AG + OPEN SPACE
SONOMA COUNTY

SONOMA COUNTY OPEN SPACE DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

September 28, 2023 | 5:00 pm

MEMBERS PLEASE CALL IF UNABLE TO ATTEND

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE VIA ZOOM OR IN PERSON

The September 28,2023 Sonoma County Ag + Open Space Advisory Committee meeting will be held in person at Ag + Open Space's office located at 747 Mendocino Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA. The public may also participate virtually through Zoom.

Members of the public can watch or listen to the meeting using one of the two following methods:

1. **Zoom:** Join the Zoom meeting on your computer, tablet or smartphone by clicking:
   https://sonomacounty.zoom.us/j/98316944769?pwd=MURud1o3TDVRWStOSEF5Z25MdEIzdz09
   If you have the Zoom app or web client, join the meeting using the Password: 778144

   Call-in and listen to the meeting: Dial 1 669 900 9128 Enter meeting ID: 983 1694 4769

2. **In Person:** Members of the public may attend in person at Ag + Open Space's office at 747 Mendocino Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA in the large conference room.

PUBLIC COMMENT DURING THE MEETING: You may email public comment to Michelle.Nozzari@sonoma-county.org. All emailed public comments will be forwarded to all Committee Members and read aloud for the benefit of the public. Please include your name and the relevant agenda item number to which your comment refers. In addition, if you have joined as a member of the public through the Zoom link or by calling in, there will be specific points throughout the meeting during which live public comment may be made via Zoom and phone.

DISABLED ACCOMMODATION: If you have a disability which requires an accommodation or an alternative format to assist you in observing and commenting on this meeting, please contact Michelle Nozzari by email to Michelle.Nozzari@sonoma-county.org by 12pm Wednesday, September 27, 2023 to ensure arrangements for accommodation.

1. **Call to Order**

2. **Public Comment**
   Comments on items not listed on the agenda. Time is limited to 2 minutes per person/item.

3. **Approval of Minutes from August 24, 2023**   **Attachment A**   ACTION ITEM

4. **General Manager's Report**

5. **Subcommittee Reports and Appointments**   ACTION ITEM

6. **Matching Grant Program Revision**   **Attachment B**
   Amy Ricard, Community Resources Program Manager
   Pamela Swan, Matching Grant Coordinator

7. **Projects in Negotiations**   **Attachment C**

8. **Announcements from Advisory Committee Members**

9. **Adjournment**
   Next Scheduled Meeting: October 26, 2023.

_____

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS
(SUBJECT TO CHANGE)
_____

10/26/23
Acquisition Update

11/23/23
No Meeting

12/14/23
Buy Protect Sell Pilot Program

AG + OPEN SPACE

SONOMA COUNTY

SONOMA COUNTY OPEN SPACE DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

747 Mendocino Avenue – Suite 100, Santa Rosa, CA 95401
August 24, 2023 | 5:00 pm

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Paul Martin	Ladi Asgill	Steve Rabinowitsh	Thembi Borras
Bill Smith	Jesus Guzman	Michelle Whitman	John Schribbs
Kevin McDonnell	Don McEnhill	Dayna Ghirardelli	Josh Proctor
Angel Lopez			

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Jan McFarland	Kristina Tierney	Mark Stapp

STAFF PRESENT:
Misti Arias, General Manager; Aldo Mercado, County Counsel; Amy Ricard, Community Resources Manager; Sara Ortiz, Administrative Aide; Michelle Nozzari, Administrative Aide.

Call to Order
Chair Thembi Borras called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

Public Comment
Duane Dewitt gave comment on the importance of protecting Roseland Creek from pollution from vehicles and he spoke on a need for accessible, uninterrupted space for the local community to access nature.

Approval of Minutes from June 22, 2023
Chair Borras asked for any comments or revisions to the June 22, 2023, minutes. Members noted there was correction in attendance of Members Paul Martin and Don McEnhill who were mistakenly listed as absent. Chair Borras took roll call. A vote took place to approve the minutes. Michelle Whitman, Kevin McDonnell, and Angel Lopez abstained from the voting; the minutes were approved with the corrections.

Advisory Committee Members Oath of Office
In compliance with state law and as part of general housekeeping, Advisory Committee Members present swore the oath of office and signed their Oath of Office forms.

The General Manager welcomed two new Advisory Committee Members, Ladi Asgill and Dayna Ghirardelli. Mr. Asgill comes to the committee with experience as an agronomist and environmental scientist in North Bay. Dayna Ghirardelli is the new Executive Director of the Sonoma County Farm Bureau. Ms. Ghirardelli previously worked for UC Cooperative Extension as a Dairy Program Representative for Sonoma & Marin.

