



**NCRP Regional Forest and Fire Capacity Program
TPRC Round 1 Project Review Summary**

Organization: California Land Stewardship Institute	Project Name: Developing a tool to test and demonstrate the feasibility of livestock grazing for fuel reduction and ecosystem enhancement	Project Location /Area Served: Sonoma Co, Mendocino Co	Budget: \$184,690	Scaled Budget: \$143,000
---	--	---	-----------------------------	------------------------------------

Project Abstract: The eastern half of the coastal ranges includes large areas of grassland/oak savannah intermixed with hardwood and conifer forest. Nonnative vegetation has grown thick and dense compared to historical conditions. These dense fuels rapidly spread fire to adjacent forest, homes and evacuation routes. Grazed lands (fall RDM 300-800 lbs./acre) can act as fire breaks and reduce fire ignitions and spread. This project will develop a tool that evaluates the cost and feasibility of using grazing for fuel reduction. We will develop a spatial database for the project area. We will convene a Cooperators Working Group to discuss the costs, willingness to graze in rural residential areas, potential revenue of grazing for fuel load reduction, define needed grazing infrastructure and costs, public and private land constraints, local capacity and actions needed to increase capacity.

TPRC Score: 67.42

TPRC Recusal: Joe Scriven

TPRC Review:

- The project is focused on grassland, much of which is already being grazed in the NCRP region. At least one reviewer would like to see this project address brush covered areas, as well.
- Proposal is applicable to a large area and demonstrates thinking “outside the box”.
- This is one of the few proposals that includes a maintenance component, post-treatment. It’s not clear what the target grazing species are (i.e. cows, goats, sheep).
- The scaled budget does not include project administration, Fire risk reduction analyses, cost and revenue analysis and project reporting.

TEK is not considered in this proposal.

- Budget line item for meetings seemed high (~\$44k) for three meetings. Some reviewers would like to have more information to justify this cost.
 - One reviewer noted that they have experience with organizing the type of meetings proposed and can attest to how labor intensive the process can be (identifying stakeholders, outreach, planning, and meeting execution) and therefore, the cost may be justified.
- Demonstrates a unique, innovative approach on a different landscape type than the other proposals.
- Project proponent is encouraged to consider the TPRC comments and reapply.

Organization: Forestscapes	Project Name: Roadside Biochar production for one acre of roadside fuels reduction	Project Location /Area Served: Humboldt County	Budget: \$6,800	Scaled Budget: \$6,800
<p>Project Abstract: Our company, Forestscapes would like to demonstrate roadside biochar production on a proposed Humboldt County roadside fuel break project. We were recently accepted as a recipient to a request for proposal from the Humboldt County Fire Safe Council to implement roadside fuels reduction and defensible space to homes in the areas of Orick and Trinidad. Our hope is to use one of these areas or any other area outlined in Humboldt Counties CWPP to demonstrate roadside biochar production.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 45.74 TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCRP funded a biochar project implemented by Redwood Forest Foundation Inc., the results of which have not been fully reported. This begs the question of whether the NCRP should fund another biochar project before the results of the Redwood Forest Foundation Inc. project have been established. • There is no recovery of energy proposed because of the remote, in-the-field nature of the demo sites. • Cost is high per acre even though the overall budget is low. • Targeted acre is more opportunistic than strategic since the work is already being planned in the area as part of another project. Because it is part of another project, the target acre will benefit from fuels reduction whether or not the proposed project is funded. • This proposal is the initiative of a relatively new, small enterprise. They would benefit from learning from the other proposals how to tailor their project to fit the solicitation. Their proposal would greatly benefit from clearly defined partnerships. They should be asked to regroup and apply for the second round of funding. • The proposal appears incomplete based on budget. 				

Organization: Healdsburg Fire Department	Project Name: Fitch Mountain Fire Resiliency and Russian River Watershed Protection Plan	Project Location /Area Served: Sonoma County	Budget: \$215,000	Scaled Budget: \$130,000
<p>Project Abstract: The purpose of this project is to reduce the fire fuels on the Fitch Mountain Preserve and Open Space and create a wildfire resilient community while protecting the Russian River watershed. This grant request intends to test and document the best treatment methods that can be used to reduce fire fuels creating a healthy forest on the Preserve.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 60.08</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This proposal did not include a full statement of qualifications. ● The proposal appears to be opportunistic in fitting an existing project to the current funding opportunity as it represents continuation of an existing fire plan. It doesn't clearly demonstrate innovation or that anything new will be learned. ● It does have political support and a substantial matching contribution. ● Does not clearly state how much of the 173 acres of the focus area will actually be treated. ● It is more of a restoration project rather than a strategic fuel break. ● Using goats for fuels reduction is an innovative approach. Some reviewers expressed their support for seeing this practice spread throughout the region. ● Cost per acre of grazing did seem high to an untrained eye. ● Focus is on implementation rather than demonstration. Good project with good partnerships that shows readiness to implement. TPRC could recommend they develop a better means of communicating lessons learned and analysis and resubmit as a Round 2 project. ● Quantifiable metrics not clearly identified (e.g. acreage, fuel reduced, defensible space created, invasive species reduced, carbon loading, GHG emissions). Proposal alluded to some of these metrics without stating quantity of method of quantification. 				

