



**NCRP Regional Forest and Fire Capacity Program
TPRC Round 2 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: \$189,290 Match: \$13,000	Scaled Budget: \$166,000
<p>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.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 64.61 TPRC Recusal: Joe Scriven</p>				
<p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It doesn't seem to have an on the ground component and lacks discussion on how differences between different grazing animals will be evaluated. ● Evaluates not just the effectiveness of grazing but the costs associated. Although, the data collection component seems light at \$1,700 (proposed NCRP budget) or \$3,700 (total budget). ● There are lots of tools out there. Discussion of how their tool would interrelate or complement others (such as the UCCE planning tool mentioned in other projects) would strengthen the proposal. ● Low % of match proposed. ● Some budget items seem high, especially the workshop item. ● One change from Round 1 was that they would invite Tribal cooperators to the Working Group but there is little indication that they've looked into this. ● Resubmission from Round 1. Proposal is very similar to Round 1 but the budget has increased and not much has changed in the proposal. 				

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP 2020 ROUND 2 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS SUMMARY

<p>Organization: The Center for Social & Environmental Stewardship</p>	<p>Project Name: Fire School Pilot Program at Lake Sonoma & Dry Creek</p>	<p>Project Location /Area Served: Sonoma County</p>	<p>Budget: \$141,940 Match: \$ 115,018</p>	<p>Scaled Budget: \$109,714</p>
<p>Project Abstract: The Center for Social & Environmental Stewardship will partner with Northern Sonoma County Fire Protection District, the UC Cooperative Extension, Sonoma RCD, and LandPaths to pilot a fire-focused, paid workforce development and training program for underserved youth (ages 16-25). Youth will learn about and implement diverse fuels management strategies, as well as participate in a Wildland Fire Fighter Type 2 Certification course and other educational career-building activities. This project will allow for testing of UCCE’s innovative new web-based geospatial tool, which helps landowners identify, estimate costs for, and prioritize fire fuels management strategies for their unique properties. It will also protect critical high-risk infrastructure, including Lake Sonoma which provides water for 600,000 people, and Dry Creek, a key salmonid spawning stream.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 69.30</p> <p>TPRC Recusal: SCWA is a stakeholder because they provide water in Sonoma County; however, they do not hold financial interest in this project. Therefore, Dale Roberts is not recusing himself.</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Budget for trainees may not be compliant with prevailing wage, if this project is subject to it. ● Leveraging many benefits for the amount they are requesting. ● Proposed program seems similar to the CCC and so would not be particularly novel or scalable. It may be better suited under an economic or workforce development program. On the other hand, it may actually be more comprehensive. Given their similarities, it would have been beneficial to form a partnership with the CCC. ● It is fairly comprehensive in that it includes things beyond just what you do on the ground – such as permitting and planning – to give participants a better context and understanding of the fuels work. It would be good if they coordinated with the CCC to expand the reach and benefit of the project. ● Mention that they will use the UCCE tool on a few large parcels or several small parcels but these terms are relative and fairly vague. ● Is this simply a pilot or do they have plans to continue the program? Plans for longevity unclear. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They do mention potential integration with CAL FIRE. 				

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP 2020 ROUND 2 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS SUMMARY

Organization: Healdsburg Fire Department	Project Name: Fitch Mountain Fire Resiliency and Russian River Watershed Protection Plan	Project Location /Area Served: Sonoma County	Budget: \$165,000 Match: \$65,000	Scaled Budget: \$100,000
<p>Project Abstract: The Fitch Mountain Preserve and Open Space (Preserve) supports extensive woodlands and forests that provide habitat for a wide variety of species. It slopes drain directly to the Russian River, so protecting the preserve will help protect the water quality in the river. The Russian River surrounds Fitch Mountain on three sides. The Russian River watershed is the water supply for most of Sonoma County and northern Marin. The LNU Complex fires in 2017 including the Pocket and Tubbs fires followed by the 2019 Kincadee fire has created a call to action by the communities affected by the wildfires. In 2019, Fitch Mountain was to be a direct hit for the Kincadee wildfire and 200,000 residents were evacuated. This included the Dry Creek Rancheria and Lytton Springs Band of Pomo Indians. Fire Fuels reduction on Fitch Mountain is a must.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 60.01</p> <p>TPRC Recusal: Dry Creek Rancheria or Fire Department is not a financial beneficiary of this project. Therefore, Chris Ott is not recusing himself.</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Many of the comments from Round 1 still apply. ● Need for fuels reduction in this area is clearly described. ● Focus is on implementation rather than innovation. ● Proposal doesn't show innovation above and beyond standard procedures. ● Concerned that the project does not move the needle on regional progress of RFFC goals. The proposal doesn't describe how they will collect, synthesize, and share data or lessons learned. ● May be in an area where other types of more disruptive vegetation management techniques are not feasible/allowable. ● \$3,200/acre - is this a high per acre cost? Dry Creek Rancheria did their own goat demo project at \$1,200-\$2,000/acre some years ago pre-fires and the price has skyrocketed for the same service as demand has greatly increased following large fires in the area. That being said, this cost seems high. ● States hourly rates are provided but they are not. ● Project management/administrative costs seemed surprisingly high for the work proposed and the timeframe in which to spend it. ● As a primary stakeholder, HOA could have provided match. 				

