



SONOMA COUNTY
AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION
AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT

Thursday, March 24, 2016

REGULAR MEETING

***SONOMA COUNTY AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION AND OPEN SPACE
DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE***

Meeting begins at 5:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PLEASE CALL IF UNABLE TO ATTEND

AGENDA

1. **Public Comment** - Comments on items not listed on the agenda
(*Time is limited to 3 minutes per person/item*)
2. **Approval of Minutes** [Attachment "A"] ***ACTION***
February 25, 2015
3. **General Manager's Report** ***INFORMATIONAL***
4. **Sub-Committee Report Outs** ***INFORMATIONAL***
5. **RCPG Grant** [Attachment "B"] ***INFORMATIONAL***
Karen Gaffney, Conservation Planning Program Manager
6. **Matching Grant Project Subcommittee** ***ACTION***
Jennifer Kuszmar, Matching Grant Coordinator
7. **Projects in Negotiation** [Attachment "C"] ***INFORMATIONAL***
8. **Announcements from Advisory Committee Members** ***INFORMATIONAL***
9. **Adjournment** Next Meeting: April 28, 2016

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Any member of the audience desiring to address the Committee on a matter on the agenda will have an opportunity to speak. In order that all interested parties have an opportunity to speak, please be brief and limit your comments to the subject under discussion. Each person is usually granted 3 minutes to speak; time limitations are at the discretion of the Chair.

DISABLED ACCOMMODATION: If you have a disability which requires the agenda materials to be in an alternative format or requires an interpreter or other person to assist you while attending this meeting, please contact Mariah Robson at (707) 565-7363, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting to ensure arrangements for accommodation.

Future Meeting Topics
(subject to change)

4/28/16

**Spotlight: Comprehensive Plan – (or CATC, RCPP)
Farm & Nature Center Update
Youth Members: Update on Recruitment Process
Community Relations Update**

5/26/16

**Project Spotlight: Stewardship
Legislative**

6/23/16

Field Trip: TBD Ag Property Easement

7/28/16

Summer Break

8/25/16

Comprehensive Plan Update & Discussion



Attachment "A"

***SONOMA COUNTY AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION AND OPEN SPACE
DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE***

February 25, 2016 MINUTES

5:02 pm Meeting convened at the District office, 747 Mendocino Avenue,
Suite 100, Santa Rosa, California

Members Present

Cary Fargo	Sue Conley	Steve Rabinowitsh	John Azevedo
Jan McFarland	John Nagle	Kristin Thigpen	Laurie Gallian
Janet Orchard	John Dell'Osso	Don McEnhill	Curt Nichols

Members Absent

Doug Lipton	Jeffrey Holtzman
Bill Smith	Gary Wysocky

Staff Present

Sheri Emerson, Stewardship Program Manager; Karen Gaffney, Conservation Planning Program Manager; Misti Arias, Acquisition Program Manager; Alex Roa, Assistant Planner; Robert Pittman, County Counsel; Lisa Pheatt, County Counsel; Mariah Robson, Advisory Committee Clerk

Chair Steve Rabinowitsh called the meeting to order at 5:02 pm.

Public Comment

Teri Shore from Greenbelt Alliance announced that community separators will be renewed in Sonoma County and there will be the first of several public meetings held on March 2, 2016 at PRMD County offices, 2550 Ventura Ave, Santa Rosa from 4:00 to 6:00 pm with a workshop following the presentation. Ms. Shore provided Homegrown Reports to the committee to be handed out that supplied further information. A notice of the public workshop was also handed out.

Joe Netter spoke in regards to the Young-Armos site and the District's site selection process, the expenditure of funds for the project before going to the Board of Directors, and that Young-Armos is a community separator and open space and that Measure A&C never intended the property to be a commercial venture. He commented that the incubator farm on Young-Armos would disrupt the flora and fauna and would change the natural conditions of the site. He also voiced concerns of the impacts on the adjoining neighborhood. There were two public meetings in February but no prior communication to the neighbors. Mr. Netter asked that he and the adjoining neighbors be informed in the

future before any decisions are made, and that alternatives sites be considered. Mr. Netter provided a petition from the homeowners and residents of the Young-Armos area.

