1 and 2
4) Noncompliance ( awarding requirements, contracting practices, etc.)
Common Audit Issues (Grantees)

1) Unallowable expenditures
2) Unsupported match
3) Noncompliance with grant requirements (contracting, reporting)
4) Inadequate fiscal controls
5) Deliverables (incomplete, lack of oversight)
In-progress monitoring:
• Mitigates common grantee audit issues.
• Ensures projects stay within scope and budget.
• Helps to identify and resolve common issues.
• Increases transparency and accountability of the grantees’ use of bond funds.
Long-term monitoring:

- Maintains grantee accountability for the useful life of the project.
- Assists grantors with decisions on future awards.
- Ensures taxpayers get the intended return on investment.
- Helps track and evaluate long-term performance of projects.
- Assists in the evaluation of long-term benefits from bond funds on a statewide basis.
Resources

- OSAE Audit Reports and Resources
  (http://www.dof.ca.gov/Programs/OSAE/Prior_Bond_Audits/)

- Feel free to call or send an email!
  - Zachary (Zach) Stacy
    - Phone: (916) 322-2985 Ext. 3747
    - Email: Zachary.Stacy@dof.ca.gov
The Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting System (RAPTR)

Gina Ford
MSU Supervisor
Adaptive Management Cycle
Bond Evaluation

• Did projects meet the goals of the bonds that funded them?
• What did we get for the dollars spent?
• How do we track the long-term performance of projects across diverse programs?
• If this information is collected, how does it inform an adaptive management cycle?
Monitoring, evaluation, and data management protocols vary widely.

There is no centralized storage system for post-completion data that are collected.

Many offices lack the ability to secure funding for long-term monitoring, operations, and maintenance.

The return on investment is only deducible at the individual project level and only for a subset of all projects funded.
Recommendations for Improvement

• Establish standard protocols for data collection and management

• Provide training

• Leverage existing reporting systems to reduce redundant data entry
Hopes for the Future

• To fulfill our mission, “to track and assess the outcomes of resources-related projects using performance-based criteria to inform California’s past, present and future investments in communities and nature.”

• To use a stakeholder-driven process for selection of performance-based criteria.

• To use state funds more efficiently and effectively to restore, protect and manage the state's natural, historical and cultural resources over the long-term.

• To justify future additional funding and positions for performance-based long-term monitoring.
# Known Benefits and Concerns

**Benefits**
- Improve Adaptive Management
- Increase Transparency
- Inform Decision-making
- Increase Multidisciplinary (and Inter-Agency) Collaboration
- Improve Science
- Enhance Program Efficiencies: Cutting the “Green Tape”

**Concerns**
- How will we fund this?
- Who will do the work?
- How will this integrate with current systems?
- Is this mandated?
- Is this really possible?
Parallel Strategies

Stakeholder Workshop Series:

YOU ARE HERE

Kick-off Meeting

Workshop 1

Workshop 2

Workshop 3

Workshop 4

Workshop 5

Wrap-up Meeting

Topic – specific Workshops

RAPTR System Creation:

Identifying Requirements for RAPTR

Designing RAPTR

Build RAPTR

Test & Validate RAPTR

Deliver RAPTR System
Conceptual Model: the Resources Agency Project Tracking & Reporting system (RAPTR)

Jim Falter
Environmental Scientist, Monitoring and Stewardship Unit
Desired Attributes

• Make data *machine-readable* wherever possible.
  • parse complex project attributes into smaller ‘bites’
  • catalog documents when necessary
Desired Attributes

• Make data *machine-readable* wherever possible.
  • parse complex project attributes into smaller ‘bites’
  • catalog documents when necessary

• Structure, naming, and formatting conventions are *standardized* and *normalized* across all offices
Desired Attributes

• Make data *machine-readable* wherever possible.
  • parse complex project attributes into smaller ‘bites’
  • catalog documents when necessary

• Structure, naming, and formatting conventions are *standardized* and *normalized* across all offices