Upcoming Board Items for Ag + Open Space include:

- Spring Hill Ranch Conservation Easement Acquisition on September 12, 2023
- Stewardship Update on September 19, 2023
- Mark West Wikiup Open Space Preserve Fee Title Purchase

Acquisition Update

Gillis Ranch and Chanslor acquisitions were approved by the Board on Tuesday. Last week the FOC approved the appraisals for Spring Hill and LaFranchi Laguna.

Community Resources Update

The Board approved full funding ($7.2 million) for 5 of the 6 Matching Grant projects submitted in Round 2 of the 2022 cycle. These awardees include Petaluma Bounty Farm, Sonoma Schellville Trail, Geyserville Public Plaza, Tierra de Rosas Community Plaza, and Mark West Community Park. Media outreach is underway. Staff will schedule an MGP Revision Ad Hoc meeting in the coming weeks.

Vegetation Management Update

The Board approved a contract with Gold Ridge RCD. This will launch a 2-year Capacity Building program for landowners within the Russian River watershed. Gold Ridge RCD will work with Kim Batchelder, community partners, and non-profit organizations to provide technical workshops and field visits to improve forest management, wildfire resilience, watershed protection, carbon sequestration, fuels management, and ecosystem health. This program is supported by a $353,000 grant from National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) matched by PG&E Settlement Funds and will start in September 2023 and go through May of 2025.

Stewardship Update

On September 19 staff will present a Stewardship Update to the Board, including information about the Ag + Open Space Endowment fund cost model and the need to seek investment options that can achieve a higher interest rate than the County Treasury. This past spring staff worked with members of the Advisory Committee/Fiscal Oversight Commission Endowment Joint Subcommittee to review and discuss the cost model prepared by the nonprofit Center for Natural Lands Management, as well as possible investment options with a longer-term investment horizon. The financial firm Macias, Gini, and O'Connell recommends that Ag + Open Space utilize an investment structure similar to that used by the County for its Other Postemployment Healthcare Plan. Ag + Open Space will need to work with state representatives to propose a change to state legislation in order to be able to participate in this type of investment.

Comments: Member Martin asked if the Agricultural Subcommittee was going to meet soon. Ms. Ricard reiterated the Agricultural Specialist was preparing materials for Farmland For All that will be available soon. Also, with the addition of new members there should be new appointments to

subcommittees. Member McDonnell mentioned that he was grateful that Petaluma Bounty Farm was among awardees for the Match Grant Program.

Subcommittee Report Outs

Acquisition Subcommittee – No updates and has not met.
Agricultural Subcommittee – No updates and has not met.
Endowment Subcommittee – Has met three times. The subcommittee supports Staff proposal. The Stewardship Update to the Board will take place on September 19, 2023.
Matching Grant REVISION Subcommittee – The subcommittee will be meeting soon to review.
Matching Grant APPLICATION EVALUATION Subcommittee – has met and reviewed applications.

Projects in Negotiation

The Advisory Committee members requested larger font for the Projects in Negotiation Spreadsheet.

Announcements

No Announcements.

Adjournment

Chair Borras adjourned the meeting at 5:31pm

Next Meeting: September 28, 2023

This meeting will be in person with an option for members of the public to join via zoom. The meeting place is: 747 Mendocino Ave, Ste 100, Large Conference Room, Santa Rosa.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle Nozzari
Advisory Committee Clerk

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 22, 2023

To: Advisory Committee

From: Amy Ricard, Community Resources Manager
Pamela Swan, Grants Coordinator

c: Misti Arias, General Manager

Subject: Matching Grant Program Revision Recommendations

Executive Summary

Since 1990, the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District has offered a competitive Matching Grant Program to public agencies and nonprofit organizations for open space projects within and near Sonoma County's cities and communities. The Board of Directors updated the Matching Grant Program Guidelines in 2009, 2011, and 2019. The primary goal of these revisions was to clarify language and improve transparency in the evaluation criteria and review process. With an ongoing commitment to program improvement to best serve Sonoma County communities, and to increase equity and accessibility for underserved communities in particular, this year staff coordinated an additional program evaluation process resulting in significant proposed revisions in the areas of program model, funding structure, technical assistance, evaluation and scoring, and administration. Staff are bringing forward these revision recommendations to the Advisory Committee and Fiscal Oversight Commission before presenting them to the Board of Directors on October 24, 2023. Upon receiving feedback and guidance from the Board of Directors, staff will make revisions as directed and return on December 12, 2023, to seek final approval and adoption of the revised program materials.

