


Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Collaborative Monitoring Survey

5 responses

1. Indicate participation in the ACCG collaborative process.

5 responses




Comments:

0 responses

No responses yet for this question.

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

5 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?

5 responses




Comments:

0 responses

No responses yet for this question.

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 responses



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

5 responses



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

5 responses



● Yes

● No

● N/A


Comments:

0 responses

No responses yet for this question.

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

4 responses



● Yes

● No

Comments:


2 responses

N/A

Somewhat

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


N/A

Somewhat

The proposed action should be developed jointly by the ACCG and Forest Service per the CFLRA, not pushed into an alternative.

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

4 responses



Comments:

3 responses


N/A

Alternative was identified in draft decision.

Somewhat

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

5 responses




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:


2 responses

To be determined.

ACCG objected, Participation was through ACCG.

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

2 responses



Comments:


2 responses

N/A

To be determined.

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

5 responses




Comments:

To be determined.

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

2 responses



Comments:


2 responses

N/A

To be determined.

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

4 responses



Comments:


2 responses

To be determined.

The FS wasted considerable ACCG member time and \$, and FS staff time, developing a comprehensive alternative that it then rejected. While it appears that some of the ecological framework developed will be tested in limited locations, this project was not collaborative and did not address ACCG member concerns.

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

5 responses



11. Overall Comments to Survey

5 responses

The Amador Ranger District did an outstanding job of being transparent and accommodating throughout the process. Some ACCG members were not fully transparent about their objections to the purpose and needs and their absolute objection to herbicides until too late in the process was very frustrating.

Maybe some projects won't be consensus and the sooner that is identified the better.

To be determined.

No explanation provided.

Throughout the development of this project, it was clear that the FS silviculturists are highly biased to using conventional methods. FS staff was at times openly hostile to ACCG concerns and participation and after encouraging ACCG members to develop an alternative, they rejected it. Really bad experience contrary to the intent of the CFLR.

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

Google Forms