Organization: Hoopa Valley Tribe	Project Name: Mill 1 Post-Fire Forest Restoration and Firewood Sales Project	Project Location /Area Served: Tribal Land	Budget: \$468,725	Updated Budget: \$249,987
<p>Project Abstract: The purpose of this project is to implement forest restoration treatments in a recently burned area which promote forest health and fire resilience on the Hoopa Valley Reservation, while also increasing Tribal capacity and improving economic vitality by utilizing forest materials removed to generate revenue. This project will allow the Tribe to train staff in heavy equipment operation and test new equipment to assess its efficiency and versatility in related work.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 61.70</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Substantial match (~115%) ● Justification for estimated revenue generated was unclear. ● Revenue generated from firewood is productive and can support ongoing forest management. ● Relevant and innovative approach to building capacity ● Deals with the reality that there are a lot of wood stoves in the region, especially among DACs and Tribal communities. This project would potentially make the inevitable cutting of firewood more strategic by connecting it to fire prevention. ● Stand regeneration plan only includes Douglas fir. A greater diversity of species should be planted to avoid creating a fir plantation. ● Burned timber as firewood is not very desirable. ● There is an issue in that budget is included for debris processing and logging, which includes rental of processing equipment. ● Purchase of one piece of equipment accounts for approx. 20% of budget; they claim to want to test different equipment but the proposal only includes purchase of one specific piece of equipment. ● By enabling them to purchase (instead of rent) equipment, the benefits of the project could potentially continue on long after the project ends, if it continues to be used. ● The proposal is building Tribal workforce capacity, protecting natural resources, and boosting the local economy of a DAC—well rounded and future-facing proposal. ● Project proponent is encouraged to consider the TPRC comments and reapply. 				

Organization: County of Humboldt Economic Development Division	Project Name: USFS Bio-Mass – Converting Waste to Cash Flow	Project Location /Area Served: Humboldt County	Budget: \$199,772	Scaled Budget: \$199,772
<p>Project Abstract: The USFS currently uses revenue gained from timber sales to pay for logging slash clean up. Clean up, which is typically piling slash and burning it, is time consuming and expensive. This project is intended to study the most cost-effective means available to create a product from the waste stream in place of burning. The greatest obstacles to selling the biomass are having a viable end user (buyer), a higher value product to sell and the cost of transporting the product to a reasonable point for the private sector to haul it to their facilities. The County of Humboldt approved a request from the Forest Service to enter into a Good Neighbor Agreement to encourage cooperation between the two entities. This application is intended as a first step in strengthening our relationship. This study will utilize existing data, add practical application (test the models) in an effort to develop a product that will help County Economic Development recruit businesses to the North Coast area.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 60.89</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● More research is needed to examine a market that has thus far failed to thrive; need is justified. ● Location is critical to success of pelletizing wood. If shown to be feasible, this would open up a lot of options for fuels reduction. Pelletizing is already a fairly well established approach on the East Coast (export to Europe). ● No statement of qualifications. Only reference to project team roles was in the budget. ● Humboldt County and Six Rivers are responsible for a massive land base with a port for easy shipping to Asia. ● This proposal represents a good mix of technology, research, and on-the-ground testing. ● The proposal read, to some reviewers, as a product development project for something that already exists and wouldn't necessarily contribute anything new and innovative. The proposal didn't thoroughly describe how its objectives are different from what's been done previously/elsewhere. ● The non-standard budget used, makes comparison to other proposals more challenging. ● Proposal assumes there is a market for pellets in Asian power plants. Needs more background info/research into how robust the market for the product is to justify the proposal. ● Alludes to but fails to include detailed information justifying maturity of the technology. ● Partnership with the Schatz Energy Lab would enable them to develop a more innovative approach and show why this is a timely proposal. 				

Organization: Humbots Data & Analysis	Project Name: UAV - Structure from Motion - Carbon Inventory (For a 100 acre test project)	Project Location /Area Served: unknown	Budget: \$20,000	Scaled Budget: \$20,000
<p>Project Abstract: The purpose of this proposal for grant funding is to obtain monies to assist with inventorying measures to support the California Climate Investment carbon inventory. Our company, Humbots Data & Analysis will provide before and after photogrammetry with unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) on a California Climate Investment (CCI) fuels reduction project to establish a baseline of carbon/fuels load using SfM processing and provide continuous monitoring and inventorying on an annual basis.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 39.95</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All three Humbots proposals seem to be offering a service rather than an actual project. The proposals don't explain expected quantifiable results or even location. • Do not have partnerships in place. • This specific proposal is underdeveloped. • They could provide services to another project, potentially. 				

