



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
**Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS**

SUMMARY

Thursday September 3rd 10:00AM-3:00PM

Welcome and Introductions

Orit Kalman and Julia Van Horn, facilitators, Sacramento State Consensus and Collaboration Program

Ms. Kalman welcomed participants to the Recreation and Access meeting, the second in a series of workshops supporting development of the Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) system and reviewed the workshop purpose and key questions being addressed. Ms. Van Horn reviewed the agenda and guidelines for remote participation during the meeting.

The key questions for the workshop were:

- 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?

Workshop participants included staff from the following State agencies:

- Department of Water Resources
- Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Air Resources Board
- State Parks
- Natural Resources Agency
- State Coastal Conservancy
- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy
- Rivers and Mountains Conservancy
- Tahoe Conservancy
- Delta Stewardship Council

Participants responded to a poll asking additional questions about the perspectives they represent. 75% of respondents said that all or a majority of their projects include an access and recreation component. Participants work on projects focused on:

- Provide recreational amenities (25%)
- Access to urban parks and trails (20%)
- Access to regional parks and trails (20%)



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS

- Access to disadvantaged communities (20%)
- Access to state parks (10%)
- Access to beach/coastal areas (5%)

Amanda Martin, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration and Finance

Ms. Martin provided background on the need for and the process of developing a statewide system for tracking long-term project performance within CNRA. A statewide monitoring system will help address the limited resources devoted to post-project completion monitoring by demonstrating the lasting impact of the State's natural resources work as well as enabling the sharing of resources across departments using a consistent system.

This series of workshops focuses on the specific metrics that may be collected in the RAPTR system. Identifying relevant and feasible metrics will help illustrate the impact of the State's investments and advocate for additional resources. Ms. Martin noted that developing the RAPTR system requires both an ambitious vision as well a focus on the small steps that will put the State on a path to understand and showcase all that its natural resources work accomplishes.

Gina Ford, Senior Environmental Scientist, 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.

Development of the RAPTR database is being carried out in two parallel processes. The first, including this workshop, focuses on engaging potential users of the database to identify the metrics it will track, while the other focuses on the technical aspects of building the system. The software development is currently in progress and will likely be released for testing incrementally as different modules are built.

Ms. Ford reviewed the overall decision process for determining the metrics and methods that will be tracked within RAPTR, noting that the current workshop is focused on initial identification of indicators that may be used to address the management questions identified during the kickoff meeting and beginning to prioritize metrics for each indicator. She noted that in addition to this series of workshops, the MSU will continue and reach out to stakeholders to refine the final list of metrics to be included in the RAPTR system as well as determine



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS

consistent methods for monitoring these metrics.

Jim Falter, Environmental Scientist, MSU

Mr. Falter reviewed the technical and design of RAPTR development. He shared how the RAPTR system will organize project data into a relational database. He presented a mock-up some of the functionality that RAPTR may offer to make data more accessible and usable. (Mr. Falter emphasized that the mock-up is meant to demonstrate functionality and is not a real prototype of what the system will look like.) Some key features likely to be included in RAPTR are an interactive map allowing properties to be selected by location, a dashboard displaying key project specifications such as grant number and program, high resolution images of the land area included in the project, a description of the project highlighting relevant information such as land cover, the current manager of the property, and the funding sources that supported the project. Other information of interest that could potentially be monitored in the RAPTR system include metrics such as landcover distribution, native species likely present on the property, seasonal climatology, hydrographic information, fire threat levels, and flood risk.

Mr. Falter noted that while the primary mission of RAPTR is to support analysis of the short- and long-term performance of natural resource initiatives across the State by aggregating and structuring project data, that same structure would allow the system to potentially automate linkages between the information contained in RAPTR and environmental and social data from external databases maintained by the State, federal agencies, NGOs and research organizations. These linkages would make it that much easier for program staff to have the relevant contextual data necessary for assessing the value of a proposed project or the performance of an ongoing project.