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP 2020 ROUND 2 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS SUMMARY

Organization: Conservation Biology Institute	Project Name: A Multi-Agency Strategy for Implementing Wildfire Hazard Reduction Projects in the Lake Sonoma Watershed	Project Location /Area Served: Sonoma County	Budget: \$240,498 Match: \$45,400	Scaled Budget: \$240,498
<p>Project Abstract: This project will create a stakeholder-driven multi-organizational strategy for fuels treatment work and apply it to increase landowner engagement and implementation in the Lake Sonoma watershed. Strategic, coordinated planning of forest and rangeland management and fuels treatment work is needed to maximize multi-benefit results for the available funding and resources. The project is built upon existing partnerships and current efforts, including the public agencies responsible for fire protection and water supply and entities supporting on-the-ground work. These programs will benefit from coordinated prioritization of the properties and landowners they are targeting for forest and rangeland fire risk reduction practices. The partners will align their fuels reduction planning efforts, identify properties and landowners, and provide direct assistance in planning vegetation treatment techniques, assessing costs, and applying for funding.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 64.99</p> <p>TPRC Recusal: Dale Roberts</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Qualified team. ● Would prefer to see a larger footprint. Not clear why the modeling should be limited just to that watershed. For this reason, the budget seemed out of balance. ● Intend to use an existing mapping tool being developed by UCCE rather than creating something new. ● Planning tool is needed. Unclear how the tool would double shovel-ready projects. ● The proposal referenced another pilot project being conducted by Ag Innovations but unclear what the connection is. ● Needs more clarity on what exactly they are proposing and how it fits into other work in progress. ● The project describes the model’s flexibility in being able to adapt the tool to other communities. ● May not be replicable in areas that do not have GIS datasets that can be input into such a model. Although, new data can always be added later when they become available. ● GIS work may overlap with some work already being done by Tukman Geospatial for the region, but it’s unclear how. Would like to see more information on how this can be transferred to other areas and how it integrates with other tools being implemented in the region. ● Will provide an informational guidebook on how to use the tool. ● Unclear whether the funding provided would be the last bit needed or if it would get them a step further in a larger project. ● Budget breakdown was not very clear on how the money would be allocated to different project components. Two lump sums. No rates for the contractors were included. 				

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP 2020 ROUND 2 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS SUMMARY

Organization: Dry Creek Rancheria	Project Name: Vegetation Management and Demonstration Project Using Native Vegetation and TEK	Project Location /Area Served: Tribal Land, Southern Region	Budget: \$245,000 Match: \$195,000	Scaled Budget: \$206,000
<p>Project Abstract: The Dry Creek Rancheria proposes to use approximately 100 acres located in the Alexander Valley as a demonstration project for post burn fuel reduction and re-vegetation management using native plants and Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK). 50% of the demonstration property was burned in the 2019 Kincade Fire providing a data driven opportunity to teach and monitor impacts from burned versus untreated wildlands and to demonstrate reforestation and fuel treatments in the burned areas to reduce the probability and intensity of future fires. An educational program will be developed to showcase techniques for fire management in the wildland urban interface (WUI).</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 69.75 TPRC Recusal: Chris Ott TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Very innovative. Combines science with work on the ground. ● Footprint is relatively small but the project has a wide range of topics that make the project attractive. Would ask that the proponent include Tribes upstream so they can share lessons learned. ● There was confusion over how many acres would be treated under the project. Unclear what the project area vs. the treatment area is. ● Reads like an implementation project with a robust water quality monitoring project. Would like to have seen discussion of how this project is transferable, who is responsible for developing a format for transferring the lessons learned, and how they will accomplish it. ● Study design is minimal. Connection between treatments and water quality monitoring is not clear. ● Proposing to use herbicides in some locations. Would like to see more innovative techniques for vegetation management. You don't often see TEK mixed with herbicide use. ● Replicability is a critical part of the RFFC project - these projects will be showcased in the Regional Priority Plan, and it is critical that they be replicable. ● Timeline issue: Schedule identifies end date as June 2022. Conflicts with need to complete the project by July 2021. ● The project includes a high funding match which is very attractive. 				

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP 2020 ROUND 2 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS SUMMARY

