- i-	Mariharia Qualitar	Indicator (bracketed letter corresponds to bulleted list in proposal; asterisk indicates		Deter Trans and County		Potential Update
Торіс	Monitoring Questions	possibility to create in the near term)	Metrics	Data Type and Source	Decision-Making Audience & Purpose	Frequency
Multiple (flood protection, access, water quality)	Multiple (see Monitoring Qs for flood protection, access, water quality)	[A] Map of existing and potential wetland restoration projects for flood protection, water quality improvement, wildlife habitat, and public access, overlaid with EJ map*	% of total projects and funding for projects providing each benefit for EJ and non-EJ communities	Restoration project data (SFBRA; later addition of Project Tracker data); EJ map TBD	Funders: Evaluating equity in distribution of existing projects, selecting new projects	Annual
	What level of flood risk reduction are wetlands and wetland projects providing to nearby communities around the estuary? How do levels of flood risk reduction from wetlands vary between EJ communities and	[C] Map of wetland wave attenuation metrics (modeled capacity to attenuate waves),	% of wetlands, by subregion and location relative to EJ and non-EJ communities, that are wide enough to		Restoration implementers: Justifying projects providing flood risk	Every 5 years (aligned with baylands habitat
Flood risk reduction	other communities?	overlaid with EJ map*	protect from waves	EJ map TBD	reduction	mapping)
					Funders: Selecting new projects providing access improvements and suggesting amenities/features that are lacking in the area;	
Inclusive access	How is wetland access, including quality of access, distributed around the estuary? How does access vary between EJ communities and other	[B] Map of wetlands with nearby public access* and key amenities/features, overlaid with EJ	Trail miles (or density) and amenities score for wetlands or wetland- adjacent shorelines near EJ and non-EJ	Bay Trail map, amenities & features on OpenStreetMap (and other publicly-available sources);	Regulators: Suggesting amenities/features that are lacking in the area; Community orgs: Advocating for new projects; Restoration implementers: Justifying projects providing access	
	communities?	map	communities	EJ map TBD	improvements	Every 5 years
Inclusive access	At wetland sites where public access is allowed, what are levels, types, and demographics of usage?	[G] Spatial and temporal trends in visitation estimates*, visitor origins, reasons for visiting, and demographics	# of visitors (summarized by subregion), visitor demographics vs Bay Area resident demographics	Initially, existing data from East Bay Parks (& other park districts). Later data TBD by workgroup (possibly surveys at select wetland sites or cell phone tracking data)	Funders: Evaluating whether access is equitable based on who is visiting projects, suggesting amenities/features based on the primary uses of a site, communicating about value of projects; Regulators: Suggesting amenities/features (or hours of operation) based on the primary uses of a site; Land managers: Evaluating whether efforts to improve equitable access (new features, programs, etc.) result in changes to visitor #s or demographics	Every 3-5 years
Engagement, Learning, & Stewardship	To what degree are communities and Tribes involved in wetland stewardship, learning, and engagement activities, and what are the demographics of those involved?	[F] Temporal trends in projects following better practices for community & Tribal outreach and partnerships	% of projects reporting public meetings, % of projects reporting targeted outreach strategy, % of projects with funding allocated to community or Tribal partners	Reported to funders as part of proposals or final reports	Funders: Evaluating progress on improvements recommended by the public/community orgs, evaluating alignment with Justice40 and other equity goals	Every 2-3 years
	To what degree are communities and Tribes involved in wetland stewardship, learning, and engagement activities, and what are the demographics of those involved?	[H] Temporal trends in representative participation in stewardship and education events/programs	#s of annual participants, participant demographics vs Bay Area resident demographics	Reported to funders or WRMP by programs (Save the Bay, Grassroots Ecology, etc.)	Funders: Evaluating whether funded projects are serving communities equitably, communicating about the value of projects; Managers: Understanding whether their programs/events are reaching target audiences, learning from others that successfully reach certain audiences to inform future efforts	Annual

Engagement, Learning, & Stewardship		[D] Temporal trends in proportion of wetland decision-makers from underrepresented groups*	% of restoration practitioners & committee members representing EJ communities or Tribes, % of restoration practitioners & committee members identifying as people of colo or other underrepresented identities	r (e.g. project managers of	Committee managers: Evaluating progress on improvements recommended by the public/community orgs	Every 2-3 years
					Funders: Selecting new projects providing water quality improvements (e.g. improved tidal flow/flushing);	
	How does water quality in wetlands proximate to EJ communities compare with water quality in	[E] Map of basic water quality metrics	Proportion of sites falling into categories (low/poor, moderate/fair,	Bay RMP nearshore sediment contaminant data, future WRMP-	Community groups, project implementers: Advocating for/highlighting need for projects that address areas with persistently low DO;	TBD, depends
Water quality	wetlands proximate to other communities?	(dissolved oxygen) and nearshore sediment contaminants, overlaid with EJ map*	high/good) for EJ and non-EJ communities	collected basic water quality data	Community groups? Evaluating where accessible shoreline areas may be unsafe for certain uses or need contaminant testing	on available data