Commitment to Access, Engagement, and Recreation in California

Sedrick Mitchell, Deputy Director of Community Engagement, California Department of Parks and Recreation

Mr. Mitchell presented on the work the California Department of Parks and Recreation (Parks) is doing to increase access to parks across California's communities. Parks covers a wide range of projects, from those focused on habitat preservation to those focused on providing parks for public access. The Department conducted a study to determine the impacts of its work on communities and were surprised to find that, though local governments are the most closely connected to communities, they were unable to meet communities' needs for access to parks due to lack of funding. Given these findings, Parks worked to rethink community engagement and access in its work, including supporting the public to engage with its facilities. In this process, Parks returned to the core objective of serving the public of California by providing opportunities for them to access resources that make the planet more hospitable and



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
**Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS**

evaluated the relevance of its existing work to meeting this objective. The Department identified a significant gap in serving the many communities that did not have State parks near them, or where existing community parks were unsafe or did not meet the communities' needs. Parks recognized that a critical component of access is providing places for people to engage with parks nearby and recognized a need for the Department to work beyond the State Parks system to provide this access within communities. Additionally, there was an equity gap related to communities' access to parks. Addressing the access gap is about more than completing projects; rather, it is about social equity and making the natural world relevant to people.

Based on this analysis, the Department developed a statewide program to address the demand for close-to-home parks. The program uses the Office of Grants and Local services (OGALS) access model, which provides technical assistance for local agencies, encouraging community-based planning for park design, grants prioritizing projects in underserved communities, and operation and maintenance oversight. The technical assistance includes community workshops in which grant writers work with community members to prepare grant applications. This approach incorporates behavioral changes within the Department that uphold the commitment to social change and the ultimate goal of serving the public through accessible parks that meet their needs.

Over three competitive rounds, the Department received nearly 1,400 project applications and provided \$623 million to develop community parks. These parks were developed through rigorous community-based planning processes, using methods like holding meetings at the site of the eventual project to engage many members of the community in providing meaningful input about how the project can improve quality of life and the future of the community. Mr. Mitchell shared photographs illustrating the outcomes of these processes, including parks built on abandoned lots and in an area that had previously been a dangerous road.

Mr. Mitchell said that intensive community-based planning can be challenging but is critical to truly ensuring access. He provided two resources: (1) a report on the Department's community engagement work over the last decade and (2) a report addressing the challenges of engagement during the COVID-19 pandemic and suggested approaches to ensure that the work does not stop during this time. Mr. Mitchell emphasized that COVID-19 has shown that access and recreation is critical and that stopping this engagement work, which is both social and environmental, is not an option.

Recreation and Access Management Questions Overview

Rae Eaton, Science Policy Fellow, MSU

Ms. Eaton provided background to inform the discussion on indicators and metrics for recreation and access projects. She reviewed the State's considerations for access and



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS

recreation projects, adapted from the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan:

- Support healthy, affordable, physical and social activities
- Improve quality of life in communities as a form of social equity and environmental justice
- Provide venues for cultural celebrations
- Preserve historic sites
- Protect California's natural resources and environments
- Provide economic opportunities

MSU staff met with many of the offices participating in the workshop prior to the event to learn about programmatic goals related to access and recreation, as well as concerns related to monitoring efforts that may consider those goals:

- Goals
 - Increase equitable access
 - Increase diversity of grant applicants
 - Maximize multiple benefits including, but not limited to, access and recreational goals at the program and project level
- Concerns
 - Capacity issues (offices and grantees)
 - Funding sources (for maintenance and monitoring)
 - Metrics and methods used to evaluate project outcomes

Ms. Eaton said that the goal for the RAPTR system is to streamline efforts and care will be taken to ensure that only a relevant, appropriate, and feasible subset of metrics are included in RAPTR so that it does not create a burden on departments that lack capacity and funding for monitoring.

The April RAPTR development kickoff meeting focused on brainstorming management questions that should be addressed through the system. Ms. Eaton presented the recreation- and access-related management questions that were identified as most important to monitor in RAPTR:

- Condition of Project Area: Can visitors safely use the project area and the infrastructure/amenities within it?
- Visitor Use of Project Area: Who uses the project area and amenities and for what purpose? If project goals included increasing access or recreation opportunities for a specific demographic or community, have those goals been met?
- Co-benefits Conferred by Project: What co-benefits does the project confer?

Ms. Eaton noted that there are many co-benefits, including some that relate directly to the



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
**Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS**

themes of subsequent RAPTR development workshops, such as habitat benefits; other co-benefits, for example related to public health, will not overlap with future workshops so the current workshop is the opportunity to address these.

