SACRAMENTO STATE
COLLEGE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT

Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System

Stakeholder Workshop

CAPITAL & GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

SUMMARY

Thursday June 3, 2021 | 9:00AM-1:00PM

Welcome, Logistics, and Introductions

Orit Kalman, facilitator, Sacramento State Consensus and Collaboration Program

Ms. Kalman welcomed participants to the Capital and Green Infrastructure workshop, the fifth in a series of meetings supporting development of the Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) system. She reviewed the workshop purpose, agenda, and guidelines for remote participation during the meeting.

Workshop participants included staff from offices under the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA). Participants' expertise included wetland, floodplain, or riparian restoration/enhancement; multi-objective stormwater projects (capture, infiltration, non-point pollution control, increase permeable surfaces, green roofs); flood protection/managed flood flows; urban forest expansion/infill; open space/parks/community space expansion; non-motorized trails (including safe routes, or walking school buses); groundwater recharge; and others. Through an in-meeting poll, 94% of participants indicated that their agencies administer grant programs that provide for installation of green infrastructure.

Welcoming Remarks

Amanda Martin, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration and Finance, CNRA

Ms. Martin welcomed participants to the workshop and highlighted the importance of the RAPTR system and participants' input in its development. Tracking and reporting on State-funded projects is critical to effective decision-making about the Agency's efforts, including telling the story of its successes as well as identifying what needs improvement. CNRA's Monitoring and Stewardship Unit (MSU) began this effort with a white paper that identified key gaps in monitoring and evaluation of the State's investments, including post-completion follow-up. Stakeholder feedback, through this series of workshops and through additional follow-up, will help ensure that the metrics included in the RAPTR system are appropriate and useful to determine whether the Agency is achieving what it set out to do in its projects.

Overview of RAPTR Design, Development, and Early Progress

Gina Ford, Senior Environmental Scientist (Supervisor), CNRA-MSU

Ms. Ford provided an overview of the RAPTR system, including background about the CNRA Monitoring and Stewardship Unit (MSU) and an overview of the strategy for developing the system. The MSU was tasked with developing a system to better tell the story of the impacts of the bond-funded grant projects under CNRA. MSU first evaluated how these projects are currently monitored and then developed a set of recommendations for future tracking and

reporting. The results of this evaluation were published in a white paper, endorsed by Secretary Crowfoot, and recommended:

- Developing a centralized track and reporting system,
- Establishing standard protocols for data collection and management,
- Providing training, and
- Leveraging existing reporting systems to reduce redundant data entry

The tracking and reporting system is being developed through two parallel processes: identification of common suites of metrics across CNRA project themes and types, and development of the relational database and project management system. The RAPTR development workshop series are the start of the metrics identification process; it will also include working groups and possibly technical advisory committees to dig into the finer details. Ms. Ford shared a timeline and key outcomes of the stakeholder workshops and noted that the summaries of each of the previous workshops were available on the MSU website. Ms. Ford noted that the existing financial reporting system, Agency Bonds Consolidated Reporting System (ABCRS), will be enveloped into RAPTR, though it will continue to function in its current capacity and with the same reporting requirements.

Ms. Ford acknowledged that the RAPTR system will be a significant change for Agency staff and said that she hoped this workshop would support people in the change process. The objectives of the workshop included:

- Cultivating a common understanding of ways to assess the performance of an individual project, and how that can be scaled to inform program and Agency decision-making.
- Identifying existing tools, systems, efforts, and issues that inform development.
- Providing clarity on RAPTR (help with "the change process").

Ms. Ford presented the conceptual design of RAPTR, which covers all phases of a project, from the pre-award phase (funding, application submission, and application processing) through the award phase (agreeing to fund the project and finalizing the agreement and classifying the project) and the post-award phase (implementation and monitoring of the project in progress, closeout, and post-project completion monitoring). Post-completion monitoring is a new piece that the Agency has not as yet been doing.

The MSU team is focused on ensuring that the metrics and methods for tracking are appropriate; the RATPR workshop series is a first step in gathering feedback about harmonizing and standardizing metrics that can apply across projects. The metrics should reflect State and Agency values and priorities and support decision-making by answering State, Agency, program, and project-level management questions. Standard performance metrics should be included in

grant agreements and included in deliverables at closeout.

While there are many anticipated benefits, such as increasing transparency, informing decision-making, improving effectiveness, enhancing collaboration, improving science, and enhancing efficiency, the concerns are fewer, relating to logistics and operations, authority and mandates, and the scope of the system. As RAPTR is developed, the team is working to address all of these concerns.