Trish Tatarian spoke on the Roseland Nature Park. She provided a letter to the committee in response to the City of Santa Rosa proposal for a public gathering space and other venues in the Roseland Creek Nature Park. Several neighbors in the Roseland area do not support the proposal from the City and would like the park to remain a nature park. Ms. Tatarian requested that the committee and District staff uphold the conservation easement that is over the park to help prevent the City's proposal.

Fred Krueger also spoke on the Roseland Nature Park and reiterated that several neighbors are not in favor of the City's proposal to create a public gathering space and stated that there is no acknowledgement of the neighbor's wishes and the original purpose of the park to remain a nature park. Mr. Krueger also requested help from District staff and the committee to retain the park as a conservation area.

Mary Balcerak also commented on the Roseland Nature Park and stated that she agreed with Trish Tatarian and Fred Krueger's comments.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of December 10, 2015 were approved as submitted.

General Manager's Report

Bill Keene, General Manager, was absent and Sheri Emerson, Stewardship Program Manager, spoke in his absence.

- A regional grant was awarded to the District in the amount of approximately \$8 million. \$5.2 million will go to the District, and the remainder will go to the local Resource Conservation Districts and the Natural Resources Conservation Service, with matching funds being provided by the Sonoma County Water Agency, the District and the Pepperwood Foundation.
- There were two public meetings last week on the Young-Armos Incubator Farm Project. Neighbors attended both meetings and some voiced their concerns about the project. While many are supportive of the idea of an incubator farm, some are opposed to placing it on this site. There were other members of the community – including some farmers – that attended the second meeting and expressed support for the idea. A lot of information was gathered in both meetings and the District and partners will now think carefully about how to incorporate this input and next steps. A meeting with the City of Rohnert Park will occur at the end of March to find out how they feel about the project.

Advisory Committee Administration

a) Election of Committee Officers

Chair Rabinowitsh asked if there were any nominations for Chair.

Laurie Gallian nominated Steve Rabinowitsh and Don McEnhill seconded the nomination.

There was a vote and all were in favor, no oppositions or abstentions. Steve Rabinowitsh accepted the nomination

Chair Rabinowitsh asked if there were any nominations for Vice Chair. Cary Fargo nominated Laurie Gallian as Vice Chair and Janet Orchard seconded the nomination. There was a vote and all were in favor, no oppositions or abstentions. Laurie Gallian accepted the nomination.

Chair Rabinowitsh asked if there were any nominations for Chair Pro Tem. Don McEnhill nominated Kristin Thigpen as Chair Pro Tem and Sue Conley seconded the nomination. There was a vote and all were in favor, no oppositions or abstentions. Kristin Thigpen accepted the nomination.

b) Advisory Committee Rules of Procedures

Chair Rabinowitsh asked for a review of the Advisory Committee Rules of Procedure. Don McEnhill motioned to approve the Rules of Procedure and Jan McFarland seconded the motion. There was a vote and all were in favor, no oppositions or abstentions.

c) Ad Hoc Subcommittee Assignments

The committee began the formation of a Matching Grant Project Subcommittee. Chair Rabinowitsh asked for volunteers. John Dell'Osso volunteered and two absent members from this evening's meeting, Bill Smith and Jeffrey Holtzman, had expressed interest via email. Chair Rabinowitsh will bring this item back to next month's meeting to confirm and ask if there will be anymore volunteers.

The current Ag Subcommittee will continue. Laurie Gallian motioned to keep the subcommittee as is and Kristin Thigpen seconded the motion. There was a vote and all were in favor, no oppositions or abstentions.

d) Committee Calendar and Roster

Chair Rabinowitsh asked the members to review the calendar dates for meetings in 2016. No changes were made at this time.