Participants responded to a poll asking about the co-benefits of the projects that they work on:

- Habitat Value (76%)
- Stormwater Management (53%)
- Active transportation (41%)
- Public Health (41%)
- GHG Emissions (30%)
- Education (29%)
- Flood prevention (24%)
- Urban Heat Island Impacts (12%)

The purpose of these management questions is to address whether delivered project benefits align with planned benefits, monitor the condition of a project site to determine its usability, and monitor activity at a site to determine what benefits the project area is providing. For the first management question, related to the condition of the project area, currently utilized monitoring methods include site visits, photos, and reports from grantees. For the second, visitor use, potential methods include visitor surveys, observations of visitors, and demographic information. For the third, co-benefits, methods vary with the co-benefit to be monitored. In all cases, consistent, widespread monitoring can be very challenging. Ms. Eaton said that this workshop provides an opportunity for participants to think creatively about how these management questions can be monitored and how a statewide system can leverage data reporting to help address these questions. She emphasized that this workshop will focus on brainstorming potential indicators and metrics that the RAPTR system might track. Further work subsequent to the workshop will focus on prioritizing metrics for inclusion as well as determining reliable data collection methods for tracking these metrics.

Monitoring and Evaluation on the Ground – A Grantee Perspective

Dr. Amy Lethbridge, Chief of Staff, Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority

Ms. Lethbridge provided on-the-ground perspective on conducting monitoring and evaluation of projects related to access. She emphasized the need for alignment between the goals of funding agencies and their grantee partners, focusing evaluation and management on achievement of those goals. Evaluation should include visitor experience and identify means to address who is not visiting and why.

Evaluation and management can be complicated and partners often do not have resources to



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS

complete comprehensive monitoring. Ms. Lethbridge suggested addressing this challenge by bringing in “outside” expertise including community members and those who work on the ground, providing technical assistance, and providing funding to support the monitoring and evaluation work.

Ms. Lethbridge also shared a monitoring and evaluation framework to ensure that expectations are aligned across all parties involved in a project. The framework outlines the objectives, inputs, outputs and outcomes of the intended project and the indicators that will be used to measure all these; these should be developed with input from stakeholders. It should include what assumptions will be adopted as part of implementation and review: what assumptions are made about the status quo? What is likely to be measured? Were these assumptions checked for site-specific applicability? Ms. Lethbridge emphasized the importance of clear and inclusive communication about the framework to everyone involved with the monitoring and evaluation process, as well as planners, implementers, and field staff who are involved in maintenance. Roles and capacity should be clearly communicated.

Monitoring and evaluation require a baseline for comparison. In some cases, baseline data may exist and in others it may need to be created or added to. A statewide data management system like RAPTR has the potential to provide baseline information. Ms. Lethbridge said that in some cases, the available baseline information may not be what is most relevant or important to the work. Like the metrics that will be monitored, the baseline information needs to be relevant and may need to be created despite there being some information about a site already available. Like determining metrics to monitor, it is important to ensure that the baseline information speaks to the goals of the parties involved in a project.

For access projects, an important consideration is whether the baseline and metrics will be quantitative or qualitative – focused on numbers versus experiences. Ms. Lethbridge said that it is important to capture the qualitative information that illuminates the reasons behind visitors’ choices and behaviors. In particular, it is important to capture barriers to visitation, rather than only the behaviors of those visiting an area, and measure increases or decreases to these barriers. Ms. Lethbridge shared some examples of barriers to access, including lack of proximity, lack of outdoor social and family networks, lack of representation, lack of knowledge, and lack of resources. Ms. Lethbridge reviewed ways to address these barriers that were developed by the Community Nature Connection. For example, lack of proximity can be addressed through public transportation routes from urban areas to public lands and programs that provide free transportation to and from regional parks. Another example is outreach and



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS

engagement with groups that serve families and program partnerships with community-based organizations to address lack of outdoor social or family networks.

Participants responded to a poll about barriers to access in the projects they work on:

- Distance from project area (35%)
- ADA inaccessibility (29%)
- Safe/reliable transportation (18%)
- Cultural barriers (6%)
- Language barriers (6%)
- Safety within project area (6%)
- Cost of visiting project area (0%)

Guiding Principles and Screening Criteria for Monitoring and Evaluation Metrics

Elea Becker Lowe, Environmental Scientist, MSU

Ms. Becker Lowe reviewed the process through which MSU staff and workshop participants will identify indicators and metrics for inclusion in RAPTR. During the kickoff, participants helped identify important management questions that data in RAPTR should help staff answer. Key management questions address goals and objectives defined at the bond, agency, and/or project level. The stakeholder workshops will focus on the indicators and metrics that can be used to answer the management questions. Indicators help focus the management questions into categories of information that could be collected, and metrics are specific measurements that can be taken of attributes within those categories.