Ms. Ford shared the vision for RAPTR. In the near-term, RAPTR will help consolidate data entry across multiple reporting systems, streamline State-funded grant management processes, and track and evaluate project and program success. It will include:

- A grant application portal
- Grant application review
- Project management and invoicing features
- Document storage
- Performance monitoring resources
- Analytical opportunities

Jim Falter, Environmental Scientist, CNRA-MSU

Mr. Falter described how the RAPTR system will help with monitoring and tracking Agency projects. The database will describe projects through individual pieces of data within predefined data fields, allowing for easy querying across thousands of projects. The system will guide staff through the parsing process that will make project information machine-readable, as well as allow for inclusion of written descriptions and ongoing documentation of project narratives. The system will use a common and generic yet flexible data structure to cover all the projects under Agency while providing sufficient granularity to make the project information meaningful.

The system will track data that defines an activity and its benefits, including the agent, action, asset, and benefit – in other words, the who, what, and why of the project. Some projects may be simple, with a single agent, action, asset, and benefit, but more often projects will be more complicated, with multiple agents, actions, assets, and/or benefits. The RAPTR data structure will be able to parse such complex projects. Users will be able to choose which particular data to track for each given project, so that the information tracked is relevant to each project. This structure will ensure accuracy and completion of project data, better track project successes and benefits, and be more amenable to queries.

SACRAMENTO STATE
COLLEGE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT

Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System

Stakeholder Workshop

CAPITAL & GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

Brad Juarros, Environmental Scientist, CNRA-MSU

Mr. Juarros gave an overview of the workshop theme: capital and green infrastructure. Green infrastructure is defined in the State's Wildlife Action Plan as "a nature-based infrastructure in communities to reduce greenhouse gases, decrease energy consumption, reduce vehicle miles traveled and convert built environments into green spaces that improve air and water quality and provide opportunities for walking, biking and recreation." Green infrastructure helps urban landscapes become more sustainable, contributes to resiliency, creates multifunctional landscapes, and provides low-impact development. Green infrastructure is flexible, applicable in rural and urban areas and able to be scaled up or down.

Green infrastructure has the potential to produce significant statewide benefits across programs, but it is important to determine whether these investments are in fact providing the intended benefits. The State has several high-level initiatives that create an interconnected policy framework with goals and objectives. Grant programs are generally well-aligned with the policy framework, but the breadth of activities can make it challenging to track all the efforts and their achievements, particularly given the emphasis on multi-benefit projects that address overlapping goals. RAPTR will help assess the achievement of the broader policy goals and objectives by tracking projects through a single platform. Implementation of the RAPTR system will begin with bond-funded grant projects, expanding eventually to cover other types of projects and funding sources.

Discussion

- Will RAPTR track non-State projects? Will it track future conceptual projects?
    - Currently, there is no plan for RAPTR to track projects that do not include State involvement. RAPTR will eventually track conceptual projects and is being built with this capability.
- Project tracking should consider not just past investments but also future needs and investments, based on local perspectives. Many bond acts are directed at population centers, yet many key projects are located outside population centers.
- Will high-level decision-makers have direct access to RAPTR to run queries or will they ask questions of agencies?
    - The information in RAPTR will be used by legislators and Agency executives and management to support decision-making, but it is most likely that they will ask questions to relevant departments. With RAPTR, it will be much easier for staff to provide robust answers to such inquiries, running a query, developing a report, and providing interpretation of the information.

SACRAMENTO STATE
COLLEGE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT

Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System

Stakeholder Workshop

CAPITAL & GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

Examples of Capital and Green Infrastructure Monitoring and Evaluation Efforts

John Melvin, CAL FIRE State Urban Forester | CAL FIRE Urban and Community Forestry Program: Program Structure and Lessons Learned

Mr. Melvin presented an overview of the CAL FIRE Urban and Community Forestry Program and how the program tracks and monitors its efforts. The California Urban Forestry Act of 1978 states that "Urban forestry" means the cultivation and management of native or introduced trees and related vegetation in urban areas for their present and potential contribution to the economic, physiological, sociological, and ecological well-being of urban society. Urban forestry provides multiple benefits, including expanded urban canopy, community greening, carbon sequestration, energy consumption, urban heat island effect, management of stormwater, and climate adaptation, with an emphasis on disadvantaged communities. The Urban and Community Forestry Program provides expert technical assistance, outreach, education and policy advice, as well as four grant programs that help accomplish policy goals at a local level.

