

Change	Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Proposed Response
N/C	Walck, Cyndie	California State Parks	3/24	The proposed focus for the Prop 1 grants is Forest Health. I would suggest that the SNC also consider providing funding for watershed restoration and mining legacy projects as well.	SNC staff is available to assist in identifying funding for projects not eligible for the SNC Proposition 1 Grant Round. <u>(GG p. 4 bottom to p.5)</u>
N/C	Maloney, Patricia	UC Davis	3/23	I attended the Proposition 1 workshop held Wednesday, March 18, 2015, and learned that projects that involved "assessments", "evaluations", and possibly even "monitoring" were not going to be considered eligible for Prop 1 funding. I would argue that "assessments" are important.	SNC staff is available to assist in identifying funding for projects not eligible for the SNC Proposition 1 Grant Round. <u>(GG p. 4 bottom to p.5)</u>
	Alford, Christine	American Rivers	3/20	1) The SNC should specify criteria for measuring whether proposals actually advance stated objectives by referencing and complying with state plans. 2) The SNC should specify the multiple benefits that the proposed project would achieve. 3) Are meadow restoration projects eligible for funding? 4) Does this program cover all watersheds. 5) Define "Forest Health". 6) Define "Forest Resiliency". 7) Add specifics regarding evaluation process regarding most relevant programs or priorities. 8) Performance measures - please specify	1. <u>(GG - p. 2-3; p. 12-13)</u> 2. <u>(GG - p. 12, 13)</u> 3. SNC staff are available to assist in identifying funding for projects not eligible for the SNC Proposition 1 Grant Round. <u>(GG p. 4 bottom to p.5)</u> 4. The program covers all watersheds located in a forest within the SNC's jurisdictional boundaries. <u>(GG - p. 6)</u> 5. <u>(GG - p. 16)</u> 6. <u>(GG - p. 18)</u> 7. All applications should include the most relevant programs and or priorities that the proposal outcomes address. <u>(GG - p. 12, 13)</u> 8. Performance measures are addressed, including a reference to the Grant Application Packet for more details. <u>(GG - p. 11)</u>

	Creasman, Mary	The Trust for Public Land	3/17	<p>A) The Trust for Public Land recommends removing fee title acquisitions and conservation easements from the list of ineligible projects. 1) Proposition 1 provides substantial and explicit funding and support for land conservation. 2) The Water Action Plan makes conservation a statewide priority. 3) SNC's legislative mandate includes support for land protection. 4) The SNC Strategic Plan explicitly supports the protection of Sierra landscapes. 5) Other conservancies have prioritized acquisitions and easements as part of their Proposition 1 draft grant guidelines. OTHER SPECIFIC COMMENTS: 1) Suggest that SNC prioritize expenditures on properties that are currently protected. 2) Are mountain meadow improvement/restoration projects eligible? 3) Suggest that applicants be allowed to apply for conservation funding at the time of application for forestry or restoration planning. 4) Encourage this section to be explicit about where applications can describe work done by partners. 5) Importance of pre-application consultation. 6) Suggest including "proven technology or practices" in addition to "new or innovative" under Evaluation Criteria. 6) What is</p>	<p>A,A1,A2,A3,A4,A5 (<u>GG - p. 6 - 8; Acquisition Alternatives - Subject to Board Approval</u>)</p> <p>Other Specific Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considered, declined 2. Not for this round, but SNC will assist in trying to find other funding sources for this type of project (<u>GG - p. 4</u>) 3. Considered, declined 4. Do not know what section this comment is referring to, but applicants have ample access to Area Representatives for advice (<u>GG- p. 8</u>) 5. Included in <u>GG - p. 8</u> 6. See "proven methodologies" (<u>GG - p.13</u>) 7. "Sufficient written permission" depends on the project and/or the property owner.
	Darlington, Jeff	Placer Land Trust	3/16	<p>1) The SNC should include Conservation Easement and fee title acquisitions as eligible Category 1 grant projects. 2) Proven successful methods should not be penalized in grant scoring. 3) The definition of "Forest" should include more than conifers.</p>	<p>1) (<u>GG - p. 6 - 8; Acquisition Alternatives - Subject to Board Approval</u>)</p> <p>2) See "proven methodologies" (<u>GG - p.13</u>)</p> <p>3) Forest definition has been expanded to include "predominantly conifer and mixed-conifer" in Glossary (<u>GG - p. 16</u>)</p>
	Tucker, Michelle	Construction Industry Force Account Council	3/10	<p>Requests the Guidelines to include language that supports and includes the use of a competitive bidding process for contracted work. Specifically calls out CCC requirement.</p>	<p>CCC requirement is required as per Proposition 1 language (<u>GG - p. 8</u>)</p> <p>Competitive bidding process in GG; considered, but declined</p>
	Lessik, Alan	California Association of Local Conservation Corps	3/10	<p>Direction on use of CCC/CALCC</p>	<p>Details added (<u>GG - p. 8 - 9</u>)</p>