• Project management work flows are *harmonized* across all offices wherever possible
  • ➔ Business Services Solution Team
‘The CNRA Bond Program is overseeing the provision of $500,000 in funding from Prop 27 to Parks ‘R’ Us to develop the Natomas Bike Park through the Improving Bicycle Health Program. This project will provide bicycle owners living in and around Natomas with a fully secure recreational area where their bicycles are safe to socialize as well as roam free and unencumbered; thus, greatly improving the health of both bicycles and their owners. Completion of the project will further provide a direct link between two high traffic bike paths used by residential commuters; thus, facilitating a reduction in street traffic around Sacramento as well as a reduction in net city GHG emissions. The first phase of the project will involve the fee title acquisition of four ~0.5-acre vacant residential lots (156-201-0743, 156-201-0744, 156-205-0613, 156-205-0617) which will then be used to develop the bike park. The second phase of the project will involve the development of various park features including a paved high-traffic bike path connecting two existing bike commuter paths, a fully enclosed special-use area for bikes to move unencumbered, and an open covered community shop equipped with permanently secured bike stands and tools. Development of the project will also involve the planting of 50 native trees as part of a broader climate-change resilient landscaping plan. The total cost of the project will be $1.2 million with additional contributions of $500,000 and $200,000 being made from Sacramento Parks and Friends of Natomas’ Bikes; respectively. Sacramento Parks will further be responsible for management of the park (including all O&M) in perpetuity following completion of the project.’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>FORMAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ProjectID</td>
<td>“CNRA-123-4567”</td>
<td>text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProjectName</td>
<td>“Natomas Bike Park”</td>
<td>text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GranteeName</td>
<td>“Parks ‘R’ Us”</td>
<td>text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProgramName</td>
<td>“Improving Bicycle Health Program”</td>
<td>text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdminOrg</td>
<td>CNRA</td>
<td>system-defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProjectDescription</td>
<td>“This project will provide bicycle...”</td>
<td>text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcqParcels</td>
<td>{156-201-0743, 156-201-0744, 156-205-0613, 156-205-0617}</td>
<td>text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProjectArea</td>
<td>2.07 [acres]</td>
<td>number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcqType</td>
<td>{Fee Title, Fee Title, Fee Title, Fee Title}</td>
<td>system-defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PropertyManager</td>
<td>“Sacramento Parks”</td>
<td>text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TotalCost</td>
<td>1.2e6 [dollars]</td>
<td>number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FundingAmounts</td>
<td>{5e5, 5e5, 2e5} [dollars]</td>
<td>number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FundingSources</td>
<td>{“Prop 27”, “Sacramento Parks”, “Friends of Natomas’ Bikes”}</td>
<td>text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example Relational Database

- **Funding**
  - ContributionID
  - ProjectID
  - FundingSourceName
  - FundingSourceType
  - FundingAmount

- **Projects**
  - ProjectID
  - ProjectName
  - ProjectDescription
  - RecipientID
  - ProgramID

- **Grantee**
  - GranteeID
  - GranteeName
  - GranteeAddress
  - GranteeEmail

- **Acquisitions**
  - AcqID

- **Programs**
  - ProgramID
  - ProgramName
  - ProgramDescription
  - AdminOrg
Real Example: State Parks
What is the total combined area of all conifer forests found at altitudes of less than 1000 m in areas where the wildfire threat level is “High” or greater and that have benefitted from fuel reduction projects completed within the past 5 years?
QUERY [machine] →

```
SELECT projectGrantNum, projectArea, fireThreatLevel
FROM RAPTR*
WHERE projectType = "fuel reduction"
    AND projectEndDate ≥ 04/14/2015,
    forestType = "conifer",
    altitude < 1000,
    fireThreatLevel ≥ 3;
```
Harmonizing Methods & Metrics

- **Workshops**
  - Project theme
  - Project Type

  ➤ Standardize Performance metrics

  ➤ Post-Project Monitoring
  - Verify Deliverables (Closeout)
  - Implement Project
  - Agreement Or contract
  - Application Intake
  - Funding
Kate Furlong is the Stewardship Director for Ventura Land Trust. She joined the trust as an unpaid intern after graduating from CSUCI with a BS in Environmental Science and Resource Management and a minor in Biology in 2017 and worked her way up the ladder. With years of restoration ecology and non-profit philanthropy under her belt, Kate jumped in to manage restoration projects all over Ventura County.