The program's tracking and monitoring efforts are significant:

- Urban Foresters are in constant contact with their grantees and assist grantees (and others) in all aspects of project implementation.
- All grants must meet with their Urban Forester before starting work and all grants inspected at least yearly. Urban Foresters have discretion to inspect them more regularly, as needed.
- Grantees must report on progress at least every 6 months. Urban Foresters may require more frequent reporting.
- All trees planted must be georeferenced and inventoried.
- All tree inventory data, as well as any management plans, must be provided to CAL FIRE. This information has been used for research and to assist others.
- Currently the tree inventory and georeferenced data is aggregated by CAL FIRE in a spreadsheet-based system, however a grantee-oriented data collection application is being developed.
- Urban Foresters currently use a novel application for their inspections.
- CAL FIRE provides grantees a final payment for continued maintenance and follows up to ensure that the maintenance is carried out.

Carmel Brown, Department of Water Resources (DWR) | Project Monitoring and Tracking: DWR Grant Programs

Ms. Brown shared about DWR's major grant programs, how their efforts are coordinated, and how and why projects are tracked during implementation and post-completion. Major grant programs include:

- Division of Regional Assistance
    - Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

  - Sustainable Groundwater Management (SGM)
  - Stormwater/Flood Management
  - Water Energy
  - Riverine Stewardship
  - Urban Streams Restoration
  - Water Use Efficiency
- Division of Flood Management
  - Coastal Watershed
  - Small Communities
  - Systemwide
  - Urban
  - Flood Control Subventions
  - Delta Levees Maintenance Subventions
  - Delta Levees Special Flood Control Projects
  - Flood Corridor
  - Floodplain Management Protection and Risk Awareness (*upcoming*)

Ms. Brown shared additional details about the IRWM, SGM, restoration, and flood management grants.

- IRWM Grants
  - Prop 50, 84 and 1 funding to date ($1.5B Bond funding, matched 4:1 by local investments)
  - Expected new funding: unknown
  - Projects must be consistent with IRWM plan and vetted through local IRWM regional planning processes
  - Types of projects: multi-benefit, gray and green infrastructure, planning and implementation, collaborative, benefits for disadvantaged communities and Tribes
- SGM Grants
  - Coordination with Executive Sustainable Groundwater Management Office
  - Prop 1 and 68 funding to date ($200M)
  - Expected new funding in FY 21-22 State Budget ($360M)
  - Types of projects:
    - Planning: GSP development, monitoring wells, modeling, engagement of underrepresented communities
    - Implementation: Projects to implement GSPs, groundwater recharge, FloodMAR, projects benefiting underrepresented communities, etc.
- Urban Streams Restoration Program
  - Prop 84 and 68 funding to date ($9.42 M)

  - Expected new funds SB-45 (if passed) ($70M)
  - Types of projects:
    - Planning only: environmental and technical studies for project development, design development
    - Planning and Implementation: removal of culverts, channel stabilization and realignment, reestablishment of floodplain function
- Riverine Stewardship Program – San Joaquin Fish Population Enhancement
  - Prop 13, Prop 84 and 68 funding to date ($38.97M)
  - Geographic scope to tributaries of San Joaquin River
  - Types of projects: Planning and Implementation for native fish rearing habitat improvements, water quality improvements, habitat connectivity, fish passage barrier removal
- Flood management Grants
  - Funding to date: Prop 1E, 1, 84 and 68
  - Expected new funding: Prop 68 (FY 21-22) and emergency drought funding
  - Projects must address flood risks, while meeting the requirements of authorizing legislation for the funding
  - Types of projects: Flood risk reduction (coastal, riverine, urban, and flash-flooding), multi-benefit, planning and implementation, collaborative, benefits for disadvantaged communities and Tribes

The Financial Assistance Internal Review (FAIR) coordinates grant programs across DWR, encouraging information sharing, improving efficiency, developing standardized templates, and developing policies and procedures for consistency. However, there is not yet standardization of post-project completion monitoring and reporting. A consistent platform for this kind of tracking, as RAPTR will provide, will be very helpful.

Project monitoring ensures accountability and transparency, both on the part of grantees as well as the State, for example by demonstrating projects' return on investment. A Department of Finance audit in 2017 found that DWR was not consistently enforcing post-project completion monitoring, though it was stipulated as a requirement for many projects.

