**Assessment instrument questions: FOR LARGER COLLABORATIVES**

We are happy to invite you to participate in this self-evaluation. You and your partners are being considered for Regional Forest and Fire Capacity Program (RFFCP) Round 3 funding in the areas of capacity building and/or project development.

* ***Definition of LARGER COLLABORATIVES*** *(formal and informal):* 
  + *You are planning and implementing* ***Landscape Level projects****. High-severity wildfire, tree mortality, and other major forest disturbances increasingly occur across large landscapes (tens to hundreds of thousands of acres). A landscape scale project is defined as one that is at least one order of magnitude bigger than a single project (usually a maximum of thousands of acres). While there is no strict acreage minimum, landscapes are generally expected to be at least the size of Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) 10 watershed. The landscape should also meet ecological considerations (e.g., watershed, fireshed, etc.).*

**How to Take this Assessment:**

* First, select a small team to work on the Assessment.
  + We suggest that you include representatives from various types of agencies, organizations, tribes, and other stakeholders involved in your partnership or collaborative. Choose the people who do not always agree!
  + **The goal is not to look good, it is to identify areas where your partnership, collaboration, or implementing organizations can improve!**
  + Once we’ve identified these areas, we can work together to develop a plan of action where you can maximize your effectiveness. This proposed plan of action and its anticipated outcomes can then be used to craft a proposal for a possible RFFCP Round 3 subgrant.
* The Assessment instrument has several sections focusing on the areas of capacity needed to identify, plan, and implement projects. More specifically, it is focused on those areas of capacity which give funding agencies confidence that you will be able to successfully implement a large-scale grant.
  + Please discuss these sections among your team and make your own notes about areas which could use improvements.
  + Try to identify specific activities that could result in these improvements (such as training, workshops, technical assistance, additional staffing, etc.).
  + Try to also identify ways in which you can document that these improvements were achieved (attendance at trainings and workshops, agreements and MOUs, pre- and post-evaluations, audits, etc.), which could become the ‘Deliverables’ of a grant agreement.
* We expect that it will take you and your team two to four weeks to complete the Assessment.
  + When you are done, we will schedule an opportunity for you to debrief with the SNC RFFCP program staff.
  + During this time, we will also talk to SNC Area Representatives and other staff who may have worked with your organizations, tribes, and partnerships. We will ask them for their assessment of your capacity issues and suggestions for ways to improve the effectiveness of your organizations, partnerships, and collaborations.
  + Remember, this is designed to help our partners generate the confidence of funders! As grant funders ourselves, we have a good perspective on what other funders may look for. We will bring in our perspective to help round out your proposed program of capacity building.
* Capacity Assessment categories below:
  + Collaboration Infrastructure in Your Planning Area
  + Projects Selection Process - Landscape Scale or Suite of Community Protection Projects
  + Project Implementation Planning - Landscape Scale or Suite of Community Protection Projects
  + Grant Administration and Financial Management
  + Assessment Monitoring and Evaluation

**Collaboration Infrastructure in Your Planning Area**

The goal of this section is to identify whether you have Collaborative Infrastructure that assures communication, stability, and mutual accountability, and which assures that stakeholders and tribes have a voice in decision-making.

Often this is accomplished through a formal forest collaborative where the participants enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding their participation.