Ms. Becker Lowe presented an example of indicators and metrics related to access at a given trail. These could include questions about safety, barriers, natural disruptions to access such as erosion or flooding, availability of relevant information, and so on.

While there are many potential indicators and metrics, as illustrated, the RAPTR system will focus in on a small set of key metrics that can be collected consistently across projects and over time, and which can inform management decisions and support evaluation of the effectiveness of State investments overall. To determine which metrics will be included, potential metrics will be considered based on a set of screening criteria. The first pass, which will be discussed as part of the workshop breakout sessions, focuses on the “SMART” criteria: specific, measurable, achievable, representative, and time-bound/time-specific. An important additional criterion is whether the metric is “RAPTR ready” – that is, which metrics that meet the SMART criteria can be most easily added to the system. This criterion considers whether the metric is already



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
**Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS**

captured in an existing repository, there are established processes in place for collecting this metric, or it could be easily added to an existing data collection process.

As Ms. Ford mentioned previously, potential metrics will be further screened following the workshop. They will be evaluated based on cost-effectiveness, machine readability, labor capacity, access to applicable technology, and availability of technical expertise, and other important considerations. There will be continued opportunities for stakeholders to weigh in during this process.

Breakout Discussions: Leveraging and Evaluating Indicators and Metrics

Attendees shared potential indicators and metrics and then evaluated these based on the SMART-R criteria in a series of breakout discussions. The discussions focused on potential indicators and metrics related to three of the key management questions identified during the kickoff, as Ms. Eaton reviewed during her presentation:

- Condition of Project Area: Can visitors safely use the project area and the infrastructure/amenities within it?
- Visitor Use of Project Area: Who uses the project area and amenities and for what purpose? If project goals included increasing access or recreation opportunities for a specific demographic or community, have those goals been met?
- Co-benefits Conferred by Project: What co-benefits does the project confer?

There were three breakout sessions, such that every group of participants had a chance to discuss each of the three management questions. One or two MSU staff facilitated and tracked the discussion for each management question. For each management question, participants addressed the following:

1. What are potential indicators/metrics that can be used to help address the questions?
2. Where can this information be found? (For example, documents, tools, etc.)
3. What can we learn from an initial SMART analysis about the appropriateness of incorporating these indicators/metrics into the RAPTR system?
4. Which indicators/metrics show the most promise in responding to the management questions and being included in the RAPTR system?

Breakout templates were used to help track suggested indicators, metrics, and SMART analysis results for each of the three management questions. See Appendix for the tables as completed based upon breakout participant input.

CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS

Report Out and Plenary Discussion

Participants were asked to share key indicators and metrics discussed during the breakout sessions. Key indicators and metrics identified in the breakout discussions are summarized in the tables below. For complete analysis notes, please review the Breakout Templates in the Appendix. The indicators and metrics suggested during the breakouts will be further screened following the workshop to determine whether and how to use them within the RAPTR system. Stakeholders will have opportunities to provide feedback during that process as well.

Condition of Project Area

A theme that emerged in the conversations about monitoring project area conditions was that project requirements and definitions of usability will be defined within a project. Maintenance requirements are usually laid out at the beginning of a project and monitoring metrics would need to be responsive to the components of that original plan. Group developed an exhaustive list with nine indicators and multiple metrics for each. Some of the indicators and metrics are very likely to have crossover with the other management questions; focusing on these areas of crossover would help keep the RAPTR system monitoring requirements manageable.