Ethan Inlander is regional stewardship director for The Nature Conservancy. He has applied geospatial technologies to conservation challenges since 1994. He currently oversees 1/3 of The Nature Conservancy's easement acreage in California, and works with the chapter's Conservation Technology and Science staff to build and deploy stewardship technologies.
Tracking the success of restoration

A presentation by Ventura Land Trust’s Stewardship Director Kate Furlong
Ventura Land Trust

- The Ventura Land Trust, a community based, 501 (c)3 non-profit organization, was established in 2003 to protect the hillsides but over the past 16 years we’ve expanded our mission.
- The mission of the Ventura Land Trust is to permanently protect the land, water, wildlife and scenic beauty of the Ventura region for current and future generations.
- “Land trusts are community-based, nonprofit organizations dedicated to the permanent protection and stewardship of natural and working lands for the public good.”
- PRESERVATION, HABITAT RESTORATION, EDUCATION, OUTDOOR RECREATION.
Major Restoration Projects

- Lower Ventura River- Willoughby Preserve
  - Invasive species removal
  - Trash removal
- Big Rock Preserve
  - Invasive species removal
Challenges

- Increasing homeless population
- Funding
- Staffing restrictions
- Invasive species
- Fire
  - Thomas Fire
Before: 11/17/17
After: 12/12/17
Qualitative vs. Quantitative Data

- **Qualitative**
  - Native vs. invasive plants present
  - Regrowth
  - Animals present

- **Quantitative**
  - Percent coverage
  - Planting survivorship
  - Biodiversity
  - Weight of trash removed
Crown Sprouting
‘We aren’t dead yet’-plants

Native plant recovery
The return of animals: biodiversity, population
Restoration Activities
Students have helped in restoration efforts while learning about fire ecology
Hundreds of volunteers have worked to repair trails, remove metal discovered by the fire, plant 750 trees and shrubs, spread mulch, and remove invasive species that were trying to take over.
Our Reasoning: Resource Triage

- Financial Constraints
  - Don’t have the funding for soil and plant genetic testing
- Staff limitations
  - Small field staff with thousands of acres to oversee
- Keystone or Endangered Species
  - Indicators of system health and one species can get funding to protect the whole habitat
- Has to be inclusive
  - We rely on help from volunteers so data collection has to be user friendly and easily accessible
  - For long term tracking, simplified metrics (mainly qualitative) have better longevity.
Monitoring Approaches

- Preserve annual reports
- Project Reports
- Comparative photos
- Google Earth Images and Drone photography
Defining Program Success

- Grant/contract agreements typically set parameters
- Understanding realities and restrictions
- Set realistic goals, optimism can be a good driver but can also be hazardous if you cannot achieve your goals.
- Industry Standards and Published Research Project results
- Using restoration success standards
  - I.e.: Planting survivorship
Why is it important to monitor and evaluate?

- Always learning! You can use your successes to plan future restoration activities, share your expertise with others, save on resources, and use on future grants.
- You want to respect your grantors! They want their money to go the farthest, to be the most successful, and to spend the least amount of money possible.
  - Increasing communication with grantors increase likelihood of continued funding
- Long term is just as important. The climate is fluctuating so you need to be creative, responsive, and adaptive. This can only be done if you are actively monitor your projects.
Questions?

Volunteer Restoration Event details on venturalandtrust.org/events (on-hold)

Sponsor a tree, lecture, or restoration event

Membership numbers help show that the community is invested in these projects which is what large grantors look for.