Sub-committee Report Outs

Sue Conley reported out for the Ag Subcommittee. They would like to continue all of the current members and would like to continue the committee for at least another year. The committee has a multi-year work plan that includes the incubator farm, an artisan cheese study in collaboration with Marin Agricultural Land Trust, value added agricultural easement structures, the Matching Grant Project, and the Farm and Nature Center.

Healthy Lands & Healthy Economies: Multiple Benefits of Working Lands and Natural Areas

Karen Gaffney, Conservation Planning Program Manager, gave a presentation on Healthy Lands and Healthy Economies, which is a three county initiative including Santa Clara, Santa Cruz and Sonoma.

For more information, the PowerPoint presentation is available at the District upon request or you can contact Karen Gaffney with any questions.

Overview of New Acquisition Projects: Donnell and Sonoma Developmental Center

Misti Arias, Acquisition Program Manager, presented an overview of two new acquisition projects, Donnell and Sonoma Developmental Center.

Donnell is a an approximately 900 acre portion of 4,000 acres of family owned property that is a highly visible scenic gateway into the County near Sonoma. It is a wildlife linkage with oaks,

agricultural crops, diverse scenery and a greenbelt. It would be a private conservation easement that would be open to trails.

The Sonoma Developmental Center is property that is currently owned by State of California Department of General Services. General Services leases the property to the Department of Developmental Services for the Sonoma Developmental Center. However, in October of last year, the Governor called for the closure of the Developmental Center. There is great concern and local interest in how to ensure the residents are cared for but also in the nearly 900 acres of open space on the property. A coalition of agencies and organizations led by Susan Gorin are advocating for protection of the land and continued care for the residents. There will be no legislation related to the land anytime soon. The land may go to Regional Parks or State Parks. The land is important and is the only connection to the Mayacamas for wildlife and offers wide scale habitat connectivity. There is no active acquisition strategy at this point.

Projects in Negotiations

There were no report outs for projects in negotiations.

Announcements From Advisory Committee Members

Janet Orchard

Ms. Orchard made an announcement for an absent public member, Susan Kirks, that there is a presentation on March 3, 2016 from 7:00 to 8:30 at the Laguna Environmental Center in Santa Rosa on the True Nature of the American Badger. Ms. Orchard passed out flyers on the event.

Steve Rabinowitsh

The Bay Nature's Local Hero Awards Dinner is taking place on March 20, 2016 from 5:30 to 8:30 in San Francisco and the District has two tickets available to anyone on the committee who is interested in attending.

The Artisan Cheese Festival is taking place on March 19 and 20, 2016 and the District is sponsoring the event that will take place at the Sheridan. The District will have a booth there and Karen Gaffney asked if any of the committee members would like to help out at the event.

Laurie Gallian

The Mayors' and Councilmembers' has restructured their meetings and have decreased the number of meetings per year due to costs.

Misti Arias

The Sonoma County Food Forum will take place on March 17, 2016.

.

Adjournment: 6:49 pm

Next scheduled meeting date: March 24, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

Mariah Robson,
Advisory Committee Secretary

RCPN Narrative Elements for Preproposal (4700 character limit per item)

Project Name:

Funding Pool:


State:

1. Describe how each partner meets the eligibility criteria in Section III.A. of the announcement.

2. Specify the geographic focus of the project area. This can be based on habitat type, land uses, political jurisdiction of State or local government, or any other appropriate method to identify the project area. Note that the project area does not need to be contiguous, but all areas should have a common primary resource concern that the project addresses.

3. Identify the project objectives and the natural resource concerns that the project will address and how the partners identified those concerns, see listing of priority resource concerns in Section II.B. A complete list of NRCS approved natural resource concerns may be found on the RCPP Web site at:

<http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/national/programs/farbill/rcpp/>

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, occupying the majority of the page below the text. It is intended for the user to provide the project objectives and natural resource concerns as requested in the text above.

4. A general description of the plans for evaluating outcomes, including plans for monitoring and modeling, and for reporting on progress to achieve the objectives of the application.