In some cases, however, this collaboration takes place without this type of formal structure, usually through the efforts of one organization or agency which takes responsibility for communication with stakeholders and tribes. If this is the case in your area, there are a few options. You might be interested in formalizing the collaboration, in which case you can specify activities and deliverables related to that goal. Or you could choose to keep the structure informal. If that is the case, funders of landscape-level projects would probably want assurances that the communication, stability, and accountability of those informal relationships have been tested and found to be resilient. If you feel confident that this is the case, please give us some indications of this resilience. However, if this is an area where capacity building funding could assist, feel free to propose some activities and deliverables which the Round 3 grant could support.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions for Consideration** | **RESPONSE** |
| Do you participate in a formal or informal group (collaborative, partnership) which identifies priority forest health/wildfire protection projects in your area? | Yes. The Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG) is an informal, community-based group of diverse stakeholders focusing on a triple-bottom-line approach to environmental, economic and community issues, through working to create healthy forests and watersheds, fire-safe communities, and sustainable local economies. |
| If so, what is the area covered by this group? (Give the boundaries, such as counties, USFS forests or districts, watersheds, etc.) Are there adjacent areas which are not currently covered by a partnership/collaborative? Would it make sense to expand your group’s boundaries to cover these areas? | Historically, was primarily in the Upper Mokelumne River and Calaveras River watersheds east of Highway 49 within Calaveras and Amador counties.  But in more recent years the group has broadened their focus and footprint to include parts of the Upper Consumnes River, Upper Stanislaus River, and South Fork American River watersheds that intersect the USFS Eldorado National Forest Amador Ranger District and portions of the Stanislaus National Forest Calaveras Ranger District, covering Calaveras, Amador and Alpine Counties. |
| List the participants in this group and their affiliations. Do you feel like all the tribes and stakeholders are included? | See ACCG full lists of members, active participants, and past participant on the ACCG website [here on the About page under the Members & Participants section](https://acconsensus.org/about/). Many in our collaborative feel that we have not been able to engage tribes as effectively as we would like. While we attempt to communicate with tribes regularly on forest planning projects, the response is usually very limited. |
| Does your group feel that other stakeholders or tribes should be involved? If so,   * 1. Have you done outreach to the missing stakeholders or tribes?   2. What are the obstacles to getting a broader involvement?   3. In terms of tribal involvement, is there more that should or could be done to encourage this? (…such as stipends, more outreach, etc.) Are there any specific challenges which you could use help overcoming? | Yes, increasing membership and engagement with additional stakeholders and tribes is an ongoing need and priority. It is identified in ACCG’s 2023 Annual Priorities list [found here on the ACCG website](https://acconsensus.org/about/priorities/), outlined in the [ACCG’s current 5-year Strategic Plan](https://acconsensus.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/STRAT-PLAN-Update-10-21-2018-JMM.pdf) (2018-2023) which is being updated currently, and also in [ACCG’s Communication & Engagement Plan](https://acconsensus.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/FINAL-ACCG-Communication-and-Engagement-Plan_2021-07-08.pdf), which is a living document first developed in 2021, to guide ACCG’s communication, outreach and engagement, and education activities.  With that said the ACCG understands the challenges and obstacles that come with active engagement in an informal collaborative process, and understands that participation in the ACCG is both time consuming, and also requires that stakeholders and tribes have the resources and capacity to engage. Within the ACCG Administration, there is also the issue of capacity (e.g., funding, time, technical expertise) to perform a greater level of outreach to effectively grow the ACCG base.  The Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority (UMRWA)-USFS Forest Project Plan (FPP) Phase 2 Project (see the next section, *Project Selection Process* for more details on the project) Team have already taken steps to increase stakeholder and tribal engagement in the project through formation of a Stakeholder group, formation of a Technical Advisory Group, and development of a tribal engagement plan. These efforts have already led to increased engagement by some non-ACCG participating stakeholders. And although this hasn’t directly led to an increase in ACCG membership, it is broadening engagement in one of ACCG’s largest and highest priority landscape projects within the collaboratives’ footprint – FPP Phase 2. Ideally, increased engagement by non-ACCG stakeholders and tribes in the FPP Phase 2 project, might lead to increased engagement in the ACCG in the future.  