N/C	Egbert, Mark	El Dorado County and Georgetown Divide Resource Conservation Districts	3/9	As part of the application process, the SNC has conducted a pre-application process to confirm applicant and project eligibility. In our case the process has provided a means to provide an interpretation of grant guidelines and ensures the appropriate documentation is being utilized. It has resulted in an increase in collaboration, increased performance reporting and long-term community benefit. The process also provides the SNC with a hands-on presence to ensure the intent of the State is being realized through the various grant programs it has the authority to	SNC will continue the consultation opportunity for the Proposition 1 Grant Program. <u>(GG - p. 8)</u>
N/C	Russell, Vance	National Forest Foundation	3/3	I am submitting some brief comments on the Sierra Nevada Conservancy grant guidelines in support of the process that we undertook for the Sagehen Forest Health Grant awarded to National Forest Foundation in 2014. I found the Conservancy's process and staff to be very rigorous and fair. As a professional who both grants funding to organizations and has applied for many grants, I prefer the open process that SNC has followed to be much more rigorous, give better results in the long run and	SNC will continue the consultation opportunity for the Proposition 1 Grant Program. <u>(GG - p. 8)</u>
N/C	Dyer, Brittany	Madera County	3/3	For the last 5 years I have both written grants and managed awarded projects from SNC. During this time I have utilized SNC staff on multiple levels and have been satisfied with their assistance. Weather it was the program development process, answering clarifying question in the grant application process, or getting guidance during the management process – they have continued to add value. Additionally, I would like to thank SNC and encourage them to continue to keep the fiscal agent in mind while developing such processes. Many funders are requiring more and more from the fiscal agent while restricting the amount of dollars available for admin services. This is a very real problem that makes it difficult for 501(c)3 to make ends meet. Especially non-profits representing	SNC will continue the consultation opportunity for the Proposition 1 Grant Program. <u>(GG - p. 8)</u> Eligible admin expenses remain at 15% of project implementation costs. <u>(GG - p. 10)</u>

N/C	Haze, Steve	Yosemite Sequoia Resource Conservation and Development Council	3/3	I have been requested to share our experience with SNC’s grant programs. We have always found submitting a short form or concept proposal to be a very good way in which to determine the feasibility and whether to make the investment of developing a full proposal. In fact, CAL FIRE has instituted this same approach for their Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction grant program in which a concept proposal is submitted for evaluation. Then, based upon the outcome of the evaluation – they determine whether you are invited to submit a full application. We have had experience with both a single-step PSP versus the two-step and it seems that the latter is preferable and much more economical for 501(c)3 non-profit organizations such	SNC will continue the consultation opportunity for the Proposition 1 Grant Program. <u>(GG - p. 8-11)</u>
N/C	Esgate, Tom	Lassen County Fire Safe Council, Inc.	3/2	Our organization is in support of the Guidelines as published in the draft. Having been fortunate to have had several SNC grants over the years we have found the SNC staff’s assistance an important resource in developing our projects. The staff has been, and continues to be, very helpful with their guidance as to how to develop better projects that can be more effective in restoring our watersheds and enhancing our communities. We would not have had the quality of projects that we have implemented without the staff’s help in the early stages of	SNC will continue the consultation opportunity for the Proposition 1 Grant Program. <u>(GG - p. 8)</u>