5. A brief description of the types and sequence of implementation of conservation practices that the project will implement, for example: conservation activity plans (EQIP only), enhancements (CSP only), wetland restoration activities (ACEP, HFRP, sponsor –held floodplain easements), easement acquisition activities (ACEP, HFRP, sponsor-held floodplain easements), other partner activities to be implemented during the project timeframe.

6. If applicable, indicate how the project will “assist producers in meeting or avoiding the need for natural resource regulatory requirements.” Section 1271B(d)(4)(A) of the 1985 Act.

7. A description of any requested program adjustments of terms (adjustments to regulations or policy), including AGI waivers, by covered program, with an explanation of why the adjustment of terms is needed in order to achieve the objectives of the project.

8. Whether and how the project requests alternative funding arrangements.

9. Any additional information that has not specifically been requested but will help reviewers understand your proposal.

RCPP Narrative Elements for Full Proposal (4700 character limit per item). Only to be completed if selected to submit a Full Proposal

12. A description of how the partner(s) will collaborate to achieve the objectives of the partnership agreement and the roles, responsibilities, and capabilities of the partner(s). Applications that include resources from other sources than the lead applicant must include a letter or other documentation from the other partners confirming this commitment of resources. Potential partners should also describe whether and how the project will coordinate with other local, State or national activities, including regional plans adopted by government entities that address resource concerns identified in the project area.

13. Applicants must clearly state, by project objective, how they intend to leverage Federal funds along with partner resources (identify in-kind and cash contributions).


A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, intended for the applicant to provide their response to question 13. The box occupies the majority of the page below the question text.

14. Describe the categories of intended producer and landowner participants. (See definition of producer in Appendix A).

15. Natural Resource Objectives and Actions

A. Identify the specific primary natural resource concern and any secondary resource concerns to be addressed through the project. Provide details about the natural resource concern(s) to be addressed and how the concern(s) were identified.

B. List the proposed objectives and how the objectives will address the identified resource concerns. Objectives should be specific, measurable, achievable, and results-oriented. Include a timeline for completion and demonstrate cost effective use of agency, partner, and producer resources. Describe how objectives will lead to environmental outcomes and how the applicant will measure these outcomes. Environmental outcomes should consider either local or regional resource concerns and priorities, or both, as appropriate for the fund pool (CCA, National, or State).

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, occupying the majority of the page below the text. It is intended for the applicant to write their proposed objectives and how they will address the identified resource concerns.

16. For each objective, identify the actions to be completed to achieve the objective and to address the identified natural resource concern, Note which actions are to be addressed through this project using NRCS program assistance and which actions are being addressed through non-Federal funding sources or other resources provided.


17. Briefly describe the major land uses of the area with special emphasis on the lands that will be included in the project.

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, intended for the user to provide a description of the major land uses of the area, with special emphasis on the lands included in the project.

18. Briefly describe why the particular area was chosen, including the scientific basis for choosing the area (e.g., high levels of nutrient yields in a locally, regionally, or nationally significant water body; the area contains know habitat for an endangered or listed species; the area has experienced significant land-use change from agriculture to other uses; the area has a history of flooding or drought, etc.) and why targeted conservation in this area will contribute to CCA, national or State priorities.

19. Describe the cost-effectiveness of the proposed approach in terms of achieving the stated goals of the project. Briefly describe whether and how the application contributes to the efficient use of funding compared to at least one alternative approach, which may include an “as is” scenario describing the cost-effectiveness of current program delivery in the project area. The Lead Partner is encouraged to consider other alternative approaches to achieving the stated goals of the project and the relative cost-effectiveness of these approaches, and why the applicants chose the approach described in the application. Describe how you will target lands most critical to achieving the primary resource concern objectives within the project area. Consider how this might affect the cost effectiveness of your approach.

20. A description of the project timeline, not to exceed 5 years in length, and a project implementation schedule which details when the potential Lead Partner anticipates finishing the project and submitting annual reports and final report. To simplify description of the project's timeline, consider using a Gantt or similar bar chart to illustrate the timing for implementing project conservation actions, complying with NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act), reporting dates, monitoring schedule, outreach meetings, and other pertinent project activities.