Organization:	Project Name:	Project Location	Budget:	Scaled
Eel River Recovery Project (ERRP)	Tenmile Creek Watershed Forest Health Pilot Project	/Area Served: Mendocino County	\$150,000 Match: \$0	Budget: \$135,750
<p>Project Abstract: The Tenmile Creek watershed has a great deal of over-stocked coniferous and hardwood-conifer forests, and also oak woodlands being over-topped by fir trees. Both conditions lead to a build-up of fuels that increase the threat of catastrophic fire, and cause increased tree evapotranspiration that is significantly depleting stream flow. ERRP wishes to promote forest health implementation to thin forests and restore oak woodlands and this project would create a Forest Health Plan template, plans for 12 participating land owners, create demonstration sites, and a watershed scale planning document to prioritize activities. CalFire Climate Change Initiative (CCI) grants are a major potential funding source for forest health improvement, but associated Air Resources Control Board Greenhouse Gas plan protocols require a huge amount of tree-diameter data to calculate carbon savings; which make it cost prohibitive. The ERRP forest health team will devise a new plan template that will be more reliant on remote sensing and drone photos and less labor-intensive and cost-prohibitive.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 67.83</p> <p>TPRC Recusal: Joe Scriven</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Connection with instream flows and thinning shows comprehensive perspective and integration of NCRP goals. ● ERRP has a good track record with working collaboratively with landowners and volunteers. ● Team represents well respected foresters and fisheries experts. ● Unclear if there will be on the ground work or if this is purely a modeling project. ● Innovative grassroots approach and use of drones to expedite field measurements. ● The proposal indicates that the project area covers 815 acres, (see map on page 5 showing five different treatment areas). These areas may just be the areas where the drone will be flown and where Forest Health Plans will be developed. ● Unsure if the templates created will be compliant with CCI requirements that would be acceptable to CAL FIRE ● Broad replicability but unclear how the results will be transferred. ● \$10,000 for drone use - will this purchase a drone or subcontract a drone operator? ● 				

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP 2020 ROUND 2 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS SUMMARY

Organization: Forest Reciprocity Group	Project Name: Forest and Mill Restoration for Fire Safe Housing Outcomes	Project Location /Area Served: Mendocino County	Budget: \$250,000 Match: \$167,350	Scaled Budget: \$165,700
<p>Project Abstract: The intended purpose of this Project is to demonstrate how communities can benefit from reducing forest fuel loads by using harvested small poles to produce fire resistant homes, for local construction, and to manufacture kits to sell regionally. When conventional forest fuels reduction work is conducted, the material is typically piled and burned, which adds to global emissions. Forest fuel loads must be reduced and these materials need to be utilized more purposefully. Regionally, fuel loads are mostly comprised of suppressed growth trees. Suppressed growth means high quality building materials. Combining this material with innovative home designs produces an economic development model of restoring forest health and community wellbeing. The Project sees this model as replicable in all forested regions. The major components of the Project include revitalizing a defunct lumber mill by bringing electrical services to wood milling equipment, providing a secure workspace, utilizing small logs from a forest fuel reduction project, take building designs to shippable DIY-type kits, and collect data to replicate this model. The Project’s collaborators Salvage Lumber Warehouse, Polecraft Solutions, and Forest Reciprocity Group members will design, permit, and route electricity to numerous wood processing stations as well as repair and secure sections of the defunct mill. Small logs brought to the mill will be prepped for drying. The dry logs will be processed to build out each building design for shipping.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 59.18</p> <p>TPRC Recusal: Joe Scriven</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Most innovative of the entire suite. ● Great approach to adding value to debris material that would otherwise be discarded or burned. ● Success would depend on whether there is a strong and sustainable market for these homes. The state is encouraging accessory dwellings be built on existing residential parcels to help address the housing crisis. ● Will quantify estimated groundwater savings but there is no explanation of how they would do that. ● Unclear how the Eel River Recovery Project (ERRP) would provide poles especially given that ERRP proposal did not do a thorough job of explaining their project on-the-ground work. ● No contingency plan for the scenario in which ERRP doesn’t get funded. ● Not sure how many defunct mills there are available that are suitable for transition to production of DIY kits. ● Transferability is a concern. What is the willingness of the contractors to share their trade secrets to enable replicability? ● There were questions about the proprietary nature of the end product. Will the designs be trademarked or sold? ● Most of the funding is for funding of the mill remodel. ● No loan component. The grant would essentially be funding a start-up business. ● Have clearly invested a lot of time and effort into developing a viable and innovative concept. However, it does not seem like investing in infrastructure is the right fit for this solicitation. 				

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP 2020 ROUND 2 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS SUMMARY

- Proposal does not emphasize the model or how it will be made transferable. This aspect is not reflected in the budget. There is also no clear indication of which staff will be responsible for developing the model into a transferable/replicable plan.
- Project admin. over a ~10-month period is high.
- Match is almost 70% of what they're asking.
- Would like to see more private funding being leveraged.

Organization: Gold Ridge Resource Conservation District	Project Name: Forest Stewardship Project Tracking	Project Location /Area Served: Region/State	Budget: \$145,240 Match: \$50,000	Scaled Budget: \$84,520
--	--	--	--	--------------------------------

Project Abstract: Improve knowledge and coordination of forest management activities by enhancing the RCD Project Tracker and California RCDs' network with private landowners. Through the enhancement of the Project Tracker platform, public, local, state and federal agencies will be able to collect and share more impactful data on forest management treatments and activities throughout the North Coast and the State. Forest management project tracking and providing easier external access to more detailed tabular and geospatial data about treatments such as thinning, prescribed burns, and fuel breaks types will enable the RCDs to be a better partner to CalFire and other forest managers in Californian tracking progress towards statewide forest health and fire prevention goals.