Background

The Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District (Ag + Open Space) offers a competitive Matching Grant Program (MGP) for projects within or near the County's urban areas. The Program is borne out of Measure F and is described in paragraph 5 of the Expenditure Plan as follows:

"5. Other open space projects include but are not limited to, urban open space and recreation projects within and near incorporated cities and other urbanized areas of Sonoma County. Funds for these projects shall be available to cities, the County and other entities through a matching grant program, with preference given to acquisition and development of projects that link communities. Examples of these projects include creek restoration and enhancement, such as along the Petaluma River, Santa Rosa Creek and Laguna de Santa Rosa, trails, athletic fields, and urban greenspace."

Since 1994, Ag + Open Space has accepted 69 projects into the MGP in each of the County's nine incorporated Cities and numerous unincorporated areas, pledging over $50 million to community-based organizations, Cities, County departments, and other public agencies. Generally located in areas lacking open space, MGP funding has enabled the development and implementation of innovative projects that reflect the needs of Sonoma County's unique and diverse communities. To date, the Program has protected nearly over 900 acres of urban open space and that amount of acreage will almost double to approximately 1,770 when all active projects are complete. With funding from the Matching Grant Program, 29 new public parks have opened and over 650 acres of natural habitats including urban creeks, marshes and wetlands, and riparian habitats have been restored or enhanced.

As a condition of funding, Ag + Open Space achieves permanent protection of lands through a conservation easement. As the majority of MGP projects include a public recreation component, Ag + Open Space may also receive a recreation conservation covenant which enables and permanently protects public recreational uses.

Ag + Open Space staff coordinates the Program with support from an MGP Staff Subcommittee and a Subcommittee comprised of representatives from the Advisory Committee and Fiscal Oversight Commission. The Subcommittees assist in evaluating applications and recommending projects for funding, as well as in the review and revision of Program administration and materials, forwarding any recommended changes to the full advisory bodies, and Ag + Open Space Board of Directors (Board). For each funding cycle, the full Advisory Committee and the Fiscal Oversight Commission vote on recommendations for Program funding to be considered by the Board. The Board provides final approval for which projects are accepted into the Program, along with associated funding amounts, and any significant program revisions.

Matching Grant Program Updates 2009 – present:
Since its inception, the MGP has constantly evolved to meet the needs of the community. Following each funding cycle, Ag + Open Space seeks input to identify ways to enhance and improve the Program. All Program improvements to date have come from stakeholder input from our Board, Advisory Committee, Fiscal Oversight Commission, applicants, staff, community members, peer organizations, and other project partners. Over the last several years, there have been significant updates and refinements to the Program to create a more community-responsive, transparent, and efficient process.

In 2009, the Ag + Open Space Board of Directors adopted a number of revisions to the MGP Guidelines, including:

- The funding match should be no less than a one-to-one ratio.
- No more than 50 percent of the MGP funding match can be associated with operations and maintenance of the project.
- Limiting impervious surfaces for development projects.
- Restricting grant funding for intensive recreational improvements, such as pools and playground equipment.

- Acquisition projects must be purchased within two years of the initial Board of Directors' recommendation of the project.

In 2011, the Board approved another update of the MGP. This update reflected improvements to the Guidelines, including:
- Administrative requirements such as offering the MGP biennially.
- Revising time limits on the completion of projects to three years for acquisition projects and five years for restoration or development projects from the date the Board of Directors accepts projects into the program.
- Updated project evaluation criteria to provide applicants with a better understanding of how projects are considered.

Following the 2016 and 2018 Program cycles, staff and the Subcommittees found that additional refinements to the Program were necessary to provide better clarity to applicants and improved transparency in the evaluation process. Several themes were analyzed for potential updates. These included but were not limited to: Program frequency; Program funding; eligibility of grant funding for capital replacement; match requirements; and subcommittee recusal.

In 2019, the Board approved another update of the MGP. This update included improvements to the Guidelines to clarify and formalize evaluation standards to improve transparency, including:

- Increased funding for the 2020 MGP cycle from $2 million to $4 million.
- Adjusted the scoring matrix to include criteria that focused on the intent of the MGP:
  - Protection of new or expanded open space. Projects that feature the purchase of new open space land are a priority of the MGP.
  - Linking communities to open space via trails or other connections.
  - Protection or creation of public access to the Russian River, Pacific Ocean, or other waterways.
  - Implementation of restoration or enhancement of natural and native habitats.
  - Protection of native plant and/or animal species.
  - Construction of an outdoor public community gathering space in a natural setting.
  - Development of new, outdoor, nature-based, recreational opportunities.
  - Construction of amenities to provide opportunities for public education about the natural world and/or local agriculture.
  - Protection of farmland that provides urban greenspace and access to locally grown food and fiber and provide opportunities for the public to experience farming and agricultural production.