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, intended for the user to provide a detailed project timeline and implementation schedule as requested in the text above. The box is currently blank.

21. Description and extent of the conservation activity plans, conservation practices, enhancements, wetland restoration activities, easement acquisition activities, and other partner activities, by program, to be implemented during the project timeframe and the general sequence of implementation of the project. Include partner contributed TA efforts and those that the partner requests NRCS provide using eligible approved conservation practices and enhancements. List easement acquisition activities to be implemented by the partners and how they will be submitted by the partners/applicants to NRCS for review and approval. Describe any activities that are innovative or include outcome-based performance measures implemented by the partner.

22. A description of the plans for assessing and evaluating the results of the project along with plans for reporting on progress to achieve the objectives of the application. Priority will be given to projects where the Lead Partner can provide resources or services or conduct activities to evaluate effects of conservation practices and activities implemented through the project.

23. Lead Partners should consider different approaches for evaluating project outcomes and propose the best approach given partner resources and capacity. Approaches may include, but are not limited to, the following: identification of issues of concern and related priority source areas within a watershed, followed by an assessment of relevant conservation implemented in the critical areas to address the identified resource concern(s); monitoring at field or applicable broader scale (e.g., watershed designated critical habitat) to document the effects of conservation practices installed; or simulation modeling to estimate practice effects.

24. Identify potential criteria to be used by NRCS to evaluate and rank agricultural producers' or landowners' RCPP program applications in the project area that are linked to NRCS' overarching metrics for judging the success of the RCPP program: solutions, contributions, innovation, and participation. Those criteria should reflect local priorities in addressing the primary resource concern as well as local considerations for conservation implementation. For all applications (CCA, national, and State), potential Lead Partners should collaborate with the appropriate NRCS State Conservationist(s) or his or her designee to develop these criteria. For approved projects, this joint effort will help NRCS select covered program applications that will best accomplish the project's intended conservation goals and address priority resource concerns identified by the Lead Partner in the application. Additional information regarding the process NRCS uses to evaluate and rank individual applications is found in each of the covered programs regulations. (See list of NRCS State Conservationists and their addresses in Appendix B).

25. An estimate of the percentage of eligible producers and landowners in the project area who may participate in the project, along with an estimate of the total number of participants located in the project area. Include a description of how the Lead Partner will provide for outreach to producers with special emphasis on beginning farmers or ranchers, limited resource farmers or ranchers, socially disadvantaged farmers or ranchers, eligible veteran farmers or ranchers, and Tribal producers and how many are expected to participate in the project.

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, intended for the user to provide the answer to question 25. The box occupies most of the lower half of the page.

26. Describe the partner's or partners' history of working with agricultural producers or landowners to address the conservation objectives to be achieved.

27. Describe any barriers expected in working with landowners to adopt conservation, and how those barriers will be addressed. Explain how the Lead Partner will encourage participation to guarantee success of the project. Identify any groups of producers who may submit joint applications to address resource issues of common interest and need. Describe how the Lead Partner will assist producers in applying for NRCS programs, including acting on the behalf of a producer at the producer's request. Demonstrate the applicants' ability to conduct outreach and to gain the cooperation of producers in the targeted area.

28. If applicable, indicate how the project will help producers in the area in “assisting producers in meeting or avoiding the need for natural resource regulatory requirements.” Section 1271B(d)(4)(A) of the 1985 Act. Briefly describe the regulation or potential regulation; the impact or potential impact of the regulation on producers, including any economic impact or impact on production; what mechanism (e.g., State-level or “safe-harbor” agreement or Candidate Conservation Agreement with Assurances) will allow project activities to be considered under the regulation.