Organization: Humbots Data & Analysis	Project Name: IGNIS Fire Starting Drone	Project Location /Area Served: unknown	Budget: \$70,000	Scaled Budget: \$70,000
<p>Project Abstract: The rise of the use of prescribed fire in the North Coast and California has warranted new and innovative ways to reduce costs, lower liability, increase response time, and increase the burn window in order to facilitate more prescribed burning. Our company, Humbots Data & Analysis would like to demonstrate the use of a fire starting drone that is capable of precisely dropping fire "ignition spheres" or ping pong balls that can start fires. We would like to use this to demonstrate in prescribed fire applications as well as wildland fire operations. We would like to demonstrate this is a variety of fuel types - from Douglas fir invaded grasslands to densely packed forest lands. We plan to fly automated flight paths, in which we can fly hundreds of acres per day.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 36.36</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal doesn't explain what happens after the fires have been started by the drone. • A similar approach is used sometimes with helicopters dropping ping pong balls so it is not a particularly innovative approach, although it may be potentially more cost-effective. • Reluctant to buy a drone for a private company. • No location identified. 				

Organization: Humbots Data & Analysis	Project Name: Post Fire Emergency Response	Project Location /Area Served: unknown	Budget: \$25,000	Scaled Budget: \$25,000
<p>Project Abstract: The purpose of this proposal for grant funding is to obtain monies to assist with the post wildfire documentation of conditions and provide critical data to identify the logistical requirements for safe hazard mitigation in the fire effect area. Humbots Data and Analysis will utilize unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) to map the hazards in affected areas and aid operational teams in providing targeted response to critical post wildfire dangers.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 37.65</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Did not create a well-rounded budget for any of their three proposals. They may have ranked higher if they had bundled their three projects. ● Do not show partnerships. ● They could potentially serve as a subcontractor for another project to provide mapping services. They have tools that can be used for a more research-based project. ● Proposal is lacking in substance. 				

<p>Organization: Karuk Tribe</p>	<p>Project Name: Burning Across Boundaries: An Inter-Tribal Collaborative Planning Project for Increased Wildfire Resiliency in the North Coast Region</p>	<p>Project Location /Area Served: Region-wide</p>	<p>Budget: \$249,694</p>	<p>Scaled Budget: \$249,694</p>
<p>Project Abstract: The intended purpose of the Burning Across Boundaries Project is to support collaborative planning that can enable tribes and partners throughout the North Coast region to work together in utilizing prescribed fire as a tool for achieving long term forest and ecosystem health. The intended result is the broadening and strengthening of a network of tribal fire practitioners with varying degrees of traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) and fire experience. The proposed project will serve as a model for region-wide peer-to-peer training through the Regional Forest and Fire Capacity Program.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 71.62</p> <p>TPRC Recusal: Toz Soto</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposal had plenty of detailed information and it showed that the proponent has the capacity to execute. ● Project can be replicated in other places. ● Reviewers liked that this will be a Tribe taking the lead with incorporating TEK. ● This project, Shasta Valley, and WRTC proposals have much in common. Seems like there could be opportunity for partnership and consolidation of the proposals. ● Promote practices with other Tribes but there are no affirmative statements that other Tribes have been identified and have expressed interest in cooperating. Much of the budget is focused on coordinating with other Tribes. ● Karuk Tribe staff are engaged with multiple inter-tribal collaborative groups and will be the lead on this project. ● Project Admin and meeting budgets (\$26k for three meetings) are high. Would like to see more justification of costs. Admin rates are often higher for Tribes and in places with less infrastructure. ● Unclear if training is just for Tribes or if it will be open to the public. ● Success breeds success. This team has been successful in the recent past, great pool of expertise. ● Compared to the other prescribed burning projects it comes down to amount of match. This has the lowest match and no on-the-ground work. ● Need to keep in mind that disadvantaged community groups will have less ability to generate or contribute match funds. ● Even though this is more education focused, less on the ground doesn't matter because this solicitation is focused on providing replicable outcomes for other areas. ● It follows through with components of the Karuk Climate Adaptation Plan. ● Could use more measurable outcomes. <p>Karuk, WRTC, and Shasta Valley RCD Funding Discussion (copied in part from funding discussion below):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Suggestion: The two prescribed fire projects with on-the-ground work (Shasta and WRTC) could be asked to reduce the acreage treated to reduce cost; although, unit costs don't necessarily scale. Karuk proposal doesn't include on-the-ground work and is inter-tribal and includes TEK, unlike the other two. ● Suggestion: Scale all three prescribed fire projects and MKWC proposal to 80% (they could scale back or recoup the rest of the project with other funds). The portfolio will still be geographically skewed but can be righted in Round 2. 				