- Provided improved clarity on minimum qualifications for all applications, as well as detailed information on evaluation criteria.
- Clarified which types of projects are ineligible for funding:
  - Projects that replace existing facilities or amenities with facilities or amenities that have the same function or purpose. Prior guidelines stated projects that "rehabilitate existing facilities" were ineligible.

- Projects that would implement tasks that are required as a condition of approval or mitigation for an unrelated development project.
- Increased the match allowed for project administration and planning from 10% to 25%.
- Prioritized projects in fire- and/or flood-affected areas.
- Removed the 1:1 match requirement, but stated that projects with more match would be more competitive.

2024 Matching Grant Program Recommended Revisions:
The 2024 update is in response to feedback received from community members, partners, program participants, peer organizations, the Advisory Committee and Fiscal Oversight Commission, and our Board of Directors. The focus of this update is to increase program equity and accessibility, particularly with underserved communities, and continue to improve transparency and community awareness.

With the objective of implementing the revisions prior to the 2024 funding cycle, staff initiated an intensive revision process in January 2023, engaging a wide range of stakeholders. This effort included soliciting feedback from Ag + Open Space staff and our advisory bodies; consulting the Office of Equity and County Counsel; interviewing community partners; surveying past and prospective applicants; and researching funding models and best practices from peer granting organizations. The findings and recommendations below reflect the outcomes of this effort.

Program Model
In order to better respond to time-sensitive urban open space projects, bolster projects that are ready for implementation, and build more support in the process for applicants lacking capacity and/or serving disadvantaged communities, staff are proposing to pilot a rolling application model over the next two years. The proposed rolling application process will consist of a pre-application to assess eligibility and readiness, and a full application for funding once eligibility and readiness requirements are met. Pre-applications will be reviewed for eligibility and project readiness by the Staff MGP Subcommittee as they come in, and full applications will be evaluated by Staff, subcommittees, and advisory bodies twice yearly before bringing funding recommendations to the Board for final approval. Full applications will be scored using the evaluation matrix and funding recommendations will be based on the merits of the project and its matrix score.

This rolling model will allow applicants to submit projects when they are truly ready, resulting in more urban open space projects completed sooner, which provides greater benefits to the community and allows staff to move forward with other projects. This rolling model is also more responsive to time-sensitive projects that may require urgent funding and are not able to wait 1-2 years for the next cycle. Lastly, this model also reduces the "Active Project Tenure" time, where some projects linger longer than necessary due to pre-Acquisition and Improvement steps that could have been taken prior to application. Staff intend to survey program stakeholders annually to assess the effectiveness of the pilot and will report findings to our advisory bodies and Board of Directors.

Program Funding
In order to support the growing demand for urban open space projects, staff recommend increasing the annual funding allocation to $3 million per year, which represents a 50% increase from the current funding level.

In addition, staff are recommending the establishment of a dedicated fund specifically for MGP projects. Staff recommend transferring to this fund the amount of money pledged to current MGP projects that have not yet been completed and reimbursed and adding $3 million to this fund every year thereafter. All MGP projects will be funded through this dedicated fund and staff will set annual organizational budgets based on anticipated MGP project completions. This separate fund will result in increased transparency of Program funding, providing staff, advisory bodies, and applicants a clear picture of available MGP funds at any given time, and the ability to plan and designate funds accordingly.

Staff are also requesting guidance regarding the development of maximum and minimum funding requests. Many public grant funders set applicant expectations by establishing a maximum and minimum request amount. A maximum request amount can spread funding to more applicants and encourage applicants to leverage project funds from other sources. A minimum funding request can avoid making small awards where other sources of funding may be better suited, and the administrative costs borne by both the applicant and funder exceed the grant award.

Pre-Award Applicant Support
Many stakeholders, especially those in underserved communities, expressed the need for increased technical assistance and application support to be competitive in the program. In response, staff are proposing several options reflecting best practices in grantmaking to increase equity and accessibility in this area:

- Increase staff assistance with a pre-application/readiness and eligibility assessment, the full application, project conceptualization, and identifying other funding sources and/or partners to support long-term management.

- Offer application-related, pre-award technical assistance to qualified organizations:
    - Pre-application would include a section where applicants could request and demonstrate a need for technical assistance. If applicants are able to demonstrate need, they would be provided a list of approved consultants to access.
    - Ag + Open Space would retain a suite of consultants to provide technical assistance to authorized applicants. Staff may provide a cap on the amount applicants are able to use for technical assistance.
    - Types of application-related, pre-award assistance may include but are not limited to application preparation, community engagement, preliminary project design/planning, site assessment, mapping/GIS, CEQA, permitting, and real estate support, all of which expedite project readiness.

