


Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Collaborative Monitoring Survey

8 responses

1. Indicate participation in the ACCG collaborative process.

8 responses




Comments:

0 responses

No responses yet for this question.

2. What groups do you participate in? Please check all that apply.

8 responses




Comments:

0 responses

No responses yet for this question.

3a. What type of meeting did you attend where project planning for above mentioned project was discussed?

8 responses




Comments:

1 response

Project name needs to be Big and bold at the top of the survey, not just written in the small print.

3b. If yes, what part of the planning process?

8 responses




Comments:

0 responses

No responses yet for this question.


4. Did you feel like you had enough time and background information to contribute to project development?

8 responses



5. Are you satisfied with the amount of collaborative input into project planning?

8 responses



6a. Were your concerns about the project expressed to project proponents? If No Concerns skip to Question 7.

7 responses



Comments:


2 responses

Not applicable.

No amount of collaborative "input" will make up for lack of that input being heard and addressed. Suggest you rephrase that question.

6b. Were your concerns resolved before the project proponent published its proposed action or were concerns incorporated into proposed action?

5 responses




Comments:

1 response

N/A

6c. If your concerns were not addressed in the proposed action, did the project proponent include them in an action alternative?

4 responses



Comments:

3 responses


Not applicable.

N/A

I don't believe so.

6d. If your concerns were addressed in an alternative, did the project proponent select that alternative in the final project decision?

3 responses



Comments:


3 responses

N/A (2)

can;t remember

6e. To what degree did you support the selected alternative?

5 responses




Comments:

1 response

N/A

7a. After the decision, did you participate in the objection process? If No continue to Question 9.

8 responses



Comments:

4 responses

This project was analyzed before we transitioned to the objection process.


N/A

Not sure. Didn't respond to this.

But I'm not sure.

7b. If yes, did you support the final ACCG pre-decision comment letter?

4 responses



Comments:

3 responses

But the letter did not address my concerns, so submitted a separate letter.

Letter showed divisiveness among ACCG. Not strong one way or the other.

N/A

8a. Did you submit a separate comment letter? If No continue to Question 9.

8 responses

Comments:


2 responses

N/A

Actually, not sure.

8b. If yes, did your letter support or oppose the proposed action?

3 responses




Comments:

0 responses

No responses yet for this question.

9. Do you believe the project proponent's final decision adequately addressed ACCG members' and participants' concerns?

7 responses



Comments:

0 responses

No responses yet for this question.

10. On this project select the area that you think could have been improved.

8 responses

Early involve... —2 (25%)

11. Overall Comments to Survey

6 responses

Survey might include county of residence. There are too many ACCG projects, so I focus on those in my county. Living in Calaveras, I don't track Foster Firs. Knowing county of residence, you could give more weight to responses from the Amador participants.

I don't recall any controversy on Foster Firs and would spend less time on this project.

1) Need to more honest with one another, especially amongst those of us that actively participated in the field trips -- decommissioning roads and the arbitrary non-scientific 30" maximum for tree harvesting is a big deal for some. Debate is a good thing, especially early on. 2) Those that do not participate in the field trips and development process should be given less weight when developing the final ACCG comment letter. (3) The belief among many in the ACCG that GTR 220/237 is the Gospel rather than a guide, along with the misunderstanding that the documents only deal with the ecological component of sustainability.

No comments.

Amador Ranger District did an excellent job of being transparent and accommodating throughout the process kept focus on fuels reduction and improving forest health.

Cradle to grave participation, not last minute interest/objection

The Amador Ranger District could never really justify taking out so many large, old red fir and largely ignored the concerns of ACCG members and participants.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google. Report Abuse - Terms of Service - Additional Terms

Google Forms