MANAGEMENT QUESTION 1 (SITE CONDITION): CAN VISITORS USE THE PROJECT AREA AND THE INFRASTRUCTURE/AMENITIES WITHIN IT?
EXAMPLE: Indicator 1 – Are amenities ADA accessible?
Metric
<i>Condition of ADA-accessible paved trails</i>
Access to engineered features (e.g., particularly unique features, play sets, shaded areas, restrooms, drinking fountains, places to rest, courts, parking area including stalls and ramped access etc.) -> Number of handi-capable barriers?
Number of defined features
Indicator 2: Are the available walking trails in a usable condition?
Metric
Overall usability
Number of natural impediments [per linear mile]
Indicator 3: Effect of use on surrounding environment
Metric
Increased stream turbidity
Unauthorized off-trail use [# of incidents per mile per unit time]
Indicator 4: Is access to the park broadcast widely across larger geographic regions (via web, media, word of mouth)
Metric

CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS

How far people are travelling to use the park [distance traveled on average/median]
How did people learn of the park's existence?
Indicator 5: Cleanliness of park grounds
Metric
Tons of trashed removed per year per acreage [outside of normal maintenance schedule]
Number of people [and orgs] involved in cleaning and maintenance
Indicator 6: Misuse of park facilities[?] -> might be better suited for Q: How are people using/mis-using amenities?
Metric
Indicator 7: Evidence of appropriate maintenance by local governing body
Metric
over-flowing trash bins [per unit time]
of instances grass/weeds overgrown [per unit time]
of instances bathrooms, drinking fountains not working [per unit time]
How often is law enforcement requested to visit park property? How often does law enforcement routinely visit a given park facility?

Visitor Use of Project Area

Four indicators of visitor use were identified: visitor activities at project area, visitor attendance, use of park features and amenities, and visitor experience. However, within these indicators, it was challenging to find metrics that could be applied consistently across projects. There may be technological tools that could help capture some of the attendance metrics, including cell phone tracking or social media reports. Another option would be to track activities that involve fee collection. Visitor experience will be particularly hard to capture; surveys may be able to capture this kind of information but are challenging to implement rigorously. In particular, visitor use is challenging to monitor because data collection is likely to differ based on the type of program and geographical scale. The metrics most likely to be consistent across the board would focus simply on quantifying use rather than qualitative questions about user experience.

MANAGEMENT QUESTION 2 (VISITOR USE): WHO USES THE PROJECT AREA AND AMENITIES AND FOR WHAT PURPOSE?
IF PROJECT GOALS INCLUDED INCREASING ACCESS OR RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES FOR A SPECIFIC DEMOGRAPHIC OR COMMUNITY, HAS THAT GOAL BEEN MET?

Indicator 1: Visitor Activities at Project Area



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS

Metric
Types of activities (individual or community) project area
Types of activities available at the project area
Availability of OHV activity
Availability of boating as recreation
Availability of walking trails
Indicator 2: Visitor Attendance (may need to separate into community and local parks and state/regional parks)
Metric
Number of users or participants
Who attends the park area (e.g. demographics, zip codes, distance traveled)
Frequency of visit
Seasonality of visitors
Indicator 3: Use of Park Features/Amenities
Metric
Use of trails
Use of access points
Use of park features (fields, play areas, tennis courts, etc.)
Use by specific groups
Indicator 4: Visitor Experience
Metric
Frequency of visit
Reported visitor experience
Purpose of visit
Availability of culturally relevant/accessible signage

Co-Benefits Conferred by Project

The indicators discussed spanned a wide range of co-benefits, including habitat, climate resiliency, economic benefits, safety, public health, and cultural value. Participants discussed the Chamber of Commerce as a potential source of information about economic benefits. The potential downside of gentrification was also discussed. Similarly, qualitative issues such as feeling of safety can vary from context to context and visitor to visitor, with isolation contributing to a feeling of safety for some but danger for others. For the habitat and climate

CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS

indicators, there are existing models that can help estimate co-benefits such as stormwater retention and flood prevention. Recreational uses could be monitored through quantitative metrics such as number of licenses sold.

Key indicators and metrics identified in the breakout discussion are summarized in the table below. For complete analysis notes, please review the Breakout Template for Question 3 in the Appendix.

MANAGEMENT QUESTION 3 (CO-BENEFITS): WHAT CO-BENEFITS DOES THE PROJECT CONFER?
Indicator 1 – Reduction in the Urban Heat Island Effect in the Project area
Metric
Temperature within park/outside of park
Humidity within/outside
Canopy cover
Indicator 2: Habitat Values & Biodiversity
Metric
Fragmentation stats
Bird species
Aquatic species (esp endangered)
Vegetation cover/species
Insects (pollinator species, predom.)
Water Quality-algal blooms, etc.
Environmental indicators for CapOutlay projects
Wildlife Corridors (Fish Passage, deer herd, etc.)—connectivity/proximity to adjacent areas
Climate Resiliency—vegetation community to respond to change.
Types of habitat/Area of habitat
Number of species
Trees—canopy cover, species diversity (carbon sink)
Indicator 4: Economic Benefit
Metric
Hotel Occupancy Rates
Intended participation
Outdoor Store—track where people come from (zip codes)
Staff Employed on site/vessel



