



EDMUND G. BROWN Jr., Governor
NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD
Mailing Address: 1416 9th Street, Room 1266
Sacramento, California 95814
www.wcb.ca.gov
(916) 445-8448
Fax (916) 323-0280

Notice of Meeting

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD

September 26, 2016

1:00 p.m.

Natural Resources Building, First Floor Auditorium¹
Sacramento, California 95814

Final Agenda

<u>Item Number</u>	
1. Roll Call	2
2. Strategic Plan Conservation Summit and Implementing Actions	3
3. Exhibit A – Survey Questions	14

1. Roll Call

Charlton H. Bonham, Chair, Director, Department of Fish and Wildlife

Michael Cohen, Member Director, Department of Finance

Eric Sklar, Member President Fish and Game Commission

Joint Legislative Advisory Committee

Senator Jean Fuller

Senator Fran Pavley

Senator Lois Wolk

Assemblymember Richard Gordon

Assemblymember Marc Levine -Alternate

Assemblymember Eduardo Garcia

Assemblymember Miguel Santiago -Alternate

Assemblymember Das Williams

Assemblymember Richard Bloom -Alternate

Executive Director

John P. Donnelly

2. Strategic Plan Conservation Summit and Implementing Actions

Staff will present the recommendations of the Wildlife Conservation Board's (WCB) conservation partners pursuant to the California Wildlife Conservation Board Strategic Plan 2014 (Plan), Implementing Action #1, Dialogs on Conservation. In addition, this meeting fulfills Plan Implementing Action #2, Conservation Summit, by providing an opportunity for the statewide conservation community to offer input and comment on implementing actions proposed for adoption by WCB. A key objective of this meeting is to explore how the State can achieve greater conservation impact through the application of the relative priorities, skills, strength and resources of WCB, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and public and private conservation partners. Further, the meeting outlines WCB staff's recommendations for implementing Plan Implementation Actions 3, 4 and 5: Unified Application and Project Review Process, Comprehensive Program Review and Measuring Conservation Effectiveness, respectively. WCB staff seeks confirmation and direction from the Board regarding the strategies, actions and priority project selection criteria proposed today to guide WCB staff over the next five years.

I. Introduction

WCB was created by legislation in 1947 to administer a capital outlay program for wildlife conservation and related public recreation. Since that time, the WCB has allocated over two billion dollars in State and federal funds for habitat conservation, restoration and outdoor recreation. The programs administered by the WCB have expanded over the decades, each defined by legislative or voter intent, fund requirements, and diverse conservation goals and objectives. In 2012, the WCB recognized the need for a Strategic Plan to document existing processes and identify new approaches to facilitate effective project selection and administration in the future. The WCB Board adopted the Plan in August, 2014.

The Plan provides a high-level blueprint for WCB decision making, and establishes the primary framework for implementing the WCB vision over five years (FY 2014-2019). The Plan represents a rational and disciplined approach to articulate policy level priorities, strategic actions and measures of WCB performance and success. The first of its kind for WCB, the Plan presents the WCB mission and vision statements, guiding principles and goals. These elements, which are supported by the plan's strategic directions and high-level framework for performance-based management, are designed to help ensure the continued success and effectiveness of WCB stewardship of California conservation dollars.

The WCB serves and works with many partners, including other State agencies, federal agencies and non-governmental organizations. It was critical to engage these stakeholders in the development of the Plan, and the final Plan reflects input from stakeholders and the public. The Plan identifies five implementing actions that, once completed, are designed to assist the WCB in carrying out the Plan by:

- Articulating clear goals and objectives both for WCB and the programs it administers;
- Recognizing and identifying approaches to integrate larger landscape scale conservation efforts into WCB activities, such as climate change adaptation, linkages/connectivity,

infrastructure mitigation, and integration with federal, state, local agency and non-profit conservation initiatives;

- Defining strategies that adhere to legal mandates but also ensure a transparent, integrated process for ranking and selecting projects across program areas; and
- Establishing metrics for measuring, monitoring, and reporting the activities and progress of WCB programs.