- Scaling to 80% could spur the prescribed fire projects to find ways to combine resources to achieve full scope of their projects.
- All three prescribed fire projects have certain elements in common. Staff will need to work with them to identify unique deliverables and outcomes for each. Ex. If Karuk focused on a TEK component, this component could be eliminated from the other two proposals to save costs.
 - Reminder: Inclusion of TEK in all projects is aligned with NCRP goals and should be included in projects wherever possible.
- TPRC will recommend funding of the Karuk, WRTC, and Shasta RCD projects at 80%.

Organization: Mattole Restoration Council	Project Name: Prosper Ridge Prairie Restoration Project	Project Location /Area Served: Humboldt County	Budget: \$247,600	Scaled Budget: \$198,000
<p>Project Abstract: The Prosper Ridge Prairie Restoration Project is a multi-phase coastal prairie restoration project with the goal of restoring 800 acres of historic native grasslands on Prosper Ridge in the King Range National Conservation Area (KRNCA). This Phase includes mechanical removal of 60 acres of encroaching vegetation, installation of native grass and forb seeds and plugs on project sites, invasive plant removal, and broadcast burning of 200 acres of previously restored project sites. Using other funding sources, over 200 whole trees removed from these grasslands restoration sites will be transported by helicopter to active salmonid and riparian habitat restoration projects adjacent to the Mattole Estuary. Permitting for this phase is complete. These methods and results will be presented in a North Coast grasslands restoration manual intended to provide information to other restoration practitioners and used to scale and replicate this project to other areas.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 74.13</p> <p>TPRC Recusal: Mark Lancaster</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sentiment shared by several TPRC members: 85% of the money goes toward on the ground work; 15% for training manual etc. Not much innovation with this project. Would be a good project for a normal implement grant round. Well designed and thought out. ● TPRC could recommend they revisit the balance between implementation and innovative, replicable outcomes and how they can be more explicit about lessons learned/create transferrable products. ● Likes that this is focused on coastal prairie unlike other proposals. ● Likes their workshop idea to teach people how to source and produce native plants for revegetation. Sees the need for this. ● Likes that their list of measurable benefits was very articulate and will reach into the future through the people reached through workshops, social media. Teach a man to fish... ● Like Wildland Fire Certification. Good track record for sharing their processes. ● Showing people how to do something in addition to a how-to manual is very effective. ● Scalability shaves off \$50k, reducing on the ground implementation. \$2k admin is very low compared to other proposals. Funding match is significant. ● Continuation of an existing implementation project (Phase 7). Would like to see a better balance of money between on-the-ground work and training, manual, etc. to make it a better fit for this solicitation. <p>Mattole Restoration Council Funding Discussion (copied from funding discussion below):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● These projects are intended to benefit the entire region through their lessons learned. Some reviewers expressed concern that this project’s emphasis on implementation is out of touch with the goals of the RFFC program. Some expressed that even the scaled budget allocates too much funding to implementation and not enough to innovation and demonstration. ● TPRC can recommend funding for less than the scaled amount (this is usually acceptable to most project proponents). Or TPRC can recommend they regroup and apply for the next round. ● Eliminating funding for this project entirely would free up funds for the three prescribed fire projects. ● MRC may be able to leverage their grant writing talent to attract more funding to execute their full project even without 100% funding from RFFC. ● Staff will emphasize to MRC that their work scope should not be reduced proportionally but rather implementation should be greatly reduced and the tasks for training, the manual and workshops left unchanged or enhanced. TPRC will recommend funding of the MRC project at 50%. 				