There has been concerns raised by some ACCG members about using stipends to increase engagement in the ACCG. However, assistance in building capacity to perform a higher level of outreach to both tribes and other stakeholders is a current challenge as mentioned above, and might be a good first step in increasing ACCG’s outreach capacity. But in terms of the FPP Phase 2 Project, the FPP Phase 2 team sees value in exploring contracting with tribes and/or the use of stipends to increase tribal involvement in the project. Since the Phase 2 team is already experiencing some initial challenges with tribal engagement, the team sees value in exploring stipends and other approaches to help tribes build capacity to actively engage in the Phase 2 project. |
| List the functions of this group:   1. What do you do? 2. How often do you meet? 3. What subjects are discussed? 4. What kinds of decisions are made? 5. In your opinion, why do people show up to these meetings? Why do they care? 6. In your opinion, why do other people NOT show up to these meetings?   Are there improvements that could be made in the way the group operates that you think would attract a broader stakeholder group or make the group in general more effective? | a. As mentioned previously, the ACCG Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG) is an informal, community-based group of diverse stakeholders focusing on a triple-bottom-line approach to environmental, economic and community issues, through working to create healthy forests and watersheds, fire-safe communities, and sustainable local economies. ACCG members make decisions by consensus in support of projects and stewardship efforts by ACCG partners and operate under a voluntary, non-binding [Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)](https://acconsensus.org/memorandum-of-agreement-moa/). Support of projects can be simply providing letters of support, or can be assisting in the development of projects through the [ACCG’s Project Development and Support Process](https://acconsensus.org/work-groups-programs/project-development-support-process/).  b. ACCG general meetings are monthly on the 3rd Wednesday (virtually or in person). In addition, there are 4 active working groups that convene monthly, including the Administration Work Group, Monitoring Work Group, Planning Work Group, and an Ad Hoc group of the Planning Work Group, called the Forest Plan Amendment (FPP Phase 2) Ad Hoc.  c. ACCG general meetings are a time for information sharing and the time for ACCG members to provide input on projects as they are developed and to make consensus decisions on supporting proposed projects. Usually there is at least one guest presentation at each general meeting on a topic related to new, emerging science and research, projects, and other topics related to ACCG’s triple bottom line. Also, each month, the active working groups, mentioned above, provide brief updates on their efforts. There is also a roundtable update portion on each general meeting agenda, where everyone in attendance is given the opportunity to share information, update the collaborative on what they, or their organization, are doing, and an opportunity to seek new opportunities or develop new partnerships.  ACCG Administration Work Group meets monthly to provide management for executing the policies and decisions of the governance function, assures documentation and management of the organizations’ information and records, manages the balance between the ACCG’s different functions, oversees accountability, develops and manages procedures for the policies and practices of the ACCG.  ACCG Monitoring Work Group meets monthly to oversee and manage ACCG’s Monitoring program, which is a collaborative multi-party effort to provide ecological, economic, and social monitoring oversight to meet the objectives of the ACCG, and translate the benefits and lessons learned from restoration efforts to future management activities.  ACCG Planning Work Group meets monthly and reviews, discusses, and makes recommendations for policy and program development, and also designs implementation projects consistent with approved Policies and Principles, prepares project proposals, drafts position papers, assesses opportunities, and may engage in joint fact-finding (e.g., research and analysis, as needed).  ACCG Forest Plan Amendment (FPP Phase 2) Ad Hoc are tasked with discussing and finding common-ground language/ direction for the FPP Phase 2 project related to forest plan amendments that the ACCG would support.  Click here to go to the [ACCG’s Work Groups & Programs webpage](https://acconsensus.org/work-groups-programs/) to learn more.  d. As mentioned previously, consensus decisions are made in regards to support of projects. Support of projects can be simply providing letters of support, or can be assisting in the development of projects through the [ACCG’s Project Development and Support Process](https://acconsensus.org/work-groups-programs/project-development-support-process/).  