The Plan is divided into five sections: i) Introduction, ii) The California Conservation Landscape: Key Trends and Strategic Issues, iii) Strategic Plan Framework, iv) Strategic Directions, and v) Implementing Actions. The five chapters are described below:

- Introduction – Section I provides a brief history of WCB and gives an overview of the organization and its authorities, identifies statewide and regional plans and initiatives that provide a foundation for the WCB project selection process, and describes the existing WCB programs.
- The California Conservation Landscape – Section II of the Plan provides WCB’s view on the current challenges and opportunities facing California’s conservation community, and outlines six strategic issues as fundamental to WCB’s ability to fulfill its mission: (1) a State Conservation Vision, (2) WCB’s role in furthering that vision, (3) WCB’s project evaluation and selection processes, (4) monitoring for success, (5) identifying long-term stable funding, and (6) providing clear communication and outreach.
- The Strategic Plan Framework – Section III sets out WCB’s Mission, Vision, Values, Guiding Principles, Strategic Priorities, and Goals and Performance Measures.
- Strategic Directions – Section IV of the Plan provides specific direction on the five goals identified within the Plan: (A) Environmental Protection and Conservation, (B) Environmental Restoration and Enhancement, (C) Public Use and Recreation, (D) Public Awareness and Education, and (E) Fiscal and Organizational Effectiveness. For each of these goals, the Plan identifies potential performance measures and objectives that can be measured to help determine progress over time.
- Finally, the Plan outlined five high-level Implementing Actions that WCB will take to complement and support the strategies, actions and priority project selection identified within the Plan. These Implementing Actions are:
 - 1) Dialogs on Conservation,
 - 2) Conservation Summit,
 - 3) Unified Application and Project Review Process,
 - 4) Comprehensive Program Review, and
 - 5) Measuring Conservation Effectiveness.

Progress on the implementing actions to date, include all the following:

- 1) Dialogs on Conservation –completed – findings presented below
- 2) Conservation Summit – today’s meeting
- 3) Unified Application and Project Review Process – recommendations developed and presented below - subject to additional input from this Conservation Summit and approval by the Board

- 4) Comprehensive Program Review - recommendations developed and presented below - subject to additional input from this Conservation Summit and approval by the Board
- 5) Measuring Conservation Effectiveness - recommendations developed and presented below - subject to additional input from this Conservation Summit and approval by the Board.

II. IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS - FINDINGS

1) Dialogs in Conservation

Implementing Action 1 of the Plan calls for WCB staff to seek input from its conservation partners on priority conservation issues and targets of opportunity including the following four key areas:

1. Unified Application and Project Review Process: the WCB project funding application process including project selection criteria, clarity and consistency of funding application forms and ways and means of improving transparency in project funding and property appraisals;
2. Comprehensive Program Review: analysis of existing WCB conservation funding programs to determine how programs can be made more strategic and aligned with high priority conservation issues;
3. Measuring Conservation Effectiveness: best practices in measuring the effectiveness of conservation programs; and
4. Conservation Vision: a long range conservation vision for the State of California and WCB's role in achieving that conservation vision.

PROCESS: WCB staff sent a survey out to 93 conservation partners from 80 organizations who have long-term experience with WCB's funding programs. The survey contained ten specific questions (Exhibit A) related to the four key topics outlined above.

Additionally, WCB undertook a series of dialogs and iterative conversations with 33 representatives of 22 organizations that protect or restore habitats, or who facilitate these activities. The representatives, which included a number of staff with CDFW and other governmental agencies, were individuals with broad experience in developing, evaluating and implementing habitat protection and restoration projects within their own organizations.

FINDINGS: Overall, the responses from the surveys and interviews were generally positive. Most found our processes, procedures and priorities to be understandable, transparent and fair. Many had suggestions on how WCB could improve to achieve greater conservation impact. The following outlines the key issues and findings from the survey and interviews conducted in the spring and summer of 2016.

Issue 1. Unified Application and Project Review Process

LAE/CAPP Process

- Some respondents were unclear on the distinction between processes that CDFW and WCB use for Land Acquisition Evaluations (LAE) and Conceptual Area Protection Plans

(CAPP) and how those processes differ from WCB's direct application process which do not require that a LAE or CAPP be prepared. However, respondents familiar with the LAE/CAPP process understood how CAPPs prioritize acquisitions over fairly broad regions of the State, and suggested that CDFW should include more areas of the state within CAPPs.

Direct Applications to WCB

- Respondents also evaluated WCB's existing applications, and found that while there was some redundancy in the questions, the applications generally worked. Partners appreciated WCB staff's willingness to assist in application processes, and most considered the applications to be easy to understand and complete.
- Respondents to the question about comparing WCB's existing application process with the new Proposition 1 Streamflow Enhancement Program guidelines and application found the new procedures more complicated, redundant, and cumbersome than those for other WCB programs. Most expressed some frustration with the Prop. 1 process, but appreciated the assistance and cooperation on the part of WCB staff. Many expressed a desire for more direct interactions with WCB staff concerning project merit, but understood the need for the program to provide transparency and fairness.
- Respondents stated that, in general, grantees should be fully responsible for assuring projects are well designed, well situated, likely to be successful and cost effective, and that WCB is responsible for assuring that the commitments of the grantees are met, and that the projects are completed as planned.