Organization: Humboldt Redwood Company	Project Name: Dual Exemption Fire Security and Oak Woodland Restoration	Project Location /Area Served: Humboldt County	Budget: \$250,000	Scaled Budget: \$250,000
<p>Project Abstract: This project is intended to create and refine a sustainable approach to managing high-density stands of young Douglas fir that are at severe risk of stand-replacing fire, disease, and senescence, and which negatively impact oak woodland. The proposed project is a stand-level experiment that will inform larger projects by providing data with which to develop site suitability and scheduling models. The fundamental obstacle standing between the mitigation of fire, disease, and Douglas fir encroachment is cost. Many of these harvests, such as this one, would be a net loss in our present conditions. We aim to develop a model with cost recovery efficiency capable of breaking even in these treatment areas, thus creating an approach that is carefully quantified, replicable, scalable, and governed by a site suitability and scheduling system to be developed from an operational time study, inventory analysis, and cost model.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 68.75</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oak regeneration component is unique among the proposals, aligns with several goals of the NCRP Plan, and is much needed in the region. ● Thinning of stands to increase carbon sequestration is a fairly well-established and understood practice. ● One reviewer expressed hesitation about providing money to a timber company to implement better BMPs that should have been implemented during the initial harvest. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Point of clarification: HRC, formed in 2008, inherited these landscapes from Pacific Lumber and did not perform the last harvest in many cases. ● Their budget proposes to break even. If burn prep work can be done at same time as harvest cost effectively, it would be important to share with other timber managers. Demonstrating the merit of this approach could help facilitate adoption of the practice. ● Cost of doing nothing is much higher than what this project is proposing ● Budget includes substantial funding match. ● Some reviewers questioned whether a private for-profit company should be given such a substantial portion of the available funding for work conducted on private land that would be completed as part of responsible forest management regardless of external funding. ● Demonstrates strong partnerships with researchers at HSU, forest advisor at UCCE, others – which will help make lessons learned transferrable to other areas/large landowners. ● Incentivizing management of marginally merchantable timber is relevant statewide. 				

Organization: Mid Klamath Watershed Council	Project Name: NCRP Strategic Fire Planning and WKRP State-and-Transition Modeling	Project Location /Area Served: Region-wide	Budget: \$250,000	Scaled Budget: \$250,000
<p>Project Abstract: The purpose of this project is to create: A strategic fuelbreaks layer for the NCRP area to inform decision-making during fire suppression and increase opportunities for managed wildfire based on a shared understanding of risk. These Potential Wildfire Operational Delineations (PODs) will be based on Potential Control Locations, Suppression Difficulty Index and Quantitative Wildfire Risk Assessments. State and Transition Models (STMs) for the WKRP Planning area. STMs show how vegetation and fuels change annually and after fires of varying severity. STMs combine cultural and scientific knowledge to quantify vegetation response to fires, allowing managers to understand how fuel management strategies affect natural and cultural resources, carbon storage, landscape and human adaptation to climate change and wildfires.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 77.38</p> <p>TPRC Recusal: Mark Lancaster & Sandra Perez</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Need clarification on who will have access to the derived spatial layers. ● The models developed will be applicable throughout the region. ● “Dream team” in fire modeling. Prioritizes projects given infinite funds. It could address more specifically how recommendations should be formed given limited funds. ● Acknowledges changing landscape on the North Coast and that one fire can drastically change whole ecosystems. STM are important to show this and provide guidance on where to direct funds for the most desirable outcomes. <p>Mid Klamath Watershed Council Funding Discussion (copied from funding discussion below):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MKWC proposal is in all likelihood somewhat scalable. A scaled budget would be justified considering their relatively small match contribution. ● TPRC will recommend funding at 80%. 				

Organization: Northwest California Resource Conservation & Development Council	Project Name: California Resource & Habitat Zone Development	Project Location /Area Served: Region-wide	Budget: \$89,650	Scaled Budget: \$89,650
<p>Project Abstract: This project will create a template for state legislation and a “model” County Resource and Habitat Zoning (RHZ) district ordinance(s) utilizing formats similar to the “Williamson” and “Z'berg Forest Taxation Reform” Acts. The RHZ would be a voluntarily entered zoning district with a ten year, annually self-renewing clause, which would result in greater wildland fire protection to communities, improved riparian and wildlife habitat, reduced non-native invasive species, reduced wildfire acres burned (and reduced carbon emissions), and will complement existing state and federal programs such as CFIP, EQIP and restoration grants. The final products of this effort included: Draft legislative language for RHZ; workshops with stakeholders; Draft model County RHZ District Ordinance; Examples of application of RHZ in three counties – one coastal, one central and eastern; economic costs and benefits of RHZ</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 74.25</p> <p>TPRC Recusal: Mark Lancaster & Sandra Perez</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Budget is modest, reasonable, and cost-effective for what is being proposed. Match is high. ● Very transferrable to counties throughout the region. ● Similar to the Williamson Act, it would be a valuable tool for protecting natural resources. ● About 95% match. Scaled budget unclear (\$5k listed as total). ● Not all project partners have yet been identified. ● Inclusion of this policy-based proposal would help diversify the portfolio of projects. This organization has a good track record of creative/forward thinking. Balance of technical work and outreach to state entities. Good investment to spark collaboration and thinking on this concept. ● Many rural counties have not been reimbursed for funds promised by the Williamson Act. This could help fuel movement of that conversation. ● Revolutionary idea, if done well, with far-reaching replicability. 				