DWR grant programs include post-performance reporting (PPR) requirements:

- As per grant agreements, the Agency is required to submit PPR every year for a defined number of years (the number of years requires depends on the program within DWR).
- Grantees are reminded of this requirement at the close-out of the grant.
- Reporting includes applicable quantitative metrics, for example, new acre-feet of water produced that year, acres of wildlife habitat added, water quality, groundwater levels, etc.

- Reported data must comply with Assembly Bill 1755, the Open and Transparent Water Data Act (DWR provides a guidance sheet to grantees to ensure AB 1755 compliance).
- The post-implementation report includes an assessment of any explanations for any differences between the expected versus actual project benefits in meeting program priorities as stated in the original implementation grant application.

During grant solicitation, DWR asks applicants to identify projected primary and secondary benefits, as well as the metrics they will use to track performance. Typical project monitoring data categories include increased restoration of important species and habitat, improved water quality, increased water supply reliability, increased flood protection, and improved climate change adaptability. The monitoring data can help both the implementing agencies, for example providing information about project performance that will help them develop future projects, and DWR, for example assessing progress toward program goals and objectives as stated in Proposition language.

Ms. Brown said that a particular challenge of post-project completion monitoring is the lack of funding to support the work, both for DWR and grantees, and lack of funding to enforce compliance. An easy-to-use, web-based reporting system may encourage completion. She said that DWR staff have been participating in the RAPTR development process, in particular providing input related to AB 1755 protocols, and have provided additional suggestions about RAPTR functionality.

Lee Butterfield, State Parks | Office of Grants and Local Services Grant Monitoring

Mr. Butterfield shared background about the State Parks Office of Grants and Local Services (OGALS), its grant management system and monitoring efforts, and suggestions for the RAPTR system. Beginning in 1964, the Office has funded over 22,000 projects; most relate to parks and park infrastructure, in addition to recreation centers and environmental restoration programs. OGALS developed a grant management system, which was implemented as of 2000. To reflect that multiple projects may be completed in the same location over time as park improvements are carried out, the system includes a site for each project and each site may be used across multiple projects; the system includes over 8,000 sites across the State.

Monitoring efforts include:

- Annual Agency reviews, which involve contacting grantees annually to receive project updates.
- Verifying that each park associated with a funded project remains open, clean, and maintained.
- Compliance inspections, roughly every five years for each project
- Sharing information with the public, for example through posts on the OGALS website.

Compliance inspections are completed through in-person visits during which OGALS staff complete compliance reports, which include photos of the site, ensuring it is well maintained and has reasonable operating hours during which it is open to the public, etc. The information tracked differs for acquisitions projects. With over 8,000 sites across the state, it is challenging to ensure that compliance inspections are completed every five years at each site.

Process and Evaluation Criteria to Determine Appropriate Metrics

Elea Becker Lowe, Environmental Scientist, CNRA-MSU

Ms. Becker Lowe discussed how the RAPTR system will inform adaptive management in support of the State's priorities and shared the process through which participants were asked to provide input on RAPTR development.

Ms. Becker Lowe explained how an adaptive management cycle can support achievement of high-level State priorities. High-level priorities inform program- and project-specific goals and their respective actionable objectives. In order to determine whether a project generated the desired outcomes, management questions need to speak to the project goals and objectives while also being specific enough to define indicators and metrics that can answer the questions. Information tracked about indicators and metrics thus can guide decision-making by answering management questions.

Participants were asked to respond to a survey after the meeting, to provide information on existing monitoring protocols as well as metrics and methods they do not yet use but would like to see included in RAPTR. The survey looks to identify meaningful metrics and methods; existing tools, systems, and methodology that could be leveraged; and informational, analytical capabilities, and project management resources needed to conduct this work effectively. Ms. Becker Lowe shared examples of the kinds of information the survey asks about, demonstrating the level of specificity needed to determine useful metrics for answering management questions. She also noted that the MSU team is assembling subject matter expert advisory committees to help refine the metrics that will eventually be included in RAPTR and invited interested participants to join those committees.

Small Group Discussion: The RAPTR System and Its Functionality

Attendees participated in a 30-minute breakout session considering the RAPTR system and its functionality, in particular benefits, challenges, and how those challenges might be addressed. Attendees shared their feedback about:

- What other opportunities could the RAPTR System help to achieve, describing how the

RAPTR System could be used to inform State programs and decision-making.

- What potential challenges or concerns (other than financial and staff capacity) should be considered throughout the system development and roll-out phases, including any suggested solutions.