e. ACCG participants attend the meetings and workgroups for partnership building, learning and knowledge sharing, interest in achieving ACCG’s triple-bottom-line, and to vet and develop their projects. Most of these participants are representing organizations doing business in the watershed and the participants are paid by these organizations because they believe ACCG adds value. There are also several private individuals who are members. All participants share the value of protecting the watershed and the community and minimizing the potential for the social and ecological disruption of catastrophic wildfires which have burned many adjacent areas.  f. ACCG participation is limited due to capacity (e.g., time, funding), scheduling conflict, and some think the decision-making process is to slow. The ACCG recently updated a SWOT analysis which identified collaboration challenges between boundaries (such as two national forests), the time-consuming consensus decision process, high turnover for some member organizations as weaknesses or threats. These may also be reasons that some people do not show up for meetings. |
| Is this group governed by a charter or MOU? (If so, please attach it to this assessment)   1. If the group is governed by a charter or MOU, please describe briefly when and how it was developed. Was there one or more leaders in that process? 2. If the group does not have a charter or MOU, have you discussed developing such a document? If yes, briefly describe such discussions (i.e., you decided you didn’t need one, you decided it might be good to have one in the future…). 3. If the group does not have a charter or MOU, what was the obstacle to developing such an instrument? 4. If the group does not have a charter or MOU and is not interested in developing one, how are members accountable to one another? | Yes. As mentioned previously, the ACCG operates under a voluntary, non-binding [Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)](https://acconsensus.org/memorandum-of-agreement-moa/). The purpose of the MOA is to provide a framework between the members of the ACCG for working together. This MOA provides clarity of intent, shared vision, membership eligibility and accountability, and basic policies and procedures for key organizational functions.  a. The original version of the MOA was approved in September 2010. The ACCG approved modifications extending the agreement to August 2015. Then the ACCG went through the process of updating the MOA and approved the revised version in July 2020. The ACCG Administrator along with the Administration Work Group headed the effort to revise the MOA that was approved in 2020.  b. Not applicable.  c. Not applicable.  d. Not applicable. |
| Regardless of what formal or informal agreements are in place, how confident are the group’s members that it will be sustainable and will fulfill obligations to partners and be accountable? What are your concerns or reservations? | * Administering the ACCG (including scheduling and organizing meetings, drafting minutes, updating key documents, managing the website, etc.) has been funded opportunistically by grants. This may not be sustainable. * Others concerns/reservations – need input from ACCG. |
| Does your partnership or your Planning Area have any specific obstacles or challenges to developing strong collaborative infrastructure? How could an RFFCP grant help you address those obstacles or challenges? | * Consistent, long-term funding of the ACCG Administrator to ensure the collaborative continues to operate and function. * Additionally, bring on an ACCG Capacity Coordinator (aka Watershed Coordinator, Stewardship Coordinator), who would perform potential functions like, * Directly engage with ACCG and non-ACCG stakeholders and local tribes (e.g., attend tribal meetings, meet with RCD staff, attend Task Force Meetings). * Develop and maintain ACCG all-lands landscape project portfolio to assist local entities (e.g., RCDs, FSCs) and other ACCG partners strategically develop projects. * Draft, develop grant applications for ACCG partners. * Assist with management of FPP Phase 2 implementation projects, and other ACCG partner projects, to help with partner capacity issues. * ACCG members, like UMRWA and others, would consider contributing funds to help support the above roles. * Continuing moving forward and ensuring there is adequate funding to continue in the development of the FPP Phase 2 large-landscape project, a key priority for the ACCG. |
| Based on your answers to these questions, what additional capacities would you like to see developed locally in the area of Collaborative Infrastructure? What are the staff, consultant, and technical assistance resources which would help you do this? | Reiterating what’s already been mentioned in terms of Collaborative Infrastructure capacity building needs:   * Consistent, long-term funding of the ACCG Administrator position. * Bringing on an ACCG Capacity Coordinator, as mentioned above. * Building capacity to increase outreach capabilities to non-ACCG stakeholders and tribes to increase engagement and grow the member base. * Ensuring there is adequate funding to continue in the development of the FPP Phase 2 large-landscape planning project, a key priority for the ACCG. |