<p>Organization: Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District</p>	<p>Project Name: Siskiyou County Collaborative Prescribed Burn Association and Demonstration Projects</p>	<p>Project Location /Area Served: Siskiyou</p>	<p>Budget: \$123,000</p>	<p>Scaled Budget: \$106,000</p>
<p>Project Abstract: The objective of the Siskiyou Prescribed Burning Demonstration Projects is to use these demonstrations to form and train Prescribed Burn Association (PBA) members in three locations in Siskiyou County. There are currently no PBAs in Siskiyou County although preliminary meetings to describe the benefits of forming such an organization have been held and interested parties have been contacted. The Scott River Watershed Center has taken the lead on these meetings and has reached out to the SVRCD to participate in the process representing the Shasta Valley and Mt. Shasta areas.</p> <p>The partners plan on creating two or three demonstration projects, one in Scott Valley, as a second reducing juniper encroachment in the Shasta Valley, and the third focused on mixed conifer restoration in neighborhoods in the south county. These projects will be the training ground for members of the various PBAs to learn how to work as a team to achieve restoration burns on the landscape.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 71.01</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Well-developed project. Not many prescribed fire projects being proposed in this region, innovative for the area. ● Proposes a combination of on-the-ground work and training, some of which will happen simultaneously. ● Proposing 40% funding match ● This project could attract a lot of different collaborators. Prescribed burning is very effective and expansion should be encouraged, especially in this geographic area. <p>Karuk, WRTC, and Shasta Valley RCD Funding Discussion (copied in part from funding discussion below):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Suggestion: The two prescribed fire projects with on-the-ground work (Shasta and WRTC) could be asked to significantly reduce the acreage treated to reduce cost; although, unit costs don't necessarily scale. Karuk proposal doesn't include on-the-ground work and is inter-tribal and includes TEK, unlike the other two. ● Suggestion: Scale all three prescribed fire projects and MKWC proposal to 80% (they could scale back or recoup the rest of the project with other funds). The portfolio will still be geographically skewed but can be righted in Round 2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scaling to 80% could spur the prescribed fire projects to find ways to combine resources to achieve full scope of their projects. ● All three prescribed fire projects have certain elements in common. Staff will need to work with them to identify unique deliverables and outcomes for each. Ex. If Karuk focused on a TEK component, this component could be eliminated from the other two proposals to save costs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reminder: Inclusion of TEK in all projects is aligned with NCRP goals and should be included in projects wherever possible. ● TPRC will recommend funding of the Karuk, WRTC, and Shasta RCD projects at 80%. 				

<p>Organization: Sonoma Resource Conservation District</p>	<p>Project Name: North Coast Forestry Education Program – Inspiring the Next Generation</p>	<p>Project Location /Area Served: Sonoma County, Mendocino County</p>	<p>Budget: \$93,633</p>	<p>Scaled Budget: \$61,690</p>
<p>Project Abstract: The purpose of the North Coast Forestry Education Program – Inspiring the Next Generation project is to connect young adults to forest ecosystem and management resources and careers through a high school in-classroom program and community college career seminars. This project will target high school and community college levels to promote and foster the next generation of forestry professionals. This pilot project will document resources needed to run an in-classroom forestry education program within 4-8 high schools executing 12 Project Learning Tree lessons, and develop and implement a forestry pathway seminar series at 2 community colleges that will inspire students into career paths in forestry, fire ecology, fire management, and natural resources.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 63.99</p> <p>TPRC Recusal: Joe Scriven</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Initially unclear to some whether they are developing a new curriculum or deploying an existing curriculum. ● A reviewer clarified that Project Learning Tree is an existing curriculum. ● Costs seem high to deploy an existing curriculum on a fairly local level. ● It would be great if they could develop additional funding match and some ongoing funding. 				

Organization: Sonoma Ecology Center	Project Name: Falk Forestry Carbonator 500 Test Project	Project Location /Area Served: Sonoma County	Budget: \$247,329	Scaled Budget: \$161,862
<p>Project Abstract: This demonstration project will provide a unique, transportable air curtain burner style biomass processor — the Carbonator 500, produced by Tiger Cat Equipment — to demonstrate our ability to process approximately 15 tons/hour of forestry biomass while also converting some of this material to biochar. Depending on which project scale is funded, we will operate this unique machine for one month at one or two different locations in Sonoma County—one on property owned by Jackson Family Wines east of Geyserville that was severely impacted by the Kincadee fire and the other on Richardson Ranch near the Sonoma Coast.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 65.33</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lease cost seems steep (~\$2,000/day) though they are proposing substantial tonnage. ● Proposes 60% match with opportunity to expand project per scalability notes. ● At least one reviewer expressed discomfort with accepting the scaled budget, which scales the project up to another site on private land. ● High cost of mobilization even within a short-distance (\$9,000/per move), making it less scalable. The proposal is also lacking in replicability given that there is only one (known) carbonator being operated in the state. ● Reliance on expensive equipment is a challenge to replicability for disadvantaged communities. ● The carbonator requires diesel to operate which greatly offset any benefits related to carbon sequestration/GHG emissions proposed by the project. ● Most of the concerns with this project stem from the budget. ● Project proponent is encouraged to consider the TPRC comments and reapply. 				