TPRC Score: 58.54
TPRC Recusal: None
TPRC Review:

- State-wide database, not focused on NCRP area specifically. The proposal refers specifically to central California and Tahoe.
- The proposal didn't explain what the upgrade from the current tool would be or provide thorough background on the group that would be performing the work. Even if a detailed plan for how specific changes won't come until the actual work starts, generally there is a sense of the kinds of information that will be added, which wasn't mentioned.
- Would like to have seen more collaborators and partnership with fire safe councils to make the tool more comprehensive.
- No assurance that the benefits of the tool will actually be realized.
- The proposal budget includes one lump sum with little explanation of how the funding would be spent.

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP 2020 ROUND 2 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS SUMMARY

<p>Organization: County of Humboldt Economic Development Division</p>	<p>Project Name: USFS Bio-Mass – Converting Waste to Cash Flow</p>	<p>Project Location /Area Served: Humboldt County</p>	<p>Budget: \$199,772 Match: \$50,000</p>	<p>Scaled Budget: \$199,772</p>
<p>Project Abstract: The County of Humboldt Economic Development Division (EDD) will work with the USFS Regional Supervisor and Staff from the Six Rivers National Forest, Humboldt State University and private sector companies in studying how biomass might be removed and at what cost in comparison to current practices. A major goal of this study is to develop price points for multiple variations of terrain, transport and fuel sources. 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 have been having a viable end user (buyer), a higher value product to sell and the cost of transporting the product at a reasonable location for the private sector to haul it to their facilities. Major innovations in several industries that need biomass have been developed. 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 as one of many the Forest Service has made within NCRP’s Region.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 58.64</p> <p>TPRC Recusal: Hank Seemann’s department had no part in development of the proposal and does not stand to gain directly. Will not be recusing.</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Many of the same comments from Round 1 still apply. ● Seems like something USFS should be investing in this approach through their own program funds; funding would subsidize market research. ● There were concerns over the market for end products. ● Developing a product doesn’t necessarily develop end buyers. ● Operating on the assumption that the technology exists but that there is no established market. ● Unclear what the scale is of the on the ground work that will be evaluated for the transferable deliverable. ● \$100k seemed like a big investment in one person but the project does justify it and adequately describes the need and promises to contribute big solutions. ● Non-standard budget in the proposal makes it hard to compare with the other proposal budgets. ● No funding match is included in the proposal. ● A funding match commitment from the private sector would show that there is a desire to develop this market. 				

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP 2020 ROUND 2 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS SUMMARY

Organization: Humboldt Redwood Company, LLC	Project Name: Forest Fuel Hazard Reduction and Utilization/Oak Woodland Restoration	Project Location /Area Served: Humboldt County	Budget: \$108,800 Match: \$122,400	Scaled Budget: \$108,800
<p>Project Abstract: The proposed project treats extreme fire hazard forest conditions and improves forest health by thinning overstocked stands using a mechanized harvesting system and removing encroaching conifers from adjacent oak woodlands. Approximately 50 to 75 percent of the stems are removed from the overstocked stands while retaining the healthiest trees in a free-to-grow stand condition. Hazardous horizontal and vertical fuel loading resulting from intermingling crowns and stand mortality will be reduced, resulting in resilient, fire-resistant stand conditions and reduced rate of fire spread in the event of a wildfire. Conifers are removed from areas surrounding true oaks to maintain open oak woodlands in which prescribed fire can be safely introduced, further reducing wildfire hazard while improving forage and herbaceous ground cover. Treatment of this stand type is cost prohibitive without funding assistance. The return, in addition to improved forest health and fire resilience, is data describing the economics and true costs of the proposed treatment and merchantable wood product recovery, for broader distribution and review, benefiting public agencies, public lands, tribal lands, and industrial and non-industrial private timberlands.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 67.88</p> <p>TPRC Recusal: None.</p> <p>TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposal is generally an improvement from Round 1. ● Were responsive to TPRC comments to reduce ask and increase match from the Round 1 proposal. ● Powerful consulting team behind them. Deep bench of collaborative partners. ● The proposers dropped the oak savannah non-commercial harvest budget line item component from Round 1, which is a real selling point in the original proposal. Would like to see it retained. ● There is value in promoting fire resiliency through specific types of vegetation, such as oak woodlands. ● Plan to bring in new equipment not currently being used in CA. This is specifically called out as a desirable use of funds under the state criteria. ● Project is on steep terrain. This new equipment could open up opportunities to improve forest health on previously inaccessible slopes. ● Would provide useful information about cost effectiveness that could be shared throughout the region to promote the practice of using cut to length equipment. ● Plan to open the project up to observation which is unusual for a private company. ● TPRC should be wary of funding a private for-profit company doing work they should or would do anyway. ● This project provides an opportunity for the NCRP RFFC program. There is a need for strong partnerships with private forest managers given the large footprint of privately-held forestlands in our region. ● Match is very high. ● Vast majority of the budget is in one category. Hard to see how the money is intended to be spent. 				