MSU staff facilitated each breakout room; after the breakout session concluded, MSU staff shared highlights from the discussions. See Appendix 1 for detailed notes from the breakout session.

Benefits of the RAPTR system:

- Providing better perspective on the scope of the State's work. It might help identify areas of overlap between projects as well as illustrate areas that receive less funding.
- Helping staff efficiently and effectively develop reports.
- Improving decision-making by compiling data from many sources, increasing the visibility of project data, and being able to draw connections between systems and projects of various types.
- Making it easier for grantees to report project information.
- Making it easier for program staff to collect the information from grantees, possibly by automating such requests.
- Mapping projects to better understand the relationships between different projects and programs over space and time.

Challenges and Solutions:

- Fostering agreement across varied projects and programs about standardized metrics that need to be tracked. It is important for RAPTR to have flexibility to capture nuances across the board.
- Staff buy-in to the RAPTR system will be crucial; continued engagement is important as RAPTR continues to be developed.
- Lack of funding for grantees to gather the project data.
- Interfacing with existing resources that State organizations currently use, like Atlas, Bios, and others. Ensure that information entered into one system does not need to be inputted again in others.
- Lack of funding for program staff to complete quality assurance. Consider having one RAPTR expert within each program and each organization to provide technical assistance as needed.

A participant suggested that future grants include a funded monitoring requirement, delineated in grant applications.

Closing Remarks

Ms. Ford thanked participants for their time and input. She said that the MSU team would use participants' feedback as they continue to work on developing the RAPTR system and invited participants to share any additional feedback via email following the workshop or by joining the working groups and technical advisory committees to continue developing the set of metrics. Once the RAPTR system has been built, a final workshop will be held to demonstrate its functionality and how workshop input informed it.

SACRAMENTO STATE
COLLEGE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT

Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System

Stakeholder Workshop

CAPITAL & GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

Appendix 1. Breakout Outcomes: The RAPTR System and its Functionality

RAPTR Benefits (For context, the benefits listed here are directly as they were taken from the workshop participants, without editing by the MSU.)

- Leverage funding opportunities by another agency.
- Different projects in one place, always updated.
- Core project information for all.
- Create reports more efficiently, reduce "fire drill" fatigue.
- RAPTR will make it easier for grantees to report.
- RAPTR could help applicants match their proposal with a funding program. We have a project with many benefits but doesn't fit neatly into the current range of options of programs.
- Database for bringing different grant programs together
- Repository for all information under grant programs
- RAPTR could be very helpful for programs that are new and don't have an existing database
- It depends on the different grant programs and agencies using it and how involved people are
- Information sharing will be one of the benefits, to help people realize the work others are doing and leverage each other's work going forward.
- A lot of the issues we face are we work in our silos and info sharing doesn't happen naturally. This can lead to recreating a lot of programs, even within the same departments. RAPTR can help bridge these gaps.
- There are increasing goals and initiatives related to connectivity, such as in biodiversity, access, coastlines, transportation access, heat islands, the 30x30 initiative; RAPTR can inform and elucidate those connections. This can help future funding and finding weak spots. It will take a tool like this to consolidate the data.
- Demonstrating that funding is being used effectively and efforts are not being duplicated. Demonstrating that expertise is being leveraged to ensure that State funding is being used as efficiently as possible. All agree on the benefit of multi benefit multi sector profits
- RAPTR can support follow up implementation of planned projects through spatial organization of project data. For example,

linking one phase of one project to the phase of another project while its under implementation during selection process. Tracking which project plans funded by a given program were later funded by a separate program. Regardless of any real administrative connection, program staff should see all physically connected projects for organizing future monitoring efforts.

- Track baseline monitoring like CRAM for projects like wetlands to identify the specific performance metrics of interest for a given set of project activities.
- A way of keeping track of past performance by specific grant recipients and contractors.
- Ability to look at the scope and geographic areas of work that the AAO's have been funding work within. This may allow for illustrating the need to spread funding into other kinds of work that currently is undervalued. Consider ow to capture this; how do we use the information to tell the story?

Challenges

POTENTIAL CHALLENGES	OVERCOMING CHALLENGES/CONCERNS
What potential challenges or concerns [other than financial and staff capacity] should be considered throughout the system development and roll-out phases?	Discuss and identify opportunities to overcome challenges and concerns.
Duplicative data entry into numerous systems	Link to existing systems - relational
How to leverage funding across programs – if one applicant can't be funded by a program, how to link with another program that can fund them?	Currently an informal process, how to leverage central systems to share information?
Challenges creating common metrics depending on reporting requirements/division/funding source/etc.	
Challenges regarding how to measure success. Lacking time components.	Best available science/peer review/agree on common process.