Become a member today!
Property Management and Monitoring

Ethan Inlander
Project Director – Stewardship and Restoration Team
The Nature Conservancy in California
The Nature Conservancy’s Conservation Estate In California
Statewide Snapshot

CALIFORNIA CHAPTER SUMMARY

Fee:
103 Properties
136,720 Acres

Conservation Easements and Deed Restrictions:
180 Properties
374,480 Acres

Map showing the distribution of properties and easements across California.
Systems of Record

Salesforce \[\text{Database} \leftrightarrow \text{Database} \] ArcGIS

Compliance Monitoring

Traditional \[\rightarrow\] Mobile \[\leftrightarrow\] Remote

Traditional

Mobile

Remote
Quality / Effectiveness

- More Level of Detail, Less Area Inspected, More Frequency of Observation

Efficiency

- More Time Spent ($), Less Time Saved, More Cost?

Human Elements

- More Landowner Interaction, Less Human Safety, More Human Safety
About 68% of current interest acreage is in Ranch properties
Residual Dry Matter (RDM)
Residual Dry Matter Mapper

Romero  Upper Romero

Select ranch - Select pasture -

Map Overlay: Selection  Compliance Summary

Variable: MODIS NDSI  MODIS Lai  MODIS Fpar  PRISM Cumulative precipitation

Scale: fitted  fixed
Unit: NDSI

Latest data: May 9, 2017

Out of compliance  In compliance

Timeline  Distribution  Annual max  Date of max  Annual mean  Annual sum
- no data  in compliance  out of compliance
- last complete water year  current year (no monitoring data yet)
- average of all data (compliance, non-compliance, no information)
Omniscape: Climate Linkages
https://omniscape.codefornature.org/
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## General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecoregion</td>
<td>Central Coast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Land Cover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardwood Woodland</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbaceous</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Assets - PLW Mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linkage</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse, Intact, Resilient</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse, Intact</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intact, Resilient</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intact</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severed Linkage</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially diverse, Modified, Potentially resilient</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially diverse, Modified</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified, potentially resilient</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Connectivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connectivity Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate linkage</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channelized linkage</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensified connectivity</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffuse connectivity</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Climate change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate change Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veg exposure to climate change (warm, wet future)</td>
<td>On average, not exposed (.26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veg exposure to climate change (hot, dry future)</td>
<td>On average, not exposed (.43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilient areas</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Threats and Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threats and Opportunities</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance to protected lands</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to TNC current holdings</td>
<td>10 Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At risk of future development or distance to risk of development</td>
<td>3.5 mi from areas at risk of development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire risk</td>
<td>16% very high 73% high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to a disadvantaged community</td>
<td>In or adjacent to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of having a water right</td>
<td>Point of diversion 180m from property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human modification</td>
<td>0.07 (natural)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Ecosystem Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecosystem Services</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 acre floodplain</td>
<td>363 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water source watershed</td>
<td>0 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above ground carbon</td>
<td>4033 Metric Tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil carbon</td>
<td>340712 Metric Tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important Farmland</td>
<td>1236 Acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Stakeholder Engagement Process

MSU
Elea Becker Lowe & Brad Juarros
**Key Terms**

✓ **Goal**: a desired state or status of a situation that depicts realistic outcomes.

✓ **Objective**: specific actionable goal that explicitly describes a realistic and measurable attribute.

✓ **Indicator**: a general gauge used to evaluate, and answer questions related to the achievement of an objective.

✓ **Metric**: a unique parameter of interest that can be measured to obtain information about the subject(s) of study.

✓ **Management Question** – questions driven by the goal of improving management decisions.

*As defined in our White Paper*
Adaptive Management Cycle
Connection between State and Program Purposes

- Funding Purpose (Bond Statute)
  - State- or Agency-level management questions
- Program Purpose
  - Program-level management questions
- Project Goals
  - Project-level management questions
- Project Objectives
Developing Monitoring and Program Evaluation Metrics: Fundamental Monitoring Elements

PROJECT GOALS

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

INDICATORS

METRICS

Management Questions
Developing Monitoring and Program Evaluation Metrics: Example

**Funding Purpose:** Improve the sustainability and livability of California communities while improving quality of life in those communities (Prop 84)

**Program Purpose:** Assist in the restoration and protection of critical habitat and improve public access to nature.

**Project Goal:** Public has access to protected and restored riparian habitat in the California Creek Park District.
**Project Goal:** Public has access to protected and restored riparian habitat in the California Creek Park District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Objective 1:</strong></th>
<th>Protect and enhance native habitat in and around the California Creek Park District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2:</strong></td>
<td>Ensure safe transportation options to the California Creek Park from California Creek Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 3:</strong></td>
<td>Develop ADA-compliant park infrastructure and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 4:</strong></td>
<td>Provide educational and interpretive signage throughout the Park District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Goal: Public has access to protected and restored riparian habitat in the California Creek Park District.