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS

Workforce development
Increased Property Values
Number of park users.
Indicator 5: Flood and Stormwater Prevention/Management
Metric
Stormwater retention
Stormwater treatment maintenance-related
SLR (coastal wetlands/parks)
Indicator 6: Community Safety / Public Health
Metric
User Impairment Risk Reduction—miles of user “social” trail decommissioned
Fire Risk Reduction—acres treated (input mgmt. type)
Air quality
Feelings of safety (race, gender, etc.)
-Cleanliness of facilities/outstanding maintenance needs.
-Alcohol use in groups
-Dangerous wildlife (rattlesnakes, mountain lions)
-Poor dog management (unleashed)
Indicator 7: Cultural Value, and ensuring cultural/historical accuracy (especially among diverging perspectives)
Metric
Cultural plant species/sites
User demographics—race, disability
Local Tribe included in stories on signage
Rituals, gatherings
Indicator 8: Recreational Values
Metric
Off-highway vehicles
Fishing/hunting—fishing licenses sold (county), number of boat launches, reports on invasive,
Mountain bike use
Equestrian Trail use
Indicator 9: Education Programs/Stewardship
Metric
Community buy-in/Programming effectiveness
Number of people educated
Partners
Tree types and benefits of diversity

CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS

Indicator 11: Active Transportation
Metric
Bike / pedestrian counts
Indicator 12: Transportation to Open Space
Metric
Buses routes to open space from x location
Trail connectivity

Discussion

A participant expressed concern about staffing capacity to carry out additional monitoring that would be necessitated by the RAPTR system. The participant said that the end user for this system would in many cases be the grantee agencies and nonprofits and it will be challenging to gain buy-in for this work.

MSU Response:

MSU staff acknowledged the need to balance making RAPTR a valuable tool without significantly impacting capacity. The goal is for RAPTR to track only select metrics for each of the management questions, such that workload increases are minor yet information is more readily accessible to understand the benefits accrued by the State's investments.

Participants responded to a poll about the relevance of RAPTR to their work:

- Choosing better projects to fund (13%)
- Accessing data and information (87%)
- Collaborating across agencies (27%)
- Evaluating the effectiveness of your projects (67%)
- Evaluating the effectiveness of your program (33%)

Wrap Up and Next Steps

Ms. Ford thanked participants for joining the workshop and providing their input. She reviewed the timeline for the remaining workshops in this series through summer 2021, to be followed by a culmination event. The next two workshops will be held in early 2021; the specific dates are not yet set.

Ms. Ford said that there would be opportunities for stakeholders to participate in working groups following the workshop to dig deeper into the indicators and metrics to help identify the metrics that will eventually be part of the RAPTR system. Participants were invited to reach out to MSU staff with further thoughts and to stay involved in the process.



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
**Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS**

The building of the RAPTR system has begun and will likely take approximately 18 months to develop. The tool will likely be released in phases, as modules that relate to grant lifecycles are completed and ready to be tested.

Participants were then asked to share feedback about the meeting; responses are summarized below. All participants indicated that the breakouts had provided a good opportunity to provide input on RAPTR development. About half of the respondents said that sufficient breaks had been provided and the other half said it would have been useful to have more breaks.

Participants said that the following agenda items were relevant to their work:

- Speaker presentations (Mr. Mitchell & Ms. Lethbridge) (67%)
- Breakout sessions (67%)
- RAPTR presentation (50%)