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP 2020 ROUND 2 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS SUMMARY

- From Funding Discussion** (see below):
- Equipment is innovative
 - Best match of any project, over 100%; have clearly tried to minimize the amount of grant money requested
 - Great project partners
 - Invite observation of private operations

Organization: Mendocino County Resource Conservation District	Project Name: Redwood Region Greenhouse Gas Calculator Toolkit	Project Location /Area Served: Region-wide	Budget: \$61,480 Match: \$0	Scaled Budget: \$56,480
---	--	--	--	---------------------------------------

Project Abstract: The project will develop a unique, user-friendly greenhouse gas (GHG) benefit calculator toolkit tailored to the North Coast’s redwood region. No similar tool currently exists. The purpose is to facilitate GHG calculations when applying for funding to implement fuel reduction activities within the Partnership boundary. The toolkit’s standardized inventory methodology and analytical tool will streamline the process of GHG calculation and reduce costs to apply for funding. The tool will analyze several fuel reduction activity types based on pre-modeled forest stands and will comply with methodology required for CCI Forest Heath grant applications. This toolkit allows end-users to produce rigorous GHG modeling results through a cost-effective process and will empower local communities to apply for climate resiliency funding for forestlands on the North Coast.

- TPRC Score:** 67.06
- TPRC Recusal:** Joe Scriven
- TPRC Review:**
- The proposal identified a need and developed a cost-effective solution for addressing it. Doesn’t necessarily address top-level goals but would be a useful tool for a reasonable budget.
 - GHG calculations are very labor intensive because it requires measuring individual trees. Other available calculators are based on statewide averages. The proposed tool would be for the redwood region and potentially useful to North Coast entities applying for CCI grants which requires this calculation.
 - Having a calculator is important in enabling participation in the State's carbon program and providing access to CCI grant funding.
 - The proposal includes Marin which is outside of the NCRP region. If selected, will need to omit this from the final project scope.
 - The proposers only plan to host one training webinar. This should be changed to Youtube or something that could be accessed indefinitely.
 - Project partners did not commit match, which would have shown their support for the project.
 - Concerning that there is no match and \$20k for project admin. \$30k has already been invested in a beta version, which is somewhat like match. Relatively small ask.
 - The extent of the end use was unclear.

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP 2020 ROUND 2 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS SUMMARY

Organization: Round Valley Indian Tribes	Project Name: Learning to Burn	Project Location /Area Served: Tribal Land, Central Region	Budget: \$240,922 Match: \$3,600	Scaled Budget: \$240,922
<p>Project Abstract: Learning to Burn is a project intended to increase the knowledge of the Round Valley Tribal Community on the many topics of fire prevention and fire management techniques that can promote forest and river health. Tribal members, with a “burning” desire to be a fire practitioner, will be provided an opportunity to learn about the multi-faceted system of the fire management industry and the science behind forest health. This task of Forest Stewardship Education will be carried out using three (3) very significant methods. First a group of interested tribal members will receive training at various levels and with various trainers to become tribal fire practitioners. Secondly, the project will decrease economic distress by increasing tribal workforce capacity. This project will give tribal members an extra “boost” to becoming gainfully employed and open lifelong career opportunities with new Tribal forest and streams programs, the US Forestry and California Divisions of Fire (CALFire). Lastly, the project will utilize traditional knowledge to identify native plants that encourage natural erosion control and teach how re-planting can restore stream and river tributary health.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 59.19 TPRC Recusal: Joe Scriven TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Great example of opportunity to help pivot the forestry industry from logging to resource management. ● Good opportunity to boost some careers. ● Not much innovation to address RFFC goals/objectives. ● Would like to have seen more specific info on treatment areas or on the ground work that will result from the project ● Unclear on role of the different partners: there is reference to USFS, CAL FIRE and Karuk Tribe ● Opportunity to integrate with the Karuk project (funded in Round 1) since they share similar goals ● Funding will mostly go to a crew of 8 for 12 months of work (this will likely be 10 months) and 6 training sessions. There is a disconnect between those benefits and the scale of the funding request. ● Very small match contribution ● Transferability is a concern. It’s not clear what the deliverables/tools are that will be used to transfer the knowledge to other areas. ● TPRC recommendation: Round 1 funded Karuk Tribe intertribal collaboration for prescribed fire - they should be encouraged to extend their reach to the central Tribal region and specifically to the Round Valley Tribes 				

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP 2020 ROUND 2 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS SUMMARY