- Increase the grant request/match allowed for project design/planning from 25% to 50%. This would enable applicants to use more awarded grant funds to retain pre-development consultants to assist with project development. This recommendation is in response to several community-based organizations lacking in pre-development expertise and limited fundraising capacity.

Evaluation & Scoring

Staff are recommending several changes to the scoring matrix to ensure equity, enhance transparency, and reflect Ag + Open Space and County priorities (See *Attachment A.)* for current Scoring Matrix). The proposed changes include:

- Remove match level and match security from the scoring matrix and instead include it in the eligibility assessment. Applicants would be required to verify they have some level of match to bring to the project. The Board could consider requiring a baseline match for all applicants.
- Include CEQA and/or permitting checklists in the pre-application/readiness assessment so applicants are aware of what is required. This will bolster project readiness prior to application.
- Remove applicant experience and quality of application from the scoring matrix, which is a best practice in increasing accessibility.
- In an effort to ensure the long-term success of MGP projects, ask applicants to include a description of how they expect to ensure the successful completion and long-term operations/management of the project in the application and score this "sustainability plan" in the matrix.
- Increase score for acquisition of new land, reflecting the MGP's prioritization of adding new open space land.
- Move currently unscored "Other Considerations" to the scoring matrix:
    - Community Support would be scored based on narrative, letters of support, and the level of community engagement (per the Office of Equity's Community Engagement Continuum).
    - Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) would be score based on the project's location and associated social/economic/environmental metrics and data sets, such as Human Development Index (HDI), California Enviroscreen 4.0, Trust for Public Land's ParkScore, and our County's own Parks Gap Analysis.
    - Projects in a Fire and/or Flood Area will change to Climate Resiliency and will be scored based on the project's location and associated metrics and data sets.

Program Administration

Staff heard from stakeholders that the application and guidelines are lengthy and onerous. To address this, staff are proposing to simplify both documents by reducing their length and the documentation required and including checklists and online maps to help applicants through the process. Staff also recommend enhancing the online application to make it easier for applicants, while also removing the requirement to submit a hard copy application.

Lastly, staff recommend rebranding the program to better reflect what the program does and the benefits it provides to the community.

Revision Recommendations Public Review
Staff presented proposed revisions at the September 5, 2023, public workshop of the Matching Grant Program Revision Subcommittee, which is comprised of members of the Fiscal Oversight Commission and Advisory Committee. Refined revision recommendations will be presented to the full Advisory Committee on September 28, 2023, and Fiscal Oversight Commission on October 5, 2023. Staff will then bring revision recommendations to the Board of Directors on October 24, 2023. Upon receiving feedback and guidance from the Board of Directors, staff will make revisions as directed and return on December 12, 2023, to seek final approval and adoption of the revised program materials.

Following Board approval and adoption of program revisions, staff will finalize the guidelines, application, and evaluation matrix and launch the program the first quarter of 2024, including targeted outreach to Sonoma County's underserved communities and workshops for potential applicants.

EVALUATION MATRIX

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS: *must meet all criteria below to be considered*

Qualifications	Meets criterion? Yes/No
1. Eligible Applicant: Public agency and/or 501(c)3 nonprofit.	
If co-applying: Agreement between applicants. At minimum, there must be a letter signed by all applicants indicating intent to enter agreement.	
If nonprofit: submittal of 1) Evidence of qualification under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Service Code, 2) California Form 590 Withholding Exemption Certificate, 3) California Form 204 Payee Data Record, 4) Articles of Incorporation, 5) By-laws	
2. Eligible Project Category: Acquisition and/or Improvement	
For **acquisition** projects applicant provides information on the status of the following: - negotiations with seller (purchase and sales agreement = most competitive) - appraisal (complete = most competitive) - required approvals, permits, CEQA, ADA, etc. - Visual design	
For **improvement** projects applicant provides information on the status of the following: - Visual design (e.g. restoration plans, construction plans, conceptual design) - Public outreach/comment on design - required approvals, permits, CEQA, ADA, etc.	
3. Authorization: letter/resolution from governing body	
4. Location: Within 0.5 miles of established Urban Growth Boundary or Urban Service Area. (If not, provides information to describe what community the project will serve and how.)	
5. Fiscal Solvency (see financial screen)	
6. Long-term in nature (20 + years)	
7. Complete application	

ELIGIBLE APPLICATION? Y/N

Must meet all criteria #1-7 above to be eligible.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Program Intent

a. Creation of NEW or Expansion of Existing Community Open Space: *25 points possible.*