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS

Appendix: Breakout Templates

MANAGEMENT QUESTION 1 (SITE CONDITION): CAN VISITORS USE THE PROJECT AREA AND THE INFRASTRUCTURE/AMENITIES WITHIN IT?									
EXAMPLE: Indicator 1 – Are amenities ADA accessible?									
Metric	Information Sources/Not Yet Collected	S	M	A	R	T	RAPTR Ready	Notes	Recommendations YES (Go with it) MAYBE (Do more research) NO (Not for RAPTR)
Condition of ADA-accessible paved trails	Project site inspection	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Need an agreed-upon system for scoring trail condition.	Maybe
Access to engineered features (e.g., particularly unique features, play sets, shaded areas, restrooms, drinking fountains, places to rest, courts, parking area including stalls and ramped access etc.) -> Number of handi-capable barriers?								Standards for ADA compliance depend on requirements defined at the time the project that was developed. More modern improvements require updating park accessibility to current ADA standards. Different projects naturally have different standards.	
Number of defined features	Need this data first								
Indicator 2: Are the available walking trails in a usable condition?									
Metric	Information	S	M	A	R	T	RR	Notes	Recommendations
Overall usability	Currently tracked but							Park usability is generally either Yes or No. State Parks currently does NOT	Compile logs of park visitation.



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT

Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System

Stakeholder Workshop

RECREATION AND ACCESS

	logged how?								count number of hazards or pitfalls. Lee Butterfield: 99% of parks are completely safe to being open to the public. Rare to find a park with some unsafe feature. Monitoring is currently a bit sparse due to funding limitations. Sedrick Mitchell: we should review status of a given park every ~5 years.	
Number of natural impediments [per linear mile]	E.g., snow barriers, fallen trees, washouts,								Not just trails, but key park features such as buildings, playsets, boat ramps...	
									Perception of 'usability' affected by perspective of monitoring agent.	

Indicator 3: **Effect of use on surrounding environment**

Metric	Information	S	M	A	R	T	RR	Notes	Recommendations
Increased stream turbidity	Natural and anthropogenic effects on erosional patterns								
Unauthorized off-trail use [# of incidents per mile per unit time]									

Indicator 4: **Is access to the park broadcast widely across larger geographic regions (via web, media, word of mouth)**

Metric	Information	S	M	A	R	T	RR	Notes	Recommendations
--------	-------------	---	---	---	---	---	----	-------	-----------------



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS

How far people are travelling to use the park [distance traveled on average/median]										
How did people learn of the park's existence?										
Indicator 5: Cleanliness of park grounds										
Metric	Information	S	M	A	R	T	RR	Notes	Recommendations	
Tons of trashed removed per year per acreage [outside of normal maintenance schedule]								The metric can mean something different according to the management question intended.		
Number of people [and orgs] involved in cleaning and maintenance								Has the number of collaborating persons and organizations increased or declined since the close out of the project. The longer the time elapsed since project closing, the more maintenance will likely be required.		
Indicator 6: Misuse of park facilities[?] -> might be better suited for Q: How are people using/mis-using amenities?										
Metric	Information	S	M	A	R	T	RR	Notes	Recommendations	
Indicator 7: Evidence of appropriate maintenance by local governing body										
Metric	Information	S	M	A	R	T	RR	Notes	Recommendations	
# over-flowing trash bins [per unit time]								Proof that prescribed maintenance schedule is being met by local governing body and/or contractors.	RAPTR automatically send out notification prompting when to assess post-project development and what to assess.	



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT

Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System

Stakeholder Workshop

RECREATION AND ACCESS

<i>Individual Activities at the project area</i>	User Survey	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	?	Difficult to collect survey information well	Maybe
<i>Community/public facing activities at project area</i>	Reports from project management	Y	Y	Y	?	?	?	May not work for all projects	Maybe
Types of activities (individual or community) project area	Visual observations by staff							Hard to quantify at all parks (esp. since not all are staffed)	
Types of activities available at the project area	Description of project area; project plan; permits issued; amenities within a project area that support							Useful to dig into what activities are and what the purpose is (e.g. inclusive, elder friendly), how activity was designed; special activities (boating) versus more general project activities (e.g. camping); how activity is gauged is dependent on the activity (useful to breakdown further)	
Availability of OHV activity	Fee collection or licensing potentially							Free in some areas; applies to both state and local parks	
Availability of boating as recreation	Fee collection or licensing potentially								
Availability of								Could be any general activities	