	Sloat, Todd	Pit and Fall River Resource Conservation Districts	3/1	<p>Overall, this is a very well prepared draft guideline packet and it provides a clear process for potential applicants to follow. Providing the opportunity for project applicants to discuss their potential project with SNC staff to determine eligibility is very valuable. It allows for project applicants to be more efficient and make a quick determination of whether or not to proceed with a grant proposal. It also allows them to refine the nature of their project to ensure it meets the required criteria. Overall, this process will ensure SNC receives higher quality proposals. A final comment relates to the nature of future agreements between recipients of SNC funds. In past agreements, SNC has withheld 10% of project costs until the completion of the grant. I suspect this process will also be utilized with new Prop. 1 funds and future agreements. This process favors larger, more financially stable entities that have the resources to carry the cash burden associated with the withholding. It also provides very real financial hardships on Contractors who must carry the debt they incur because they do not have the option to withhold 10% of their payment to their vendors (e.g. fuel costs). Hopefully SNC can find a more workable solution to this issue than</p>	<p>SNC will continue the consultation opportunity for the Proposition 1 Grant Program. <u>(GG - p. 8)</u></p> <p>1. Possible modification of the 10% withholding process. To be discussed during grant agreement revision for Proposition 1 Grant Program.</p>
--	-------------	--	-----	---	--

N/C	Jensen, Louise	Lassen Land and Trails Trust	2/27	This early discussion of potential projects between SNC staff and prospective applicants is invaluable. This step not only saves the local agency or non-profit precious staff resources, it must also save the state resources, as well. If a project seems inconsistent with the guidelines or is weak, it is best to know in advance and choose not to apply, go to a more appropriate funding source, or simply re-evaluate the merits of the project all together. It has been our experience that most state agencies are happy to have such initial discussions rather than have to review large numbers of applications for projects which are not appropriate or at a fundable stage. This must save each of those agencies a great deal of staff time in the long run, along with savings in application processing costs and materials cost for communicating with applicants. We know, having chosen to not apply for some past projects following conversations with experienced state agency staff, that the practice has saved our small regional non-	SNC will continue the consultation opportunity for the Proposition 1 Grant Program. (GG - p. 8)
	Cash, Bryan	CNRA	2/26	Direction on use of CCC/LCC	Details added (GG - p. 8-9)
	Diepenbrock, Mart	CCC	2/20	Direction on use of CCC/LCC	Details added (GG - p. 8-9)
	Addis, Reed	Environmental and Energy Consulting	2/17	Direction on use of CCC/LCC	Details added (GG - p. 8-9)

	Timmer, Kerri	Sierra Business Council	3/26	<p>1) Include federal agencies as eligible applicants. 2) Include prescribed burning as an eligible forest treatment. 3) Prioritize projects that a) contribute real-time data regarding impacts of forest treatments on water supply and quality b) achieve co-benefits not necessarily tied to the grant funding c) contribute sustainably harvested material to local biomass utilization facilities where they exist d) explicitly demonstrate and describe how the project will advance the state's climate change goals (GHG emission reductions and carbon storage improvements). e) demonstrate connections/value to downstream beneficiaries. 4) Coordinate with other State agencies (DFW, WCB, DWR) to ensure that Sierra needs are represented in other Prop 1 programs - evaluation team representation</p>	<p>1) Prop 1 specifically excludes federal agencies as eligible applicants. 2) "Prescribed burning" has been added as an eligible forest treatment. <u>(GG - P7.)</u> 3a) Prioritization considered, but declined. A portion of the grant can fund data collection, but only during the life of the grant; 3b) Described in more detail in the GAP - "please describe the multiple benefits that your project identifies". 3c) Included. <u>(GG - P. 7)</u> 3d) Included. <u>(GG - p. 12,13)</u> 3e) Not specifically called out, but implicit through other identified benefits. Applicants should include in project description. 4) SNC is actively engaged with other State agencies to encourage investment in the Sierra</p>
--	---------------	-------------------------	------	--	---