<p>Organization: Sonoma Ecology Center</p>	<p>Project Name: Use of Portable Field Kilns to Process Biomass and Make Biochar</p>	<p>Project Location /Area Served: Sonoma County, Mendocino County</p>	<p>Budget: \$249,483</p>	<p>Scaled Budget: \$154,894</p>
<p>Project Abstract: This project will demonstrate use of a special “flame-cap kiln processing unit” containing 12 specialized portable metal kilns to process forest slash onsite -- converting up to 20% of the biomass into biochar available for improved soil health and carbon sequestration. Our proposed mobile system includes a trailer to haul the kilns from location to location; a portable 1,000-gallon water tank mounted on a separate tow-behind trailer, a hose and sprayer needed to extinguish the fires safely; and tools needed for the field team to manage the burn process. We will demonstrate the value of this approach as an alternative to standard practices.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 66.79</p> <p>TPRC Recusal: Mark Lancaster</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Transferrable to the whole region (unlike the carbonator project), including rural and disadvantaged communities. Training component on use of the biochar kilns is a valuable addition. ● Several TPRC members reported ranking this project higher than the other Sonoma Ecology Center/Biomass project because it is more replicable. ● More sites and more data will be generated than the carbonator project; also, more cost-effective. ● If selected, it could be adjusted to more clearly state what the learning objectives are through the detailed project scoping phase. ● States that it will compare changes in soil health of treated and untreated areas using plant vigor as a metric. Some expressed doubt that this could reasonably be measured within the timeframe of the grant term. ● Proposal clearly shows how benefits will be quantified: amount of debris processed & biochar produced ● No preparation of material is needed for the carbonator unlike the material to be burned in a field kiln, which needs to be cut and dried. Sonoma Water attended a demonstration of the carbonator and it did need some operation (have to feed it, operate the machine) vs the field kilns which are batch processed, burn on their own. ● Could reach more diverse areas with the kilns because they are fairly mobile. ● Project proponent is encouraged to consider the TPRC comments and reapply. 				

Organization: Watershed Research and Training Center	Project Name: North Coast All Hands All Lands Prescribed Fire Team	Project Location /Area Served: Tribal Land, Regionwide	Budget: \$181,020	Scaled Budget: \$181,020
<p>Project Abstract: The purpose of this demonstration project is to create a North Coast All Hands All Lands Prescribed Fire Team. This team will leverage the skill sets and capacity of federal, state, tribal, and non-governmental partners, to improve forest health and fire resiliency by increasing the use and scale of cooperative prescribed fire across a pilot area within the NCRP region. The goal of this demonstration project is to create an All Hands All Lands structure for interorganizational coordination of personnel, equipment, and project opportunities in a pilot area within the NCRP region in regards to prescribed fire planning and implementation. This project will build more capacity with a skilled workforce, and create an ease of transferring resources from one area to another. This project is innovative in that it is seeking to establish an entirely new business model for sharing resources across organizations and geographies, tackling challenging issues such as professional qualifications recognition, legal liabilities and risk sharing, optimizing the utilization of human and equipment resources, and aggregating the collective capacity to scale implementation in both specific landscapes and across the broader region.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 71.98</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It bears some similarity to the proposals submitted by Karuk and Shasta RCD; overlap should be examined and opportunities to join forces should be examined during the project scoping process. ● Unlike the Karuk proposal, this proposal includes on-the-ground work in addition to training. It also includes substantial funding match. ● Some reviewers felt this project would go a long way in furthering the use of prescribed fire. ● Didn't specify the size and scope of the on-the-ground work. ● Mobilization costs to share resources are not included (for example, for the shared training engine). ● Unclear if the requested amount for pilot deployment applies to all 3-5 burns. ● Unclear how organizational infrastructure would apply to other areas. Coordination with other groups/agencies is such an individualized exercise and often specific to the area. ● Proposal states the budget is not scalable. ● WRTC is a great team with established connections throughout the region. <p>Karuk, WRTC, and Shasta Valley RCD Funding Discussion (copied in part from funding discussion below):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Suggestion: The two prescribed fire projects with on-the-ground work (Shasta and WRTC) could be asked to significantly reduce the acreage treated to reduce cost; although, unit costs don't necessarily scale. Karuk proposal doesn't include on-the-ground work and is inter-tribal and includes TEK, unlike the other two. ● Suggestion: Scale all three prescribed fire projects and MKWC proposal to 80% (they could scale back or recoup the rest of the project with other funds). The portfolio will still be geographically skewed but can be righted in Round 2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scaling to 80% could spur the prescribed fire projects to find ways to combine resources to achieve full scope of their projects. ● All three prescribed fire projects have certain elements in common. Staff will need to work with them to identify unique deliverables and outcomes for each. Ex. If Karuk focused on a TEK component, this component could be eliminated from the other two proposals to save costs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reminder: Inclusion of TEK in all projects is aligned with NCRP goals and should be included in projects wherever possible. ● TPRC will recommend funding of the Karuk, WRTC, and Shasta RCD projects at 80%. 				