SACRAMENTO STATE
COLLEGE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT

Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System

Stakeholder Workshop

CAPITAL & GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

Fostering agreement across departments on protocols/metrics.	Creating flexibility in the system to make changes.
Reporting – preparing the system to generate required reports.	
Can we get STO to help process invoices faster?	
How will the system process required information/metrics and other information?	
Programs close then who follows up with the projects after a program's funds are expended.	RAPTR could automate the request for information from the grantee.
Relies on voluntary data-it's in the agreement, however there's no funding for program, or recipients and hope the grantee can find resources can find be found. But success has not been great.	
Why are we doing something, for example, asking IRWM's and SGMA agencies to enter their information in two different places.	
When you have benefits (project) reported in an inconsistent way. There is a language difference.	What they've built into Atlas is AI that can read the reporting information and match this to a common set of indicators we can track.
	Include the people and business processes that underlie the technology; there needs to be a forum of engagement to ensure people are on board.

SACRAMENTO STATE
COLLEGE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT

Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System

Stakeholder Workshop

CAPITAL & GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

Hard stuff is the soft stuff. It's a people challenge not a tech or science challenge. We've sliced and diced due to our areas of expertise and it's broken the systems. Challenge is continuing to build collaboration and communication, "co-management" will be essential for addressing these challenges	Workshops like today are helpful. Need to be persistent and continue building on it. Organizations are not built to sustain these types of movements. As it goes live, holding practical use seminars that show case studies from programs actively using RAPTR
Over optimizing one aspect of the system can and has created problems in other aspects of the system	Multi-sector optimization is essential. Getting a broader view of these actions. Regions mean different things to different people. Scale makes a big difference.
Organizations are not built to sustain these types of movements	Continue to do these types of meetings to remind people we're working and building. Getting buy-in from the top is important. Work on MOU's to memorialize people's engagement. Need "rules of the road" for interaction with system and with each other. Make sure we communicate the benefits that this provides to us and the stakeholders. What tools/data can be provided to end users. Needs to be repeated and reinforced. Another audience for that is the legislature and showing the value these can offer. "what did you do with the funding we gave you last time?" What were the results and benefits?
Having the staffing and resources to feed project data into RAPTR as well as the requisite QA/QC.	One person trained to be the 'RAPTR expert' would be better than training all employees (beyond basic use). Have one person be the technical expert (maybe at CNRA) to work on it behind the scenes.
Disjointed project management as RAPTR 'evolves' and transfer of legacy data becomes an issue; especially when reporting across projects that begin before RAPTR was being used	
Most of the issues will be attempting to identify 'standardized' performance metrics or use existing data in a scientifically	

robust way to evaluate long-term project performance. Just getting people to agree	
Minor concerns due to Cal FIRE already purchasing a project mgmt. system.	Making sure this can "talk" to RAPTR
Funding for long-term monitoring	Currently no fund source – where will this money come from?
Small agency (68); funding is a concern and so is staffing and time consumption of work. Concern that the larger organizations will get more attention and coordination with the system.	Existing database for SCC; and want to make sure it will talk.
Prior audit dings on the post project monitoring. Trying to do so, via surveys and such.	Send out forms to current landowners (difficult at time to get the forms back, and the pandemic didn't make it easier). Capital projects get visited every 5 yrs for 20 yr life (pandemic setbacks again).
Can't necessarily replace an internal system / database – we track more information on our internal efforts than what RAPTR would capture.	Need to be sure that the ability to do interfaces or export/import from internal DBs over to RAPTR.
Questions on how audits function/work and why do the DOF auditors have a way to evaluate "performance" when they aren't experts in the type of work	Need better understanding of what the audit criteria.
It would be nice to have an app for field work.	RAPTR app for field entry of data. (similar to Cal Fire's iTree or other apps, or DWR's app for mapping trees on levees)
Mapping tools that allow for reporting of progress.	Shapefile options, and some projects are not polygon based (like at CalFire).
Restoration projects have EcoAtlas; is there a way to have a tie in there?	Lots of information already in EcoAtlas, would be good to leverage

SACRAMENTO STATE
COLLEGE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT

Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System

Stakeholder Workshop

CAPITAL & GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

Collect data to aggregate data that would relate information about projects.	Quantification and analytics built into RAPTR