	Wallace, Lisa Prestowitz, Michele	Truckee River Watershed Council	3/27	<p>1) Comments and concerns about special consideration given to projects that use CCC.</p> <p>2) Clarify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Multiple application deadlines b) Project start and end dates c) Post Project Monitoring d) Match e) Pre-application f) Funding Minimum 	<p>1) Proposition 1 requires all applicants to ask CCC/CALCC if it is feasible for them to perform work on the proposed project. There is no preference given to project that incorporates CCC into the work plan. No project will be penalized if it does not use CCC, if CCC determines that it is not feasible to be involved with the project. <u>(GG - p.6-7)</u></p> <p>2a) Two Year Grant Cycles for Proposition 1 with two deadlines per cycle <u>(GG - p.12)</u></p> <p>b) Project start is when the grant agreement is fully executed; End date is the date in the grant agreement that represents the completion of the project.</p> <p>c) SNC shall have access to the project for 25 years for monitoring purposes <u>(GG - p. 10)</u></p> <p>d) There is no match required, but if the project leverages other resources, it may score higher for that criteria <u>(GG -p. 13)</u></p>
--	---	------------------------------------	------	--	--

	Kane, Susan	Sierra Cascade Land Trust Council	3/27	<p>1) Fee Title and Conservation Easements should be eligible 2) Prioritize projects that are currently protected or have established that they will be permanently protected in the future. 3) Applicants should be allowed to apply for conservation funding at the time of application for forestry or restoration planning funding. 4) Encourage this section to be explicit about where applications can describe work done by partners. 5) Are mountain meadow improvement/restoration projects included in this program? 6) Importance of the pre-application. 7) Expand definition of "Forest" to include mixed chaparral and oak woodlands. 8) Recommend that projects located on federally owned lands NOT be given priority over privately owned lands. 9) Add prescribed fire as an eligible restoration and management technique. 10) change "may prioritize projects" to "will prioritize projects" when considering the geographic distribution of awards</p>	<p>1. <u>(GG - p. 6 - 8; Acquisition Alternatives - Subject to Board Approval)</u> 2. Considered, but declined 3. Considered, but declined 4. Do not know what section this comment is referring to, but applicants have ample access to Area Representatives for advice regarding building an application <u>(GG- p. 8)</u> 5. SNC will assist in trying to find other funding sources for this type of project <u>(GG - p. 4-5)</u> 6. The SNC will continue to offer support before full application submittal. <u>(GG - p. 8)</u> 7. Considered, but declined 8. Federally owned lands are not given priority over privately owned lands 9. 2) "Prescribed burning" has been added as an eligible forest treatment. <u>(GG - P.7)</u> 10. Considered, but declined</p>
	Zwillinger, Rachel	Defenders of Wildlife	3/27	<p>1) the Guidelines focus on an unreasonably narrow subset of the project purposes authorized in proposition 1. 2) The SNC should strengthen evaluation criteria by aligning more strongly with Water Action Plan and funding for disadvantaged communities 3) CE/Fee Title/Water rights acquisitions should be allowed 4) limit admin costs to 10%</p>	<p>1) Noted; Focus is per Governing Board direction; no change 2) (GG - Evaluation Criteria have been strengthened (GG - p. 12 - 13) 3) Water rights acquisitions are not an eligible project type for SNC, although included in other agencies administering Prop 1; Acquisition Alternatives may be allowed: (GG - p. 7 - 8) - Subject to Board Approval) 4) Project Administrative costs may be up to</p>