Funding Discussion, General Comments:

- High-ranking projects not selected will be encouraged to consider the TPRC comments here and reapply, and will likely rank highly for the next round, as well.
- The projects that applied this round had the capacity to take advantage of this funding round, despite a tight turnaround. Round 2 may have more disadvantaged communities, Tribes, or proponents who need more time/assistance to develop a proposal.
- Selection of the top six projects will result in a geographically skewed portfolio with no projects in Sonoma or Mendocino.
 - TPRC began negotiating adjustments to the final budgets of the top six projects to allow funding for Project 1 (CLSI, Sonoma), which would allow more regional equity. Ultimately, the TPRC decided they would like to consider full funding for Project 1 in Round 2, if they choose to reapply instead of cutting the budgets of more highly ranked projects.

Mid Klamath Watershed Council Funding Discussion:

- MKWC proposal is in all likelihood somewhat scalable. A scaled budget would be justified considering their relatively small match contribution.
- TPRC will recommend funding at 80%.

Karuk, WRTC, and Shasta Valley RCD Funding Discussion:

- Suggestion: Fund Shasta, WRTC, and Karuk this round but ask that they combine their proposals. NCRP would still issue separate contracts. They would all contribute to at least some of the same deliverables, where their work scopes overlap.
- Suggestion: Fund each for \$100,000 or scale back each budget by the same percentage and ask them to figure out how to work together.
 - This strategy might prevent Shasta Valley PBA from being able to implement. Although, an 85% scale would give Shasta an amount close to their scaled budget.
- Suggestion: Offer a percentage of the requested budget to Karuk and WRTC and find a way to fund the scaled budget for Shasta. Shasta would benefit from coordinating with these two. Karuk and WRTC wouldn't replace work performed by Shasta.
- Suggestion: Ask WRTC and Karuk to work together to develop a joint proposal for Round 2 or at least to modify their proposals to reduce overlap. They work closely together already on other projects and could easily be asked to combine projects into a more comprehensive proposal.
- Suggestion: Split \$250k between WRTC and Karuk and ask that they submit a proposal for supplemental funding in Round 2.
- Suggestion: The two prescribed fire projects with on-the-ground work (Shasta and WRTC) could be asked to significantly reduce the acreage treated to reduce cost; although, unit costs don't necessarily scale. Karuk proposal doesn't include on-the-ground work and is inter-tribal and includes TEK, unlike the other two.
- Suggestion: Scale all three prescribed fire projects and MKWC proposal to 80% (they could scale back or recoup the rest of the project with other funds). The portfolio will still be geographically skewed but can be righted in Round 2.
 - Scaling to 80% could spur the prescribed fire projects to find ways to combine resources to achieve full scope of their projects.
- All three prescribed fire projects have certain elements in common. Staff will need to work with them to identify unique deliverables and outcomes for each. Ex. If Karuk focused on a TEK component, this component could be eliminated from the other two proposals to save costs.

- Reminder: Inclusion of TEK in all projects is aligned with NCRP goals and should be included in projects wherever possible.
- TPRC will recommend funding of the Karuk, WRTC, and Shasta RCD projects at 80%.

Mattole Restoration Council Funding Discussion:

- These projects are intended to benefit the entire region through their lessons learned. Some reviewers expressed concern that this project's emphasis on implementation is out of touch with the goals of the RFFC program. Some expressed that even the scaled budget allocates too much funding to implementation and not enough to innovation and demonstration.
- TPRC can recommend funding for less than the scaled amount (this is usually acceptable to most project proponents). Or TPRC can recommend they regroup and apply for the next round.
- Eliminating funding for this project entirely would free up funds for the three prescribed fire projects.
- MRC may be able to leverage their grant writing talent to attract more funding to execute their full project even without 100% funding from RFFC.
- Staff will emphasize to MRC that their work scope should not be reduced proportionally but rather implementation should be greatly reduced and the other components (i.e. training, manual, workshops) left unchanged or enhanced.
- TPRC will recommend funding of the MRC project at 50%.