	Meets Criterion?	Points Applied	NOTES
Acquisition **and** development of **new land** for public open space for agriculture, recreation and/or natural resource restoration. *25 points.*			
Acquisition **or** development of **new land** for public open space for agriculture, recreation and/or natural resource restoration. *15 points.*			
Acquisition **or** development of **land adjacent** to exisiting public open space for agriculture, recreation, and/or natural resource restoration. *10 points*			
SUBTOTAL		0	MAX = 25 points

b. OTHER program intent: *15 points possible. 5 points = meets up to 2 criteria, 10 = meets up to 4 criteria, 15 =*

	Meets Criterion?	Points Applied	NOTES
Link communities to open space via trails or other connections. Preference is given to projects that include regional trail connections.			
Protection or **Construction** of public access to the Russian River, Pacific Ocean or other waterways.			
Implementation of **restoration** techniques to restore or enhance natural and native habitats.			
Protection of native plant and/or animal species.			
Construction of an outdoor public community gathering space in a natural setting. Preference is given to projects where no community gathering space currently exists.			
Development of new, outdoor, nature-based, recreational opportunities. Preference is given to projects that are located where no such recreation opportunities currently exist.			
Construction of amenities to provide opportunities for public education about the natural world and/or local agriculture.			

Protection of farmland that provides urban greenspace and access to locally grown food and fiber and provide opportunities for the public to experience farming, agricultural production and/or food and fiber production.			
SUBTOTAL			MAX = 15 points
PROGRAM INTENT TOTAL		**0**	**MAX = 40 points**

2. NEED: The project fulfills a well-identified and high-priority need within the geographic area where the project is located.

10 points possible. See below for more.

	Meets Criterion?	Points Applied	NOTES
Project is identified in or furthers policies of at least <u>one</u> adopted plan or document. *3 points.*			
Project is identified in or furthers policies of <u>two or more</u> adopted plans or documents. *5 points.*			
Project is identified as high priority or meets high priority policies/goals in adopted plans/documents. *5 points.*			
NEED: TOTAL			**MAX = 10 points**

3. BENEFITS: The project results in multiple benefits to the community and to native plants and wildlife.

10 points possible. 0 points = does not meet any criteria, 5 = meets one criteria, 8 = meets 2, 10 = meets all three.

	Meets Criterion?	Points Applied	NOTES
Project will provide multiple demonstrable benefits to the human community.			
Project will provide multiple demonstrable benefits to the natural community (e.g. plants and animals).			
Applicant clearly describes how project benefits will be measured.			
BENEFITS: TOTAL			**MAX = 10 points**

4. READINESS application shows ability
40 points possible. Scoring broken down in subcategories a through d below.
a. Project Tasks/Schedule/Budget
5 points possible.

	Meets Criterion?	Points Applied	NOTES
Applicant has completed the table and included logical tasks, schedule, and budget necessary to complete the project.			
SUBTOTAL			MAX = 5

b. Planning + Design
15 points possible. 3 points for meeting each criteria. 0 = meets none, 3 = meets one, 6 = meets 2, etc.

	Meets Criterion?	Points Applied	NOTES
Application demonstrates clear understanding of process for implementation including permitting requirements (state, federal, and local agency), CEQA, ADA, etc.			
Project design shows no more than 25% of project is covered by structures, impervious surfaces, and/or hardscape.			
Application demonstrates understanding of potential impediments to project completion and provides explanation of how they will be addressed.			
Project will be easily accessible to the City and/or community where it is located via public transport, public roads, bike and/or pedestrian routes.			
Project design includes incorporation of natural elements in design (e.g. grassy areas, trees, vegetation).			
SUBTOTAL			MAX = 15

c. Experience
5 points possible. 2 points = meets one criteria, 5 = meets both.

	Meets Criterion?	Points Applied	NOTES
Applicant has experience, or is working with a partner(s) with sufficient expertise to successfully complete the project.			
Applicant and/or project partner(s) have successfully completed similar types of projects.			
SUBTOTAL			MAX = 5

d. Project Funding/Match Security
15 points possible. See below for more

	Meets Criterion?	Points Applied	NOTES
Application shows 1:1 match. *5 points.*			
Match security. *10 points possible. 10 points if 100% match is secure, 5 points if more than 50% of match is secure, 0 points if less than 50 % is secure.*			
Is partial funding an option? *(No points, just y/n for evaluation).*			
SUBTOTAL			MAX = 15

READINESS: TOTAL	0	**MAX = 40 points**
TOTAL SCORE	**0**	**MAX = 100**

5. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS: <u>No points</u> awarded in this category, but these factors may be utilized in finalizing funding recommendations.