Objective 1: Protect and enhance native habitat in and around the California Creek Park District

Objective 2: Ensure safe transportation options to the California Creek Park from California Creek Downtown

Objective 3: Develop ADA-compliant park infrastructure and facilities

Objective 4: Provide educational and interpretive signage throughout the Park District
Objective 1: Protect and enhance native habitat in and around the California Creek Park District

Indicator 1.1: Population of fish and wildlife species within the California Creek Park District project area

Metric 1.1.1: Number of “X” species counted within [wildlife observation area 1] on the first of each month at XX:XX time of day
Objective 1: Protect and enhance native habitat in and around the California Creek Park District

Indicator 1.2: Abundance of plant species in California Creek Park District project area

Metric 1.2.1: Number of “X” plant species counted within [observation site 1] on the first of each month.

Metric 1.2.2: Area of vegetative cover of “X” plant species within [observation site 1] on the first of each month.
Objective 1: Protect and enhance native habitat in and around the California Creek Park District

Indicator 1.3: Water quality at California Creek Park district

Metric 1.3.1: Percent oxygen content at [water quality testing site 1] on the first of each month at XX:XX time of day

Metric 1.3.2: Turbidity at [water quality testing site 1] on the first of each month at XX:XX time of day

Metric 1.3.3: Percent shade cover at [water quality testing site 1] on the first of each month at XX:XX time of day
How are we going to make this happen?

SMART Criteria

Specific
Measurable
Achievable
Representative
time-sensitive
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitions and Easements</td>
<td>Projects that acquire property or establish a conservation, flood, or agricultural easement on some property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Access</td>
<td>Projects to increase access to nature and recreational or cultural opportunities, access for severely disadvantaged and disadvantaged communities, access to museum or heritage trails and sites, and park safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat (Aquatic)</td>
<td>Projects include work related to removal of non-native/invasive species, reintroduction of native species, restoration of physically or biologically degraded habitat, improving or maintaining acceptable levels of water quality and environmental flow, facilitating the natural migration of fish, and other wildlife, and other relevant topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat (Terrestrial)</td>
<td>Projects that include work related to land conversion, removal of non-native/invasive species, reintroduction of native species, and restoration of physically or biologically degraded habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>Projects that consider capital outlay including hard infrastructure (bathrooms, benches, interpretive signage, levees, bridges, building renovations), erosion control and bank stability, and urban green infrastructure (e.g. bioswales, rain gardens, urban tree planting, projects relating to aquifer recharge).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Today’s Focus: Management Questions
Questions That Will Be Addressed In the Workshops

Based on the management questions that are determined in this kickoff meeting,

• What common metrics could be tracked across similar project types to inform project-, program-, and bond-level analysis?

• Which metrics are most appropriate and realistic to track in a central system?
Discussion Questions

1. What additional projects should be considered as part of this category?

2. What are the important management questions that should be addressed through RAPTR to promote project success?
Wrap Up and Next Steps

Gina Ford & Rae Eaton
Workshop Series Timeline

April 2020: Kick-off Meeting

July 2020: Workshop 1

September 2020: Workshop 2

Fall 2020: Workshop 3

Winter 2020: Workshop 4

Spring 2020: Workshop 5

Summer 2020: Wrap-up Meeting
Thank you for joining us today!

Please feel free to contact us at:

**MSU@resources.ca.gov**

Or visit our webpage for more information:

[https://resources.ca.gov/Initiatives/Monitoring-and-Stewardship-Unit](https://resources.ca.gov/Initiatives/Monitoring-and-Stewardship-Unit)