Transparency

- No comments were received regarding the WCB appraisal process. This may indicate the WCB Appraisal Review and Disclosure Policy (Policy), adopted by the Board in May 2012 and amended March 2013 has been accepted; however, without any responses specific to the appraisal process it is impossible to know at this point. Since implementation of the appraisal policy, four projects have been subject to the Policy. While there were no substantial issues with any of the four appraisals, the additional transparency in the purchase of real property on larger projects provide additional transparency in the spending of State funds and should help ensure public confidence in the appraisal process.

Issue 2. Comprehensive Program Review

WCB currently has eleven Programs: Land Acquisition; Natural Heritage Preservation Tax Credit; Ecosystem Restoration on Agricultural Lands; Forest Conservation; Habitat Enhancement and Restoration; Oak Woodlands; Public Access; Rangeland, Grazing Land and Grassland Protection; California Riparian Habitat Conservation; Streamflow Enhancement; and Inland Wetlands Conservation. Responses relative to a review of WCB's programs are as follows:

- When asked if these eleven programs were sufficient to achieve priority conservation goals, 88% said yes.
- However, several respondents said that the State as a whole lacks focused, specific and measurable priority conservation goals and, without them, program review is difficult.

- Respondents also expressed a desire for more direction within programs, or a desire for new programs, that emphasize projects that provide landscape or watershed level benefits.
- Finally, several respondents expressed a desire for more funding for all the programs, but especially for those on working landscapes. WCB is one of only a few public funding agencies that provide opportunities for organizations working in agriculture and forestry.

Issue 3. Measuring Conservation Effectiveness

Monitoring was consistently considered to be important by all respondents. All thought that baseline reports and regular monitoring reports should be a part of all, or nearly all, projects. There were four broad areas of concern when it came to monitoring, as follows:

- Success cannot be monitored if there are no specific and measurable goals for projects.
- The amount of monitoring, and which projects should be monitored, was a matter of concern. Respondents suggested that all projects should be monitored for compliance (i.e., the acquired property remains relatively unchanged from, or better than, the baseline, or the restored habitats appear healthy), but not necessarily for success (e.g., desired species are present or rebounding as a result of the project).
- Related to the above, there was widespread concern for implementing long-term monitoring for success without dedicated long-term funding provided by the funding agency.
- Finally, there was some concern that grantees do not have the expertise or impartiality to appropriately monitor their own projects, and to provide accurate monitoring reports.

Issue 4. Conservation Vision

Conservation partners and CDFW staff who participated in the survey, dialogs and conversations provided critical information on how WCB should focus and prioritize its acquisition, restoration and enhancement activities. The following are their suggestions:

- The highest priority conservation needs identified in the surveys were linkages/connectivity, water resources protection and restoration, and resilience and adaptation to impacts of climate change. There is great overlap in these, for example connectivity is important to reducing impacts of climate change, as is protecting water resources.
- Linkages and connectivity refer to linking or connecting two or more relatively large blocks of natural landscape (that individually may or may not be of sufficient size to be self-sustaining and are, ideally, protected) by ecological connections that support movement of most native animal and plant species. The desired outcome is a resultant total acreage of the blocks and connection that is self-sustaining in the long-term and large enough to sustain populations of species of greatest conservation need and advance their recovery, while also supporting keystone species. The more robust the linkage the more effective the connectivity and, therefore, more desirable.

- Water resources include improvements in the quality, timing or amount of water supplied to benefit fish and wildlife, and the protection and restoration of wetlands and riparian habitats.
- Climate resilience includes water and connectivity activities, but also protection and restoration of landscapes that allow for the greater movement of plants and animals, areas of refugia, or protection of lands with high concentrations of endemic species.
- On a second tier, but also considered very important by respondents, was the concept of increasing protection for under protected ecological regions and under protected vegetation types.
- A third tier of identified conservation priorities included access for recreation, benefits to underserved communities, and comprehensive planning efforts, such as NCCPs and HCPs.
- Habitat sustainability, that is, blocks large enough to maintain natural processes without significant, continued and costly management, was considered to be a central consideration.
- Respondents opined that small, isolated lands are, in most cases, of questionable resource value in the long-term.
- Respondents thought that projects should be evaluated not only on their habitat values but on the entire suite of “Ecosystem Services,” they provide, which include the full range of benefits people obtain from ecosystems. Such services include ecosystem goods (trees, fiber), purification of water and air, flood mitigation, climate stability, all biodiversity, decomposition of waste, pollination and seed dispersal, soil fertility, recreation and more.

III. IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS - RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WCB's BOARD TO CONSIDER ADOPTING

The following recommendations were assembled based upon survey responses and staff's dialogs with stakeholders. The proposed recommendations, if adopted by the Board, would be used to guide WCB staff through FY 2018/19 in improving internal processes, ensuring transparency of project selection processes, developing more strategic funding programs, and expanding measurement of the conservation effectiveness of WCB programs. The Conservation Vision at the beginning of this section provides the basis for all recommendations that follow.

Conservation Vision

Within the Conservation Vision, the following five priority areas are of highest significance. “Additional Priorities” and “Other Project Considerations,” as described below and incorporated into a project proposal, may enhance an already strong proposal.

Five Priority Areas

1. **Linkages/Connectivity**: This is identified as lands that link or link in part (assuming future connection possible) currently protected areas. Several regional plans have been completed, in addition to a Statewide Corridor Map developed by CDFW and Caltrans, that show to a greater or lesser extent and detail, the location of corridors that are critical to connecting existing habitat areas. The effectiveness of linkage, condition of habitat,

and overall size of the areas to be linked are significant factors. Linkages consistent with these factors are central to enabling species to adapt to impacts of climate change. Ecoregions with the greatest habitat fragmentation, and therefore the greatest need for linkages, should be a priority.

2. Climate change: Projects that provide adaptability and resilience to climate change could include any of the following: 1) acquisitions that measurably increase size of protected areas to provide greater movement for plant and animal species, or create refugia; 2) projects that provide transitional zones, including lands that increase gradients relative to elevation, soil complexity, water retention, latitude, or that allow for the migration of quality habitat and species facing direct loss from sea level rise; and 3) lands that increase or protect biodiversity by providing habitats for species of greatest conservation need, protect concentrations of endemics or protect or restore rare vegetation types. Finally, projects whose primary purpose is protection or restoration of native wildlife habitat or natural areas but also beneficially reduce or sequester greenhouse gas emissions should be considered.
3. Water resources: These include acquisitions and restoration projects that directly protect or restore water resources, or contribute to their protection. Examples include providing cold water, improving water quality, and increasing the amount of water or changing the timing of delivery to improve conditions for fish and wildlife, and could include any of the following:
 - listed salmonids and native fish assemblages in sustainable areas in healthy condition;
 - wetlands supporting waterbirds;
 - high quality riparian and other watershed lands; and
 - mountain meadows and desert oases;
4. NCCP/HCPs and CAPPs: Support existing NCCP/HCPs through protection of lands, and assist in the development of new NCCP/HCPs. Work with CDFW to develop more CAPPs where appropriate.
5. Public Access: Identify opportunities for passive recreational, hunting and fishing access consistent with primary purpose of acquisition. This priority includes projects that offer the potential for meaningful access for recreationally underserved urban communities. Access should provide a sense of inspiration for conservation and an element of education for young users.

Additional Priorities

Projects with the following characteristics will receive priority over those that lack them, however greater consideration will be given if a project falls within one or more of the above Five Priority Areas.

1. Working Landscapes: The ability to work on projects on farms, ranches and other private working lands is critical to WCB's success in providing significant benefits to the priority areas outlined above. Projects that provide a central element of a working landscape, while permanently conserving wildlife habitat and natural areas from conversion is key. Sensitive habitat areas should be protected. Public access compatible with property use and management should be encouraged.

2. Collaboration: Projects that provide meaningful long-term collaboration with other funders or land managers to accomplish priority actions or provide Ecosystem Services beyond those resulting solely from a grantee's project. Meaningful collaboration could take the form of expanded public access, joint restoration of adjacent lands, joint sediment control in a common watershed, expanded up/down stream improvements beyond project limits, etc.
3. Local and Regional Planning Efforts: Projects should support goals and objectives from these planning documents that are consistent with WCB's goals for the projects. High valued projects supported through these planning/review efforts receive priority, especially when within one or more of the above Five Priority Areas.
4. State Wildlife Action Plan, Water Plan 2016, California Natural Resources Agency's Climate Adaptation Strategy, 2014: Projects that serve to carry out specific recommendations within these Statewide plans will receive priority. Projects should address one or more of the Five Priority Areas above.