<p>Organization: Scott River Watershed Council</p>	<p>Project Name: Siskiyou County Fuel Reduction, Greenhouse Gas Reduction and Soil Health Amendment Demonstration Using Innovative Carbon Sequestering Biochar Technology</p>	<p>Project Location /Area Served: Siskiyou</p>	<p>Budget: \$197,553 Match: \$92,415</p>	<p>Scaled Budget: \$197,553</p>
<p>Project Abstract: The Scott River Watershed Council is seeking funding to create a biochar demonstration project on private forested land in the Scott Valley. The project will demonstrate the creation of biochar using innovative large scale and efficient carbonator technology. The demonstration will reduce smoke and greenhouse gasses (GHG) from a fuel reduction treatment on over 80 acres around the City of Etna and create value-added biochar which will be provided to local agricultural producers as a soil amendment. The production of biochar will be evaluated for economic feasibility, quality, scale, and market demand. The project will also include a workshop to introduce scalable biochar production and application to the region.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 68.09 TPRC Recusal: Sandra Perez TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Checks multiple boxes: innovative to use fuel and turn it into useable product while enhancing wildfire resiliency ● The proposal shows intention to collaborate with the community and agricultural producers to determine suitability of the product ● Good opportunity to leverage separate funding for watershed coordinator to coordinate landowners. ● Also proposing an 80-acre shaded fuelbreak as an additional benefit. ● Price for carbonator for 2 weeks seems exorbitant. Although the investment in the equipment may be worth it. ● Missed opportunity for match contribution from equipment manufacturer to show effectiveness of their technology ● Consistency is an issue: proposal mentions processing 12,000 lbs and 12,000 tons - large per unit price difference. ● Is \$12/ton a decent price? It is fairly expensive for a soil additive, which is typically \$3-5/ton. This would be in addition to other costs, such as hauling (unless material is picked up by producers). 				

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP 2020 ROUND 2 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS SUMMARY

<p>Organization: Scott River Watershed Council</p>	<p>Project Name: Klamath Meadow Restoration Planning Demonstration Project</p>	<p>Project Location /Area Served: Siskiyou</p>	<p>Budget: \$194,600 Match: \$118,677</p>	<p>Scaled Budget: \$172,795</p>
<p>Project Abstract: A pilot project in the Scott-Salmon Mountains will evaluate a range of meadow types encompassing approximately 214 acres, to plan restoration actions to improve forest health, fire resilience, and water storage. The project will serve as a template for restoring meadows across the Klamath Region, offering employment and training to disadvantaged residents. A coalition of scientists, agency staff, landowners, watershed groups, Tribal entities and Forest Service staff has formed to support meadow restoration in the region, serving as a technical advisory group. Baseline conditions will be evaluated, and conceptual restoration plans developed, preparing restoration to move forward rapidly in a second, implementation, phase of the project.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 67.88 TPRC Recusal: Sandra Perez TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Seems like a good project but not closely tied to the objectives of the RFFC program (specifically to fire) or at least links are not direct. Seems more closely tied to water supply and quality issues. ● State Carbon Plan calls out meadow restoration as being key to carbon sequestration. ● Unclear why new wells are required when they already have some monitoring wells in operation. ● Some of the data they are proposing to collect are already publicly available - may be an opportunity to scale down. <p>From Funding Discussion (see below):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Discussion of this project did not result in strong support despite the scoring. Averaged as the third highest ranked project, discussion resulted in a small reduction in the average score. ● In response to the concern over lack of connection to fire, meadows are a natural firebreak and meadow restoration is key to carbon sequestration. ● Siskiyou County was funded in Round 1. This entity (Scott River Watershed Council) and Siskiyou County by proxy will receive funding for another, more highly ranked project under this funding round. Dropping this project would also enable funding of two other projects ranked very closely (within a tenth of a point) from other areas of the NCRP region. Taking these points into consideration, the TPRC saw justification in dropping this project in favor of more regional representation per the solicitation guidelines and stated desires of the PRP. 				

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP 2020 ROUND 2 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS SUMMARY

Organization: Sonoma Ecology Center	Project Name: Use of Portable Field Kilns to Process Biomass and Make Biochar	Project Location /Area Served: Sonoma County	Budget: \$153,604 Match: \$15,000	Scaled Budget: \$153,604
<p>Project Abstract: This project will purchase and demonstrate use of a mobile “flame-cap kiln processing kit” containing 6 specialized portable metal kilns, called Ring of Fire kilns, to process forest slash onsite -- converting up to 20% of the biomass into biochar that will then be available for improved soil health and carbon sequestration both within the forest and in local agricultural operations. These kilns also significantly reduce smoke pollution compared to typical open burn piles. In addition to the kilns, our proposed mobile system also includes a trailer to haul the kilns from location to location; a tow-behind trailer holding a 1,000-gallon water tank with a hose and sprayer needed to extinguish the fires and additional fire safety; and tools and clothing needed for the field team to manage the burn process. We will demonstrate the value of this approach as an alternative to standard open pile burning practices in several locations. We will train crews from the California Conservation Corps, the Usal Forest Redwood Company, a network of Native American tribes organized and led by the Potter Valley Tribe in Mendocino County, and from the Scott Valley Watershed Council in the safe use of the kilns and optimal biochar production.</p>				
<p>TPRC Score: 69.09 TPRC Recusal: None. TPRC Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Bulk of the work is in Mendocino but will be managed by a Sonoma group. ● SEC is the biochar champion in the region and likely in the project management role because of their extensive experience. ● The project seems more of a test of technology rather than actual on the ground implementation of fuels reduction. ● May prove to be less effective than the carbonator in terms of carbon capture but represents a step forward. ● This low-tech approach could be implemented almost anywhere on a large scale by CCC crews. Much more mobile than carbonator technology. ● Some of their performance metrics don’t seem very robust or feasible to measure. ● Seems like the BIA could have contributed match. ● Project management 1.6x Round 1 cost even though now there’s less time to implement. ● Some of the factors they propose to track seem too subjective such as visual air emissions and visible changes in plant life and vigor. 				