	NOTES
a. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion: *First-time applicants, projects in communities where no previous MGP funding has been awarded, where MGP funding has not been awarded in the last two MGP cycles, and/or where little or no access to open space exists nearby may be given higher priority.*	
b. Community Support. *Application demonstrates broad community support.*	
c. Performance on Previous and/or Current MGP Projects. *Past project performance may be considered when making funding recommendations.*	
d. Project is located in Fire and/or Flood impacted community. *To the extent feasible, the MGP will fund competitive projects located in communities affected by recent fire and flood events.*	
e. Quality of application. *Application is complete, answers are clear and succinct, all applicable supporting documentation is submitted, applicant demonstrates adequate readiness and capacity.*	

Conservation Easement Project Name	Acreage (approx)	Sup. District	Project Evaluation (Step 1)	Initiating Project	Due Dilligence	Project Structure	CE Negoations	Appraisal Process	FOC	BOD	Escrow/Closing (Step 4)	Status	Comments
Abril Ranch	1,929	4										On-Hold	Stalled due to federal mineral rights ownership
Armstrong Redwoods State Natural Reserve - Ayers Addition	320	5								+		Approvals/Baseline	FOC date: 9/7; Ancipated BOD Date: 10/17
Baumert Springs	372	5					+					Negoating CE	Project Structure - development
Bavarian Lion Vineyards	1,858	4										Iniating Project	Iniaing Project
Bianchi Family	633	5										Iniating Project	Iniating Project
Big Sulphur Creek (Krasilsa)	507	4										Iniating Project	Iniating Project
Blucher Creek Headwaters	212	5										Iniating Project	Project back to acve - iniating project structure
Chanslor Ranch	378	5										Approvals/Baseline	Final Negoation and Board Prep
Crawford Gulch	92	5										Iniating Project	Project Structure - development
Deniz Ernest & Beverly Trust	217	2										Iniating Project	Project Structure - development
Deniz Family Farm	315	2										Iniating Project	Project Structure - development
Denner Ranches	489	5										Approvals/Baseline	Finalizing baseline
Diamond W Ranch	849	2										Negoating CE	Project Structure - CE drafing
Gillis Ranch Preserve	139	2 & 5									+	Escrow/Closing	BOD approval: 8/22; Esmated closing date: 9/26
Hood Mountain Regional Park & Open Space Preserve - Salt Creek Additon	989	1										Appraisal Process	Appraisal Review Complete - negoating process
Lafranchi (Laguna)	127	5										Approvals/Baseline	Ancipated BOD date: 10/17
Limping Turkey Ranch	158	2										Iniating Project	Iniating project
Lobban – Creekside Addition	3	1										Appraisal Process	Working on project structure
Lobban – Mark West Creek	266	1										Appraisal Process	Working on project structure
Lobban – Miyashiro Addion	5	1										Appraisal Process	Appraisal phase - appraisal under review
Mark West Wikiup Preserve	31	4										Negoating CE	Draft Purchase and Sale (PSA) out, CE in process
McClelland Dairy	348	2										Negoating CE	Project Structure - CE drafing
McCormick Ranch - Regional Parks	253	1										Appraisal Process	Appraisal phase
Nolan Creek 1	317	5										Iniating Project	Project Structure - development
Nolan Creek 2	171	5										Iniating Project	Project Structure - development
Nolan Creek 3	49	5										Iniating Project	Project Structure - development
Peters Ranch	278	2										Iniating Project	Project Structure - development
Preston Farm	133	4										Negoating CE	Project Structure - development and CE negoaons
Rincon Hills	218	1										Iniating Project	Project Structure - development
Rowland Mack	168	1					+					Negoating CE	Project Structure - development and CE negoaons
Russian River Habitat Restoration	63	4										Iniating Project	Iniating project
Russian River Redwoods	394	5										Iniating Project	Iniating project
Soda Springs Ranch Open Space Preserve	209	4										Escrow/Closing	Project closed 9/1
Spring Hill Ranch	579	2					+					Approvals/Baseline	Appraisal update. Landowner seeking ACCs.