Other Project Considerations

The following, while not directly tied to WCB's mission of protecting, restoring, and enhancing natural resources for the public's use and enjoyment, do support its vision of empowering and inspiring current and future generations. As such, these criteria would be reason to consider protecting or restoring properties that may not provide the greatest wildlife benefits associated with projects that fall within the five priority areas listed above. Projects that do address the following and one of the Five Priority Areas above will receive priority.

1. Educational benefits: Projects that include on-site programs tied to educational opportunities for grade 3 and up in natural resources or conservation that link to appropriate state or local science standards.
2. Interpretation offerings: Projects that include on-site programs for the general public that provide exposure to, and understanding of, natural resources or conservation through guided hikes, self-guided interpretive trails, apps for understanding on-site values, informational panels/kiosks or similar activities.
3. Volunteer efforts: Projects that include the following efforts using volunteers:
 - a. Docent program to facilitate public exposure to natural resources of property.
 - b. Property management including patrols, public safety measures, property maintenance, trail construction, interpretation and education.
 - c. Use of volunteers to help implement restoration projects.

Unified Application and Project Review Process.

Strategies

LAE/CAPP Process - WCB will work with CDFW to develop a streamlined comprehensible process for creation and approval of LAEs and CAPPs consistent with WCB's Conservation Vision discussed above. Most land and water acquisitions are evaluated through LAEs or CAPPs, which are prepared by or under the direction of CDFW, before coming to WCB for implementation. An ongoing effort currently underway within CDFW to evaluate and streamline

the processes for LAEs and CAPPs provides opportunity for WCB staff to provide input into the process.

Direct Applications to WCB - Evaluate existing direct applications (for acquisitions under the Oaks, Rangeland, and Forest Programs, and for all restoration and public access projects) for clarity, redundancy and consistency in order to develop a unified application, where appropriate.

Transparency - Transparency in WCB operations, project ranking and selection processes needs to be clearly articulated.

Actions

LAE/CAPP Process - September 2016 -June 2017.

- Develop and implement a streamlined CAPP/LAE process with CDFW and try to achieve consistency between CDFW's process and WCB's Conservation Vision.
- Provide guidelines to all our stakeholders on new processes.

Direct Applications to WCB - September 2016 – December 2016.

- Evaluate all direct applications for focus, clarity and redundancy as well as consistency with priority project selection criteria.
- Consolidate the six existing applications to the extent possible.
- Modify applications to encourage applicants to advance the five priority focus areas as outlined above under Conservation Vision.
- Create a fully competitive grant program for the Public Access Program, based on WCB's experience with the Proposition 1 Streamflow Enhancement Program. Phase in other programs over the following year as appropriate.
- Prepare a public access handbook by June 2017 to assist grantees in considering access options for all project types, including acquisitions, restorations and construction of public access facilities.
- Collaborate closely with other funding organizations to provide greater ecosystem benefits.
- Update website as soon as Program application processes are initiated.

Transparency

- Continue to provide feedback to grantees when applications are rejected.
- Maintain and update FAQs on the WCB website.
- Maintain and regularly update Programs and funding information on the WCB website.
- Provide project information on WCB website.
- Maintain existing WCB Appraisal Review and Disclosure Policy.

Comprehensive Program Review.

Strategies

While the existing programs are broad enough to allow for most types of acquisition or restoration projects to be initiated, they may not provide the focus to be easily understood by stakeholders and to address WCB's priority areas for protection and restoration as identified in this document. The following strategies are proposed.

- Programs must support the proposed Conservation Vision above.

- Programs must be clear and focused.

Actions - September 2016 – February 2017.

- Evaluate which programs can be modified without new legislation.
- Determine what modifications would provide the clearest guidance to stakeholders.
- Consolidate, combine, or recommend creation of new Programs based on the proposed Conservation Vision.
- Evaluate the changes to the applications, and modify Programs as appropriate.

Measuring Conservation Effectiveness.

Strategies

Survey respondents identified four broad areas for improvement in determining effectiveness of WCB conservation actions: identifying measurable goals for projects, determining which projects should be monitored and to what level, providing for the long-term costs of monitoring, and ensuring the ability of organizations to effectively monitor the work. The following are the recommended strategies to address each of these areas for improvement.