**Projects Selection Process** - Landscape Scale Project(s) and/or Comprehensive Community Protection

The goal of this section is to assess your project selection process. Project funders like to know that the project selection process started with the development of clear project selection criteria, and that a broad range of stakeholders and tribes were involved in that process.

Funders also like to see a good use of data and tools, such as LiDAR information, Decision Support Tools, etc. in addition to local knowledge.

If there are local tribes which could play a role in the implementation or management of a project, this is also of interest.

If you feel that there are improvements that could be made to your project selection process, please propose appropriate activities and deliverables.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions for Consideration** | **RESPONSE** |
| Has your organization or group identified a large landscape (e.g. HUC 10 watershed) project or projects, OR have you identified a suite of comprehensive community protection projects?  If so, briefly describe the project (areas covered, types of treatment, benefit objectives, other co-benefits, etc.) | Yes, The Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority (UMRWA) has initiated a landscape level program to  improve forest health and resilience on National Forest System lands in and adjacent to the Mokelumne  River watershed in partnership with the USDA Forest Service (USFS) Eldorado National Forest and the  Stanislaus National Forest, and the Amador Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG). This effort, known as the Forest Projects Plan (FPP), is a multi-phased project designed to reduce the risk of high-intensity, large-scale wildfires, improve forest conditions, and protect communities and  important wildlife habitat, water and other resources.  UMRWA working very closely with the ACCG completed planning (NEPA and CEQA) for Phase 1 early in 2023 and has secured nearly $12MM in CALFIRE grant funds to implement fuel reduction treatments on  the first 5,388 acres of the FPP Phase 1 project area, representing 21% of the roughly 26,000-acrel Phase 1  area.  UMRWA is concurrently completing the planning for the FPP Phase 2. The FPP Phase 2 study area is an approximately 225,000-acre expanse situated primarily within the upper Mokelumne River watershed and entirely within National Forest System lands administered by the Eldorado National Forest, Amador Ranger District (120,577 acres, or 53%) and the  Stanislaus National Forest, Calaveras Ranger District (105,850 acres (47%). While up to 225,000 acres will be evaluated under this project; the actual treatment acreage is anticipated to be less and will depend on evaluation of the existing (and possibly future) conditions and treatment scenario modelling, among other factors. Mechanical, hand and prescribed burn treatments, as provided in Phase 1, will also be proposed in Phase 2 along with additional forest management actions, such as commercial thinning, aspen stand and meadow restoration and road decommissioning. UMRWA anticipates utilizing a stage-decision making approach for the FPP Phase 2 consisting one Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), with separate Record of Decisions (RODs) prepared for sub-projects. |
| Are there any components of this project or projects that are tribally led or co-managed projects? If not, what are the barriers to including local tribes in project implementation and management? | The USFS is the lead agency and responsible for government-to-government tribal consultation under  AB 52. UMRWA will also outreach and engage with tribal entities whose ancestral lands are within the  planning area based on its draft Tribal Engagement Plan. Using previous SNC grant funds, UMRWA has drafted a Tribal Engagement Plan intended to enhance  its forestry program by ensuring meaningful tribal participation in UMRWA’s decision making processes  that affect tribal interests. UMRWA is committed to strengthening communication, building trust and  developing constructive relationships with Tribes that have historical ties and ongoing interest in the  management of Upper Mokelumne River watershed resources. The draft plan will be vetted with the  Eldorado and Stanislaus National Forest Archaeologists and also SNC’s Tribal Liaison, among others,  prior to its implementation. This plan represents UMRWA’s initial thinking and intentions for Tribal  engagement prior to direct input by Tribal interests. The plan will likely therefore be updated to reflect  Tribal perspectives and interests following UMRWA’s initial outreach and consultation efforts. The plan  will serve to guide the establishment of constructive tribal relationships, facilitate tribal participation,  ensure tribal input is meaningfully considered and supporting tribal capacity building in UMRWA  forestry program, including the proposed project. |
| Whether or not you have identified a specific landscape-scale project, describe the process of project prioritization that your area has used. How were projects they identified? Did you have a clear set of criteria to prioritize the project(s)? What types of data and tools were used? Were all the relevant stakeholders involved in the decision-making process? Are there any aspects of this process that you think could be improved? | Phase 1 of the Forest Projects Plan was developed very closely with the ACCG Planning Workgroup using a project assessment and prioritization tool developed by ACCG’s Strategic Landscape Assessment Working Group (SLAWG). This work, funded by SNC RFFCP, was initiated in 2020 completed by 2021. This landscape level assessment completed by the ACCG was the catalyst for the development and identification of priority locations for inclusion the FPP Phase 1 project. This tool identified areas at most risk for fire and prioritized treatments on areas to project communities and biodiversity. This resulted in a focus on WUI areas and PACs. By design, the project avoided controversial large-scale logging and significant canopy reduction which will be evaluated as possible treatment actions in Phase 2. The ACCG General membership served as the primary stakeholder group for Phase 1. ACCG workgroups and membership had multiple briefings and influenced virtually every aspect of the project. The Phase 1 team believed that a more expansive stakeholder group, creation of a Technical Advisory Group, and a more formal Tribal Engagement Plan were improvements needed in Phase 2.  As mentioned above, the FPP Phase 2 planning study area encompasses about 225,000 acres. However, actual acreage that will be prioritized for treatment and included in the proposed action will depend on results of the Phase 2 NEPA analysis of existing (and future) conditions and departure of those from desired landscape conditions, using a decision-support tool(s) framework (e.g., ForSys, Promote). LiDAR and other high-resolution data are anticipated to be incorporated into the analysis. In addition, local expertise and knowledge, along with potentially field validation (if funding available), will inform model outputs, and ultimately inform priority areas for treatment. The ACCG, FPP Phase 2 Stakeholder Group, FPP Phase 2 Technical Advisory Group (TAG), and the USFS, and the modeling team will all work together and be involved in this decision-making process. |
| What other additional capacities would you like to see developed locally related to the selection of large, landscape-scale project priorities? What are the staff, consultant, and technical assistance resources which would help you do this? | Additional funding to continue in the development of the FPP Phase 2 large-landscape planning project, a key priority for the ACCG. ACCG and the Phase 2 project team are right now developing our approach to consolidating data on the study area and modeling the existing and potential future conditions, in particular under projected future climate. This is a quickly evolving area and the expertise to use these new tools is very scarce. |