	Blake, Lucy	Northern Sierra Partnership	3/27	<p>1) Eligible projects should include both controlled burning as a fuels treatment and research on carbon and water benefits from fuels treatments in connection with a site-specific fuels treatment project. 2) Conservation Easements should be eligible. 3) Evaluation criteria should give greater priority to a) projects that are likely to result in a more resilient forest condition on a landscape scale b) projects that achieve multiple benefits c) projects that enhance forest resilience d) projects that are part of a landscape that has been identified as having relatively greater ecological value and/or higher threat of high intensity mega fire e) projects that commit to securing a significant amount of project funding from other sources 4) recommend SNC staff be part of the evaluation teams</p>	<p>1a) "Prescribed burning" has been added as an eligible forest treatment. <u>(GG - p.7)</u> 1b) The SNC will not be funding "stand alone" research or monitoring projects, but will assist in trying to find other funding sources for this type of project <u>(GG - p.4-5)</u> 2) Acquisition Alternatives: <u>(GG - p. 7 - 8; Acquisition Alternatives - Subject to Board Approval)</u> 3a-e) Included <u>(GG - p. 12-13)</u> 4) SNC is considering this possibility.</p>
--	-------------	-----------------------------	------	---	---

	Ziegler, Jay	The Nature Conservancy	3/27	<p>1) More detail on the pre-application. 2) Scoring based on the tangible results. 3) Importance of the Safeguarding California Plan (SCP). 4) Project benefits (reduce climate risk, public health, economic). 5) Importance of direction to appropriate Prop 1 source (SNC, WCB ...). 6) Add controlled burning as a fuels treatment strategy. 7) Research on the carbon and water benefits from fuels treatments in connection with a site-specific fuels treatment project should be eligible as a CAT 1 project. 8) Conservation Easements should be eligible. 9) More detail on pre-applications. 10) State plans should be more clear - which ones? 11) Suggest giving more points to projects that are consistent with such plans as the Environmental Goals and Policy Report. 12) Evaluation Criteria should prioritize projects that result in more resilient forest conditions on a landscape scale and projects that are part of a landscape that has been identified as having relatively greater ecological value and/or relatively higher threat of a megafire</p>	<p>1. Details of Project development (<u>GG - p. 8-12</u>) More details will be provided in the GAP and through interaction with the Area Representative. 2. See Evaluation Criteria (<u>GG - p. 12-13</u>) 3. Specifically cited (<u>GG - P. 4</u>) 4. (<u>GG - p. 4-5, 7, 12-13</u>) SNC staff are available to assist in identifying funding for projects not eligible for the SNC Proposition 1 Grant Round. (<u>GG p. 4 - 5</u>) 6. "Prescribed burning" has been added as an eligible forest treatment. (<u>GG - p.7.</u>) 7. SNC will not be funding "stand alone" research or monitoring projects, although It can be included as a peripheral activity within a Cat 1 project. The SNC will assist in trying to find other funding sources for this type of project (<u>GG - p. 4</u>) 8. Acquisition Alternatives: (<u>GG - p. 7; Acquisition Alternatives - Subject to Board Approval</u>) 9. See response to #1 10. The appropriate State Plans for SNC Proposition 1 funding have been listed in the Introduction. (<u>GG - p. 3 - 4</u>)</p>
	Martin, Izzy	The Sierra Fund	3/27	<p>Requests funding for abandoned mine lands (AML) projects.</p>	<p>Discussed but declined. SNC staff are available to assist in identifying funding for projects not eligible for the SNC Proposition 1 Grant Round. (<u>GG p. 4 bottom to p.5</u>)</p>