Funding Discussion

Funding decision approach:

- Consider highest ranking projects, recommend scaled funding to insure the greatest number of high ranking projects are included in the TPRC suite, consider funding high ranking Sonoma and Mendocino projects in compliance with the PRP direction for regional representation across Round 1 and 2 (Reminder: this is not a directive to ensure every single area has funding but should be taken into consideration.)
- This recommendation aligns with the direction provided by the PRP as part of the approval of the Round 1 Demonstration Project funding during the April 3, NCRP Quarterly meeting. During that meeting, the PRP directed that the Round 2 solicitation and project review would provide preference and consideration to areas not funded in Round 1 to help ensure regional participation and representation.

Scott River Watershed Council, Klamath Meadow Restoration Planning Demonstration Project

- Discussion of this project did not result in strong support despite the scoring. Averaged as the third highest ranked project, discussion resulted in a small reduction in the average score.
- In response to the concern over lack of connection to fire, meadows are a natural firebreak and meadow restoration is key to carbon sequestration.
- Siskiyou County was funded in Round 1. This entity (Scott River Watershed Council) and Siskiyou County by proxy will receive funding for another, more highly ranked project under this funding round. Dropping this project would also enable funding of two other projects ranked very closely (within a tenth of a point) from other areas of the NCRP region. Taking these points into consideration, the TPRC saw justification in dropping this project in favor of more regional representation per the solicitation guidelines and stated desires of the PRP.

Two Biochar Projects

- Do we want to fund both biochar projects?
 - Carbonator vs portable kilns - methods propose very different methodologies for biochar projects.

Humboldt Redwood Company, LLC, Forest Fuel Hazard Reduction and Utilization/Oak Woodland Restoration

- Equipment is innovative
- Best match of any project, over 100%; have clearly tried to minimize the amount of grant money requested
- Great project partners
- Invite observation of private operations

Many of the projects are related to burning, fuels reduction, and thinning but it's important to think about developing value-added projects (creating rather than destroying). RPP may be an opportunity to explore or promote public private partnerships.

TPRC Recommendation of NCRP Round 2 Demonstration Priority Projects

Following is the TPRC recommendation that includes a draft suite of demonstration projects and recommended budget amounts for PRP consideration during the NCRP Quarterly Meeting on June 19, 2020.

The TPRC recommends funding the seven projects at the budget amounts listed in the table below in the ‘TPRC Recommend Budget’ column. The selected projects were within the 8 highest ranked projects, all scoring above 67 points. The Scott River Watershed Council, Klamath Meadow Restoration Planning Demonstration Project also scored above 67 points but was not selected for funding for the following reasons:

- The Scott River Watershed Council submitted 2 projects for this round of funding and both scored highly. The top scoring project was funded.
- The score for the Scott River Watershed Council, Klamath Meadow Restoration Planning Demonstration Project was less than one point higher than the lowest scoring project funded.
- Not funding the Scott River Watershed Council, Klamath Meadow Restoration Planning Demonstration Project allowed for funding two projects with slightly lower scores (less than one point) that provided wider regional participation and representation. This recommendation aligns with the direction provided by the PRP as part of the approval of the Round 1 Demonstration Project funding during the April 3, NCRP Quarterly meeting. During that meeting, the PRP directed that the Round 2 solicitation and project review would provide preference and consideration to areas not funded in Round 1 to help ensure regional participation and representation.

Following is a table of the Round 2 NCRP RFFC Demonstration Projects ranked by score and TPRC recommended funding amounts. Below are Funding Round summaries.

ID	Final Score	Organization, Project Name	Area Served	Match	Budget	Scaled Budget	TPRC Recommend Budget
5	69.75	Dry Creek Rancheria, Vegetation Management and Demonstration Project Using Native Vegetation and TEK	Tribal Land, Southern Region	\$195,000	\$245,000	\$206,000	\$196,000
2	69.30	Center for Social & Environmental Stewardship, Fire School Pilot Program at Lake Sonoma & Dry Creek	Sonoma County	\$115,018	\$141,940	\$109,714	\$109,714
15	69.09	Sonoma Ecology Center, Use of Portable Field Kilns to Process Biomass and Make Biochar	Mendocino & Siskiyou County	\$15,000	\$153,604	\$153,604	\$122,883
13	68.09	Scott River Watershed Council, Siskiyou County Fuel Reduction, Greenhouse Gas Reduction and Soil Health Amendment Demonstration Using Innovative Carbon Sequestering Biochar Technology	Siskiyou County	\$92,415	\$197,553	\$197,553	\$158,042

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP 2020 ROUND 2 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS SUMMARY