**Project Implementation Planning** – Landscape Scale Project or Suite of Community Protection Projects

The goal of this section is to assess your capacity to move a project successfully through the implementation process. Funding agencies want to know that you have the resources lined up for successful project management and can show that you have been able to obtain the workforce, equipment, and contractors needed for implementation.

If there are areas where this has been a problem, please propose potential activities that could be funded by the RFFCP and the deliverables that would reflect the capacity improvements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions for Consideration -** If you have a landscape-scale project, or a suite of community protection projects, which you would like considered for funding: | **RESPONSE** |
| At what stage is your priority project currently? (Concept, Design, Permitting, Funding, Implementation started?)  What resources would be needed for the next project stage(s)? | FPP Phase 1 is in the implementation phase and FPP Phase 2 is early in the NEPA/CEQA Planning phase. |
| What entities have already been identified to further the project?   * Project design * CEQA/NEPA leads * CEQA/NEPA analysis * Funding development * Implementation partners * Monitoring partners (including cultural monitoring)   Are you having difficulty finding entities to take on necessary responsibilities? What could help? | UMRWA has an existing contract with Stantec to provide the staffing for Phase 2 environmental planning and project management. The Phase 2 planning will be implemented as follows: the UMRWA – USFS Project Team, which is already established and meets regularly, will continue to meet regularly to coordinate planning, perform collaborative engagement, conduct USFWS consultation, perform (or procure) focused field surveys and specialist reports, consolidate spatial data, perform (or procure) scenario modelling, ground truthing, public scoping, preparation of the administrative draft EIS. The UMRWA team leader will prepare grant progress reports and invoices. UMRWA’s Treasurer and Controller (EBMUD) will perform all accounting functions. UMRWA staff will be responsible for all coordination with SNC. The USFS is the lead agency and responsible for government-to-government tribal consultation under AB 52. UMRWA will also outreach and engage with tribal entities whose ancestral lands are within the planning area based on its draft Tribal Engagement Plan.  One of the current looming questions is who will take on the very technical role of running the models to predict future conditions under various project alternatives and climate scenarios. It would help to have a contract for those resources that would be available to develop the Phase 2 alternatives, but also be available during the implementation phase to update plans as projects are completed and new information is available. |
| Which organization(s) or tribe(s) would take the lead in implementing your priority project(s)? What are the capacity gaps for the implementing organization (i.e., project management, grant administration, equipment, partner/tribal involvement, coordination, and other issues with federal land management agencies, etc.) What type of assistance would help you overcome those gaps? | UMRWA would take the lead on implementing the priority projects under FPP Phase 2. This appears to be the path for Phase 1 and no other entities seem to have the capacity for this work. However, UMRWA hopes to partner with any and all entities who which to participate with implementation. This might include tribes, non-profit organizations such as CHIPS, Mule Deer Foundation, and others. The structure of an implementation partnership has not yet been a focus for ACCG or UMRWA. |
| Has the implementing organization/tribe/  agency had issues in the past with implementing projects on time and on budget? What were the issues and what could help avoid these problems in the future? | UMRWA has implemented many forest health/infrastructure grants with a good record of timely completion on budget. UMRWA has already secured nearly $12MM in CALFIRE grant funds to implement fuel reduction treatments on the first 5,388 acres of the FPP Phase 1 project area, representing 21% of the total Phase 1 area. |
| What are the issues you see in obtaining the contractors/workforce needed to complete the work? Do you feel confident about your capacity to take on their contracts and find the suitable workforce? What assistance might help? | UMRWAs most recent request for bids resulted in 8 firms providing bids, with three at or near the project budget. Only one local (Amador/Alpine/Calaveras Counties) bid was received. UMRWA and ACCG would prefer to see more local bidders submitting competitive bids. The region would also benefit from contractors who can complete the work as quickly as possible. Regional forums to help local contractors plan for and submit public works bids might help. UMRWA does not foresee an issue with our own capacity to contract the work out. |
| Based on your answers to these questions, what additional capacities would you like to see developed locally related to project implementation? What are the staff, consultant, and technical assistance resources which would help you do this? | The state of California is investing heavily in the Planscape Tool. In three to five years Planscape might be able to allow trained users to perform the kind of landscape assessments and project development needed for the Forest Project Plan. If the Planscape platform is developed as envisioned, then user training and support (maybe a user’s group) would be hugely beneficial. In the meantime, consultant modelling expertise will be essential and knowledgeable ACCG and UMRWA team members would provide for informed decision making. |