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS

walking trails								(picnicking, walking, exercise) that could be measured at any project	
Indicator 2: Visitor Attendance (may need to separate into community and local parks and state/regional parks)									
Metric	Information	S	M	A	R	T	RR	Notes	Recommendations
Number of users or participants	Computer counting at trailheads or entrances; kiosks; random staff counts; cell phone locations							Unsure how widespread technology is; using RAPTR system to send annual information requests to grantees; may be able to draw on hits to technology (websites, apps); concern that over-reliance on numbers nudges grantees to meet some number (becomes problem); cell phone location data isn't connected to phone numbers but provides bulk numbers	
Who attends the park area (e.g. demographics, zip codes, distance traveled)	Voluntary responses; staff observations; observations/ Attendance at specific events;							Visitors have to voluntarily divulge information (may not want to share; how they are approached will matter) or have to have staff/volunteers counting people; method consistency is a concern; some question over how useful this data will be; separate park attendance vs event attendance; when you survey the park can bias that data; distance traveled especially useful for regional areas);	



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS

								frequency of visitor attendance at parks; what other parks they've visited in the year; helpful if done with specific time period in mind	
	Phone/text survey; survey made available through QR code							Some groups may not respond to this method (e.g. older groups; people who don't have smart phones)	
	Focus groups							Less representative, can do quantitative; does get at qualitative information	
	Social media							e.g. tweets from a location; hard to capture increased users at site versus general increase in twitter users; visitor searches for park provided some information on level of interest in a park; security/privacy concerns	
Frequency of visit	Voluntary responses; surveys during planned (staffed) activity							(For outdoor access programs, asking about frequency/quality of independent outdoor experiences); need to consider how to establish a baseline	



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT

Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System

Stakeholder Workshop

RECREATION AND ACCESS

Seasonality of visitors	Hotel occupancy; use tracking (e.g. thru parking/ service fee or campsite registration)								Track when in year people visit; resources limiting factor; useful for determining where to invest money in new amenities, especially if there are anticipated changes in seasonal use; limited use for local parks; may be able to rely on same information used for staffing needs to supply this information instead	
									General note: challenges associated with monitoring in general at local parks	
Indicator 3: Use of Park Features/Amenities										
Metric	Information	S	M	A	R	T	RR	Notes	Recommendations	
Use of trails										
Use of access points										
Use of park features (fields, play areas, tennis courts, etc.)	Track through reservations as indicator of use							Information can be gathered from local entities		
Use by specific groups	Ongoing agreements with specific groups; grantee partnerships							Agreement and application information from grantee; specific volunteer activities conducted by groups provide information; may be able to include questions in visitor surveys		



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS

	with nonprofits								
Indicator 4: Visitor Experience									
Metric	Information	S	M	A	R	T	RR	Notes	Recommendations
Frequency of visit	Voluntary responses; surveys during planned (staffed) activity							(For outdoor access programs, asking about frequency/quality of independent outdoor experiences)	
Reported visitor experience	Voluntary reviews available online				N			Not a representative sample; might have bias; lost resource way to monitor	
Purpose of visit	Visitor survey							Collect information on intended purpose for visit	
Availability of culturally relevant/accessible signage								Signage that is understandable to all visitors; particularly ensures first-time visitors know what they can and can't do (private roads, restrooms open, etc.); also includes safety considerations	

MANAGEMENT QUESTION 3 (CO-BENEFITS): WHAT CO-BENEFITS DOES THE PROJECT CONFER?

EXAMPLE: Indicator 1 – Reduction in the Urban Heat Island Effect in the Project area



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY - MONITORING AND STEWARDSHIP UNIT
Resources Agency Project Tracking and Reporting (RAPTR) System
Stakeholder Workshop
RECREATION AND ACCESS

Air quality	CARB										
Feelings of safety (race, gender, etc.)										Double edged. Isolation can be benefit, but also safety concern. Park-dependent. Depends on interactions with other users. General discomforts potentially exacerbated in park environment.	
-Cleanliness of facilities/outstanding maintenance needs.										Indicates staff not present, safety concern.	
-Alcohol use in groups											
-Dangerous wildlife (rattlesnakes, mountain lions)										Sometime people go to parks to have experiences that are not "safe"	
-Poor dog management (unleashed)											
Indicator 7: Cultural Value, and ensuring cultural/historical accuracy (especially among diverging perspectives)											
Metric	Information	S	M	A	R	T	R	R	Notes	Recommendations	
Cultural plant species/sites	Tribes/previous research (DSC)								Can be difficult to capture/gather information.		
User demographics—race, disability	State tools (community fact finder)									Got it.	
Local Tribe included in stories on signage	CEQA process, tribal liaisons at CNRA								Whose story are we telling at any of these sights?	maybe	
Rituals, gatherings	Parks divisions.								how can we make folks feel comfortable in the space to	?	

