
Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Collaborative Monitoring Survey

5 responses

1. Indicate participation in the ACCG collaborative process.

5 responses




Comments:

1 response

USFS - Stanislaus NF, founding ACCG member

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




1 response

Participation in other groups on a limited basis as needed

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






1 response

Multiple meetings over a 2-3 year period

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

5 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?



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





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




1 response

I felt that ACCG early involvement in development of the proposed action was key to the successful outcome of objection review and decision processes

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






Comments:

I felt that the agency resolved ACCG concerns before publishing the proposed action, but that may only be my perception

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






Comments:

1 response

n/a

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




1 response

n/a

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






Comments:

0 responses

No responses yet for this question.

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

5 responses



Comments:

0 responses

No responses yet for this question.

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




1 response

I felt the ACCG comment letter was concise and very helpful as we moved toward objection review and decision processes

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






Comments:

1 response

not applicable for agency rep

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

1 response



Comments:

1 response

n/a

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




2 responses

Yes and No

I may be biased, but I felt that the agency decision addressed ACCG members' and participants' concerns

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

5 responses



11. Overall Comments to Survey

5 responses

Out of all the projects our center has been involved in the ACCG process this one was the most responsive in developing project elements that reflected the input of ACCG members.

Need continued support for more implementation within Hemlock footprint.

Calaveras Ranger District should be more aggressive in generating revenue from stewardship projects. Avoiding lawsuits is only one measure of success. pace and scale is another measure.

Excellent example of collaborative planning by the FS, which actively engaged the ACCG in project development.

project could have been improved in finding a way to arrive at the selected alternative in a shorter timeframe

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

Google Forms