29. A description of any requested adjustments of terms, including AGI waiver requests, by covered program, with an explanation of why the adjustment of terms is needed in order to achieve the objectives of the project. If a Lead Partner is requesting specific covered program flexibilities that depend on detailed participant or project information, the application must provide the needed information. Lead Partners should contact the appropriate NRCS State Conservationist, or his or her designee, to determine the specific information that may be required. (See list of NRCS State Conservationists and their addresses in Appendix B.) Please read Part I-A of the Announcement thoroughly if requesting covered program adjustments. Lead Partners should contact the appropriate NRCS STC, or his or her designee, regarding potential adjustments being sought to determine if they are allowable. The National Office will review requests for adjustment of terms; and base approval of those requests on how the proposed adjustments meet statutory requirements, intent, and priorities of the program.

30. If the project will request an alternative funding arrangement, include a detailed description of the proposed arrangement. Include how the proposed arrangement will meet all requirements for: RCPP; applicable covered programs; and participating individuals and entities, specifically eligibility conditions, payment limitations, Adjusted Gross Income requirements, conservation compliance requirements, and contract implementation requirements. Note any proposed NRCS roles as outlined in section III.C. Detailed information on proposed alternative funding arrangements may be provided as an attachment to the project proposal and may be in addition to the required documents. More details on specific requirements of alternative funding arrangement proposals will be provided to selected preproposals.

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, occupying the lower two-thirds of the page. It is intended for the applicant to provide a detailed description of any proposed alternative funding arrangement, as specified in the text above.

31. If the proposal includes any activities that are not covered by one of the NRCS conservation practice standards, briefly identify the beneficial and adverse effects of those activities on affected natural resources (soil, water, air, plants, and animals) and specially statutorily protected resources (e.g., cultural and historic resources, wetlands, threatened and endangered species, etc.). NEPA regulations at 40 CFR parts 1500-1508 and the NRCS regulations implementing NEPA at 7 CFR part 650, require that an environmental review and appropriate documentation be prepared for all Federal actions. As part of the application packet, applicants conducting activities other than NRCS conservation practices are required to provide environmental information pertaining to their project to help NRCS determine the appropriate NEPA documentation. If project actions are covered by an existing NEPA document, provide the name of the document, a link, or indicate how a copy can be obtained. NRCS may require applicants to provide additional information or otherwise assist the agency, if it requires such information or assistance, to ensure that the Federal funding meets environmental requirements. Applicants need to work with State Conservationists to ensure NEPA requirements are met. NRCS cannot approve funding until the environmental review requirements demonstrating compliance with NEPA are met. The NEPA process and associated permitting can be a lengthy process and should be accounted for in the project budget, schedule of activities, and project timeline (Appendix F 19.). Note: Applications for projects with potentially adverse impacts may need to be modified in order to achieve acceptable and beneficial levels of environmental impacts. NRCS may choose not to approve funding for projects that may result in unacceptable adverse environmental impacts.

32. For projects requesting use of watershed authorities, identify the Project Sponsor, any existing watershed plans and NEPA documents pertaining to the proposed watershed activity and provide the name of the documents, a link, or indicate how copies can be obtained.