Grant Administration and Financial Management

The goal of this section is to assess the resources available to administer and manage large grants. These are areas where the potential capacity building and training resources could result in significant improvement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions for Consideration** | **RESPONSE** |
| Would the identified project implementation entity or entities be administering the grant itself or would it use a fiscal agent? If a fiscal agent, has one been identified? Please give us the name of each project implementor or fiscal agent and a brief summary of their experience as a grant administrator. Describe the largest grant that the organization has administered in the past. | Yes, UMRWA would be administering the FPP Phase 2 implementation grants. UMRWA is managing two current grants valued at $5 an $7 million. Past grants with values of up to approximately $3M (Integrated Regional Water Management Program) have been successfully administered. The IRWMP grants have been for water utility infrastructure including water treatment plants, pipelines, and other facilities. UMRWA has also administered grants from SNC, NFWF, and WCB. |
| If the implementation entity/entities will be self-administering the grant, what are the resources available to manage a large amount of funding? | The UMRWA team leader will prepare grant progress reports and invoices. UMRWA’s Treasurer and Controller (EBMUD) will perform all accounting functions. UMRWA staff will be responsible for all coordination with SNC. |
| Does the organization have a line of credit or some other financial resource to overcome cash-flow issues? | UMRWA’s maintains a reserve and has a line of credit with its Treasurer and Controller, EBMUD. This line of credit is being adjusted to meet the cash flow needs for a 4000-acre per year implementation program. |
| Has the organization had issues with submitting timely reports and invoices in the past? What efforts have been made to overcome these issues? What additional resources are needed? | No issues. |
| Have any funding agencies found the administering entity or key partners out of compliance for grant administration, billing, or reporting? What were the issues? What efforts have been made to overcome these issues? What additional resources are needed? | No compliance issues with any funding agencies. |
| Based on your answers to these questions, what additional capacities would you like to see developed locally related to grant administration? What are the staff, consultant, and technical assistance resources which would help you do this? | Grant administration is not a significant technical or resource issue. |