- Existing baseline report standards should be evaluated to determine effectiveness for providing sufficient information to monitor compliance ;
- Projects should have specific and measurable outcomes;
- Apply the best available science and best practices for projects that are adaptively managed and could contribute to the current body of knowledge;
- Tracking and evaluating the performance of conservation investments should be cost effective.

Actions - September 2016-June 2017.

1. Continue to monitor all projects for compliance.
 - Modify existing monitoring forms and, with support from IT, develop more effective web-based monitoring methodology to allow direct integration with WCB database.
2. Convene a WCB/CDFW technical team to devise a monitoring plan that includes the following:
 - For grants for acquisition projects, evaluate existing minimum requirements for baseline reports, modify them as necessary, and require those of all grantees.
 - For restoration projects, identify and define measurable outcomes specific to the types of habitats restored.
 - For restoration projects, require more data-rich final reports which will be used as a comparison document for future monitoring.
 - Identify projects that would be most likely to contribute to the body of knowledge for conservation actions through adaptive management, and concentrate resources on a more comprehensive monitoring approach for these projects.

3. Develop more cost-effective monitoring methods with grantees and other funders.
 - Prepare guidance documents for monitoring, conduct training as necessary and include these requirements in applications.
 - Encourage grantees to pursue endowments to be used for monitoring and maintenance.
 - Advise grantees of other opportunities for funding monitoring activities (e.g., grants for services, work with other granting organizations to share responsibilities).

Future Conservation Advancements - The above represents recommended priorities for conservation actions through FY 2019. A long range vision for California and WCB should consider identifying a system of landscape reserve areas, representing all ecological regions, for conservation priority. Such a system should build around large acreages of existing protected areas. Planning for such a vision of conservation in California could be led by CDFW, possibly in partnership with the California Strategic Growth Council. The above priorities could be the foundation in taking this formal conservation step.

PERSONS WITH DISABILITES

Persons with disabilities needing reasonable accommodation to participate in public meetings or other CDFW activities are invited to contact the Department's Reasonable Accommodation Coordinator Melissa Carlin at (916) 651-1214 or Melissa.Carlin@wildlife.ca.gov. Reasonable Accommodation requests for facility and/or meeting accessibility should be received by August 20, 2016. Requests for American Sign Language Interpreters should be submitted at least two weeks prior to the event, and requests for Real-Time Captioners at least four weeks prior to the event. These timeframes are to help ensure that the requested accommodation is met. If a request for an accommodation has been submitted but is no longer needed, please contact the Reasonable Accommodation Coordinator immediately.

3. Exhibit A – Survey Questions

Strategic Plan, Dialogs in Conservation

For property acquisitions, do you understand the distinction between the procedures to acquire property through the WCB/CDFW Land Acquisition Evaluation (LAE) or Conceptual Area Protection Plan (CAPP) processes and those procedures to acquire property through a direct application to WCB?

For those programs that allow for direct application to WCB, did the application ask the right questions to identify critical needs; is it incomplete, redundant or irrelevant; and was it easy to understand?

If you have experience with the new application process for the Proposition 1 California Stream Flow Enhancement Program, how does your experience with this process compare with your experiences with other processes for applying for WCB funding?

Are the eleven WCB Programs (Acquisitions, Natural Heritage Preservation Tax Credit, Ecosystem Restoration on Agricultural Lands, Forest, Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Oaks, Public Access, Rangeland, Riparian Habitat, Streamflow Enhancement, and Inland Wetlands) sufficient to most strategically achieve State priority conservation goals?

Are WCB monitoring requirements clear? Reasonable? Adequate?

If you have a monitoring program of your own, what type(s) of projects (e.g., land acquisition, restoration, public access) do you monitor, what factors do you evaluate, and how often do you monitor?

For WCB grants (both acquisition and restoration), what should WCB's Grantees' role be, and what should WCB be responsible for? Should projects have a baseline report and annual monitoring reports required as part of the granting process?

Rate the following conservation objectives: 1 – very important, 2 – important.

- Linkages/connectivity
- Adaptation to climate change
- Wetland, riparian, water resources
- Under-protected ecological regions
- Under-protected vegetation types
- NCCP, MSHCP, HCP planning efforts
- Access to fishing, hunting, and passive recreation
- Other (please specify)

How would you, or how do you, identify projects that could ameliorate or provide resilience to climate change?

Do you regularly use the following Statewide planning documents: CDFW State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP 2015), the California Water Action Plan, and the Natural Resource Agency's

California Climate Adaptation Strategy? What other strategic planning efforts do you regularly use in your project planning?