PROJECT	Acreage (approximate)		Supervisory District	Acquisition Plan Category	Project Design	Appraisal Process	Approvals/Baseline	Escrow	Comments
Arrowhead-Maas Ranch	245	2	Farms & Ranches	x					CE under negotiation
Bettinelli Dairy	300	2	Farms & Ranches						On hold at request of owner
Buttke Dairy	253	2	Farms & Ranches						On hold at request of owner
Cresta III	46	1	Recreation & Education	x	x				On hold at request of owner
Donnell	909	1	Greenbelts & Scenic Hillside	x					CE under negotiation
Fitch Mountain (Acq P2)	26	4	Recreation & Education	x	x	x			Under contract
Foppiano Vineyards	160	4	Greenbelts & Scenic Hillside	x	x				Fiscal Oversight Commission reviewed 3/5/15
Glenn Ranch	230	2	Farms & Ranches	x	x				On hold at request of owner
Gloeckner-Turner Ranch	3,364	5	Water, Wildlife & Natural Areas	x					On hold at request of owner
Hansen Ranch	330	2	Farms & Ranches	x	x				Appraisal under review
Howlett Forest	1,395	5	Water, Wildlife & Natural Areas	x	x				Appraisal underway
LaFranchi	1,189	4	Farms & Ranches	x					On hold at request of owner
Lafranconi	211	5	Greenbelts & Scenic Hillside	x					CE under negotiation
Madeline Poncia Trust	175	2	Greenbelts & Scenic Hillside	x					Project design
Mattos Dairy	866	2	Farms & Ranches	x					Project design
McClelland Dairy	337	2	Farms & Ranches	x	x				On hold at request of owner
McCullough - Phase 2	259	1	Recreation & Education	x	x				On hold at request of owner
Ranchero Mark West	120	1	Recreation & Education	x	x	x	x		Board approved October 13, 2015
Rips Redwoods	1,850	5	Water, Wildlife & Natural Areas	x					CE under negotiation
Sonoma Developmental Ctr V (Transforma	945	1	Greenbelts & Scenic Hillside						Resource assessment underway
Spring Hill Ranch	313	1	Farms & Ranches	x					On hold at request of owner
Stewarts Point Ranch	871	5	Water, Wildlife & Natural Areas	x	x				Appraisal under review

Total Acres: 14,395

Matching Grant Projects	Acreage (approximate)	Supervisory District	Location	Grant Process				Comments
				Begin Grant Process	Appraisal Process	Approvals/Baseline	Escrow	
Bayer Farm Site Development	6**	5	Southwest Santa Rosa	x	x	x	x	Reimbursement ongoing
Colgan Creek Park and Preserve (Ph 1)	2	5	Southwest Santa Rosa	x	x	x	x	Board approved 1/29/08
Colgan Creek Park and Restoration (Ph 2)	5	5	Southwest Santa Rosa	x	x	x	x	Board approved 4/21/15
Colgan Creek Restoration (Ph 3)	7	5	Southwest Santa Rosa	x	n/a	x	x	Board approved 4/21/15
Crane Creek Regional Trail	6	1	East of Rohnert Park	x	n/a			Advisory Committee accepted project 6/28/07
Creekside Park, Phase 1A	4**	5	Monte Rio	x	n/a	x	x	Reimbursement ongoing
Denman Reach Phase 3	2	2	North Petaluma	x				Drafting documents
East Washington Park	25	2	Northeast Petaluma	x	n/a	x		scheduled for FOC April 7th
Falletti Ranch	4	2	Cotati	x	x	x	x	Tracking match
Forever Forestville	4	5	Downtown Forestville	x	x	x	x	Tracking match
Guerneville River Park, Phase 2	5	5	Central Guerneville	x	x	x		FOC approved 1/9/14
Irwin Creek Riparian Restoration	47**	5	West of Santa Rosa	x	n/a			Negotiations
Moorland Park	4	5	Southwest Santa Rosa	x				Initiating project
MRRP-Meadowlark Field	58	5	Sebastopol	x	x	x	x	Reimbursement ongoing
Nathanson Creek Preserve Restoration	1**	1	Sonoma	x	n/a			Drafting documents
Paula Lane OSP	11	2	West Petaluma	x	x	x	x	Tracking match
Patterson Point	2	5	Villa Grande	x	x	x	x	Reimbursement ongoing
Riverfront Regional Park Phase 3	305	4	West of Windsor	x	n/a			Advisory Committee accepted project 7/24/08
Roseland Village Public Space	1	5	Southwest Santa Rosa	x				Initiating project
Sebastopol Skategarden Expansion	1	5	Sebastopol	x	n/a			FOC approved 11/12/15, BOD approved 12/15/15
SMART Pathway – Hearn to Bellevue	6	5	Southwest Santa Rosa	x	n/a			Negotiations
SMART Pathway - Payran to S. Point	14	2	Petaluma	x				Initiating project
Sonoma Garden Park, Phase 2	5**	1	East of Sonoma	x	n/a	x	n/a	Reimbursement ongoing
Total Acres:	462							

** Restoration/Development Project on previous acquisition.