Assessment, Monitoring and Evaluation

The goal of this section is to look at your existing capacity to evaluate the effectiveness of your work in achieving forest health and fire protection. A demonstrated commitment to monitoring and evaluation is attractive to funders.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions for Consideration** | **RESPONSE** |
| Have you started or completed an assessment of current landscape conditions? Please describe what has been done and what tools were used. | The Phase 1 project areas was assessed using the SLAWG tool as described above. The assessment of current landscape conditions across the FPP Phase 2 study area has not been initiated, but expected to begin by Q1 2024. |
| Have you developed any instruments or protocols for project monitoring? | These have not yet defined for the Phase 2 project. |
| Have you developed any procedures for evaluating effectiveness/outcomes of your work over time? | Not yet defined for the Phase 2 project. But this is worthy of effort to be incorporated into Planscape as it is developed. Monitoring will be essential to continuing protection of the forests. |
| Based on your answers to these questions, what additional capacities would you like to see developed locally related to assessment, monitoring, and evaluation? What are the staff, consultant, and technical assistance resources which would help you do this? | Funding for development of FPP Phase 2 implementation monitoring framework, protocols, and also funding to perform the field monitoring.  The team would harness the technical expertise of the [ACCG Monitoring work group](https://acconsensus.org/monitoring/) and other partners to develop the monitoring framework, protocols.  If SNC is interested in promoting Planscape then it would be helpful to support a broader team of people to develop the tool to maximize its use and usefulness. |

**Sample Activities and Deliverables**

If you have your own suggested Activities to improve your effectiveness and/or outcomes that you would like to set as your goals/ objectives/ Deliverables, please list those out in your assessment. If you need some ideas though, these should get you started thinking.

**LARGER COLLABORATIVES *Categories, Sample Activities, Sample Deliverables:***

* + ***Collaboration Infrastructure in Your Planning Area***

*SAMPLE ACTIVITIES:*

* + - * *Activities to convene or formalize a partnership or collaboration.*
      * *Outreach and discussions with tribes and stakeholders to invite participation, identify any obstacles to participation, and help overcome these obstacles.*
      * *Training or technical assistance to improve operations. Engagement of professional facilitator or other needed intervention.*
      * *Draft a charter or MOU or make improvements to existing charter/MOU.*

*SAMPLE DELIVERABLES:*

* + - * *Formation of a partnership or collaborative to prioritize forest health/wildfire protection projects.*
      * *Go through process to reconsider group boundaries.*
      * *Documentation of outreach and inclusion activities. Increase in number and diversity of members.*
      * *Evaluation demonstrating improved facilitation and operation of the partnership/collaboration.*
      * *Charter or MOU*
      * *Demonstration of communication and accountability mechanisms.*
  + ***Projects Selection Process - Landscape Scale or Comprehensive Community Selection***

*SAMPLE ACTIVITIES:*

* *Development of criteria for project selection, work with consultants to help identify projects or suites of projects.*
* *Outreach and engagement with local tribes to explore leadership or co-management of a component of the selected projects.*
* *Engagement of facilitators or professionals to assist in developing project prioritization criteria and/or in use of decision-support tools. Outreach and education to tribes and stakeholders to encourage involvement with the project prioritization process.*

*SAMPLE DELIVERABLES:*

* *Identify a ‘landscape scale’ project or a ‘suite of comprehensive community protection projects’*
* *Documentation of meetings with tribes. Development of tribally led or co-managed projects.*
* *Documented improvements to the project prioritization process and/or use of decision-support tools.*
* *Documented increase in stakeholder involvement with the prioritization process.*
* *Obtain necessary resources to prioritize projects in general, and landscape-scale projects in particular.* 
  + ***Project Implementation Planning – Landscape or Suite of Comprehensive Community Protection Projects***

*SAMPLE ACTIVITIES:*

* *Identification of organizations, tribes and/or agencies to take the lead for upcoming project phases.*
* *Put project management or other systems in place.*
* *Grant Administration and Financial Management*
* *Assessment Monitoring and Evaluation*

*SAMPLE DELIVERABLES:*

* *Completion of next project stage(s).*
* *Completion of implementation team.*
* *Build capacity of lead organization in the following ways:*
* *Documentation of project management or other systems.*
* *Expanding availability of contractors and workforce in the following ways:* 
  + ***Grant Administration and Financial Management***

*SAMPLE DELIVERABLES:*

* *Identification of potential fiscal agent.*
* *Improve resources to manage large grants in the following ways:*
* *Build financial resources in the following ways:*
* *Develop reporting and invoicing systems.*
* *Build internal record-keeping systems. Improved staff training.* 
  + ***Assessment Monitoring and Evaluation***

*SAMPLE DELIVERABLES:*

* *Complete assessment of landscape conditions including the following components:*
* *Develop the following instruments and protocols for project monitoring:*
* *Develop the following evaluation procedures:*