ID	Final Score	Organization, Project Name	Area Served	Match	Budget	Scaled Budget	TPRC Recommend Budget
10	67.88	Humboldt Redwood Company, LLC, Forest Fuel Hazard Reduction and Utilization/Oak Woodland Restoration	Humboldt County	\$122,400	\$108,800	\$108,800	\$87,040
14	67.88	Scott River Watershed Council, Klamath Meadow Restoration Planning Demonstration Project	Siskiyou County	\$118,677	\$194,600	\$172,795	\$0
6	67.83	Eel River Recovery Project, Tenmile Creek Watershed Forest Health Pilot Project	Mendocino County	\$0	\$150,000	\$135,750	\$120,000
11	67.06	Mendocino County Resource Conservation District, Redwood Region Greenhouse Gas Calculator Toolkit	Regionwide	\$0	\$61,480	\$56,480	\$41,900
4	64.99	Conservation Biology Institute, A Multi-Agency Strategy for Implementing Wildfire Hazard Reduction Projects in the Lake Sonoma Watershed	Sonoma County	\$45,400	\$240,498	\$240,498	
1	64.61	California Land Stewardship Institute, Developing a tool to test and demonstrate the feasibility of livestock grazing for fuel reduction and ecosystem enhancement	Sonoma & Mendocino County	\$13,000	\$189,290	\$166,000	
3	60.01	Healdsburg Fire Department, Fitch Mountain Fire Resiliency and Russian River Watershed Protection Plan	Sonoma County	\$65,000	\$165,000	\$100,000	
12	59.19	Round Valley Indian Tribes, Learning to Burn	Tribal Land, Central Region	\$3,600	\$240,922	\$240,922	
7	59.18	Forest Reciprocity Group, Forest and Mill Restoration for Fire Safe Housing Outcomes	Mendocino County	\$167,350	\$250,000	\$165,700	
9	58.64	County of Humboldt Economic Development Division, USFS Bio-Mass – Converting Waste to Cash Flow	Humboldt County	\$50,000	\$199,772	\$199,772	
8	58.54	Gold Ridge Resource Conservation District, Forest Stewardship Project Tracking	Regionwide	\$50,000	\$145,240	\$84,520	
				\$1,052,860	\$2,683,699	\$2,338,108	\$835,579

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP 2020 ROUND 2 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS SUMMARY

ROUND 2 SUMMARY

Area Served	Match	Proposed Budget	Scaled Budget	Approved Budget
Humboldt County	\$172,400	\$308,572	\$308,572	\$87,040
Mendocino & Siskiyou County	\$15,000	\$153,604	\$153,604	\$122,883
Mendocino County	\$167,350	\$400,000	\$301,450	\$120,000
Siskiyou County	\$211,092	\$392,153	\$370,348	\$158,042
Sonoma County	\$225,418	\$547,438	\$450,212	\$109,714
Sonoma & Mendocino County	\$13,000	\$189,290	\$166,000	\$0
Tribal Land, Central Region	\$3,600	\$240,922	\$240,922	\$0
Tribal Land, Southern Region	\$195,000	\$245,000	\$206,000	\$196,000
Regionwide	\$50,000	\$206,720	\$141,000	\$41,900
ROUND 2 PROJECT SUBTOTAL				\$835,579
Administration *	\$0	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$48,000
TOTALS	\$1,052,860	\$2,731,699	\$2,386,108	\$883,579

ROUND 1 SUMMARY

Area Served	Match	Proposed Budget	Scaled Budget	Approved Budget
Humboldt County	\$390,000	\$704,172	\$654,572	\$123,800
Siskiyou County	\$51,000	\$123,000	\$106,000	\$98,400
Sonoma County	\$192,450	\$462,329	\$291,862	\$0
Sonoma & Mendocino County	\$28,000	\$527,806	\$359,584	\$0
Tribal Land, Northern Region	\$304,328	\$499,681	\$499,681	\$199,755
Regionwide	\$292,400	\$520,670	\$520,670	\$434,466
unknown	\$0	\$115,000	\$115,000	\$0
ROUND 1 PROJECT SUBTOTAL	\$1,258,178	\$2,952,658	\$2,547,369	\$856,421
Administration *	\$0	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
TOTALS	\$1,258,178	\$3,012,658	\$2,607,369	\$916,421

ROUND 1 & 2 SUMMARY

Area Served	Match	Proposed Budget	Scaled Budget	Approved Budget
Humboldt County	\$562,400	\$1,012,744	\$963,144	\$210,840
Mendocino & Siskiyou County	\$15,000	\$153,604	\$153,604	\$122,883
Mendocino County	\$167,350	\$400,000	\$301,450	\$120,000
Siskiyou County	\$262,092	\$515,153	\$476,348	\$256,442
Sonoma County	\$417,868	\$1,009,767	\$742,074	\$109,714
Sonoma & Mendocino County	\$41,000	\$717,096	\$525,584	\$0
Tribal Land, Northern Region	\$304,328	\$499,681	\$499,681	\$199,755
Tribal Land, Central Region	\$3,600	\$240,922	\$240,922	\$0
Tribal Land, Southern Region	\$195,000	\$245,000	\$206,000	\$196,000
Regionwide	\$342,400	\$727,390	\$661,670	\$476,366
Administration *	\$0	\$108,000	\$108,000	\$108,000
TOTALS	\$2,311,038	\$5,629,357	\$4,878,477	\$1,800,000