Column phases (diagonal headers): Project Evaluation | Initiating Project | Due Dilligence | Project Structure | CE Negotiations | Appraisal Process | FOC | BOD | Escrow/Closing

Conservation Easement Project Name	Acreage (approx)	Sup. District	Step 1	Step 2				Step 3			Step 4	Status	Comments
Starrett Hill	319	5	�	■	■	■						Initiating Project	Project Structure - development
South Sonoma Mountain Grove	369	2	▩	■								Initiating Project	Initiating project
South Sonoma Mountain Skyline	492	2	▩	■		+						Initiating Project	Project Structure - development
South Sonoma Mountain Rodgers Creek	798	1 & 2	▩	■		+						Initiating Project	Project Structure - development
Wi Home Ranch	395	2	▩	■								Initiating Project	Initiating project
Wolf Creek Ranch	1,195	5	▩	■								Initiating Project	Initiating project
Total Acres	16,637												

+ indicates change in phase since last update (August 2023)

Matching Grant Project Name	Acreage (approx)	Sup. District	Step 1 (Project Evaluation)	Step 2 (Initiating Project / Due Diligence / Project Structure / CE Negotiations)	Step 3 (Appraisal Process / FOC / BOD)	Step 4 (Escrow/Closing)	Step 5 (Implementation + Tracking Match)	Status	Comments
A Place to Play	87	5						Initiating Project	Initiating project
AmeriCorps Trail	12	5			(filled)	(filled)		Other	Implementation - CE/ RC will be recorded following trail construction.
Badger Park	20	4						Initiating Project	Site Assessment in process for project documentation
Bayer Farm Development ***	6**	3		N/A N/A N/A	N/A N/A N/A	N/A		Completed Project & Tracking Match	Reimbursement ongoing; Grant extended
Bodega Bay Trail	178	5						Initiating Project	Site Assessment in process for project documentation
Colgan Creek Phase 3 MG***	7**	3		N/A N/A N/A	N/A N/A N/A	N/A		Completed Project	Restoration work complete
Colgan Creek Phase 4 MG	4	3						Initiating Project	Accepted into program during 2022 MGP funding cycle
Crane Creek Regional Trail	75	1						Negotiating CE	Negotiating CE, Rec Covenant, Mtg to align around MGA agreement
Denman Reach	2	2						Negotiating CE	Negotiating CE
Falletti Ranch	4	2						Completed Project & Tracking Match	Tracking match
Forever Forestville***	4	5						Completed Project & Tracking Match	Tracking match
Geyserville Community Plaza	1	4	+					Initiating Project	Board approved 8/22/2023
Graton Green	1	5						Completed Project	Completed
Healdsburg Montage Park	36	4						Initiating Project	Getting out LOI / MGA
Helen Putnam Regional Park Extension	56	2						Negotiating CE	LOI under review by landowner
Helen Putnam Regional Park Extension Phase 2	47	2						Negotiating CE	LOI under review by landowner
Keiser Park Expansion 2	2	4						Negotiating CE	Negotiating CE
Mark West Community Park	1	4	+					Initiating Project	Board approved 8/22/2023
Maxwell Farms	79	1						Initiating Project	Drafting Documents
Paula Lane Open Space Preserve	11	2						Completed Project & Tracking Match	Tracking match
Petaluma Bounty Community Farm	3	2	+					Initiating Project	Board approved 8/22/2023
Petaluma River Park	20	2						Initiating Project	Letter of intent in negotiation
River Lane***	1	5						Escrow/Closing	Moving toward close;complaintant issues; 10/25/24 extension
Roseland Creek Community Park - Phase 1c	3	3						Negotiating CE	Negotiating CE, Rec Covenant
SMART Pathway – Hearn to Bellevue*	6	3						Completed Project	Completed
Sonoma Schellville Trail	21	1	+					Initiating Project	Board approved 8/22/2023
Southeast Santa Rosa Greenway***	61	1						Negotiating CE	Appraisal done. Mtg w City to align docs and timeline
Steamer Landing Park Development (McNear Peninsula)	27**	2						Initiating Project	Initiating project
Taylor Mountain Regional Park & OSP - Cooper Creek Addition	54	3						Completed Project & Tracking Match	Closed 4/1/20. Tracking match
Tierra de Rosas Plaza	1	3	+					Initiating Project	Board approved 8/22/2023

Total Acres | 790

* District approved a 2-year extension

** Restoration/Development Project on previous acquisition

*** District approved 5-year extension (MGP 2 year, fire 3 year)+ indicates change in phase since last update (August 2023)

Transfer Project Name	Acreage (approx)	Sup. District	Transaction Type	Step 1 Project Evaluaon	Step 2 Inia ng Pr oject	Due Dilligence	Project Structure	CE Negoa ons + Transfer Agreement	Step 3 Appraisal Process	FOC	BOD	Step 4 Escrow/ Closing	Comments
Saddle Mountain Open Space Preserve	960	1	Transfer	▨	▨								Inia ng pr oject
Tierra Vegetables	15	4	Resale	▨	▨	▨	▨	▨					CE and Covenant negoa on
Young-Armos	56	5	Transfer/Sale	▨	▨								Inia ng pr oject
Total Acres	1,031												