What: Chaffee Common Ground Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda

Where: Board of County Commissioners Meeting Room, County Administrative Offices, 104 Crestone Ave., Salida, CO

When: Monday 22 July 2019

Time: 8:30 – 10:00 AM

Time	Topic	Decisions	Presenting
8:30-8:35	Consent Agenda Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings Financial Update	Vote to approve	
Developing Grant Programs			
8:35-8:55	Discussion on **current grant programs** with SME input to finalize programs/language. Discuss next steps and which programs will be available this year. Attachment A	Agree final language, agree to next steps plan	
8:55-9:30	Discuss **Grant Criteria** with SME input to finalize language. Discuss for input proposed points weighting. Discuss the path ahead. Attachment B (Grant Criteria) and Attachment C (Ratings Rubric Example)	Agree final language. Input on points. Agree next steps	
9:30-9:50	Discuss Outstanding questions, prepare for SME conversations Attachment D	Agree approach	
9:50-9:55	**CAC Schedule**: 05 August 9-11AM 19 August 9-10AM Sept forward – first/third Monday. September – RFPs to the Community EO October - Applications due 15 November – Funding decisions **SME Board Meetings** 19 August – same schedule, agenda to include learning calls 09 Sept – same schedule, prepare to send programs to community.		
9:55-10:00	Public Comment and close		

Subject Matter Expert Boards Meeting Schedule

Conserving Working Ranches and Rural Landscapes: 10:10 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
Strengthening Forest Health: 11:35 a.m. – 12:55 p.m.
Managing the Impacts of Outdoor Recreation Growth: 1:10 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.

Time	Topic	Decisions	Presenting
5 Mins	Welcome Intro new faces		
10 Mins	Final input – Programs and language, discuss next steps (Attachment A)		Rick – A
10 Mins	Final input – Grant rating criteria, discuss next steps (Attachment B, C)		Cindy - B
50 Mins	Structured feedback on outstanding questions (Attachment D)		
5 Mins	Public Comment and close		

Attachment A: Chaffee Common Ground - Initial Programs Proposal

Funding Area	Resolution 2018-46 Area	Program Description	Describe Evaluation Process	SMEB work
Strengthening Forest Health (25%)				
Planning Grants	"planning...of treatment activities enhancing forest health and community fire resilience.."	Funding tor planning of treatment activities (such as the Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) and treatment project planning), funding development, research/analysis supporting treatment planning and prioritization, and related educational activities.	Competitive Grants or Forest Health Specific Selected Partnerships	Build a program description / request for proposals Build a scoring rubric Build an application form with instructions
Project Grants **Enhance Forest Health and/or Enhance Community Fire Resilience**	"execution of treatment activities enhancing forest health and community fire resilience"	Funding to execute treatment activities or activities that increase community fire resilience. Note: This may include Public Lands treatment as prioritized by the County CWPP and private lands projects that serve a broad community purpose (prioritized by county and local CWPPs).	Competitive Grants or Partnership Agreements	Plan for early 2020 fund cycle
Managing the Impacts of Outdoor Recreation Growth (5%)				
Planning and Monitoring Grants	"Planning to protect the watershed health from negative impacts resulting from outdoor recreation use.."	Funding for planning, project development, monitoring, funding development and education to protect watershed health from the impacts of outdoor recreation use, pilot program staff	Competitive grants or partnerships	Plan for early 2020 funding cycle
Project Grants	"Project execution to protect the watershed health from negative impacts resulting from outdoor recreation use.."	**Rapid Response Grants (Phase I)** (Immediate tactical solutions such as barriers, signage, hardening assists, education)	Competitive Grants	Build a program description / request for proposals Build a scoring rubric Build an application form with instructions
		Strategic Response Grants (for 2020 forward)	Competitive Grants	Plan for early or late 2020 funding cycle
Conserving Working Ranches and Rural Landscapes (25%)				
Program and Planning Grants	"Planning and programs...and other tools developed in partnership with the agricultural community to enhance economic viability and longevity of working ag lands"	**Grants that support planning efforts or** programs/partnerships and new/innovative tools that provide services prioritized by the ag community. May include multi year funding for new conservation tools. Examples: Programs broadly supporting and prioritized by the Ag community such as One Stop, Growing Good Neighbors, County Fencing and Signage, Agricultural Branding and use of local ag products (eg. prison and schools use local beef) etc..	Competitive Program Grants considered as developed with Ag community (competing for Ag funds only) or a Program/Planning Grant Cycle (competing for the 45%)	Build a program description / request for proposals Build a scoring rubric Build an application form with instructions
Ag Program	"Planning and programs...and other tools developed in partnership with the agricultural community to enhance economic viability and longevity of working ag lands"	Chaffee Conservation Connection	Agricultural Funding Program. Consists of 5 Year agreements with qualitied landowners to a) not develop, b) keep water tied to the land, and c) continue in ag best management practices.	Agree program eligibility requirements Agree program framework Develop application form and instructions
Enhancement Grants	"Programs...and other tools" to enhance economic viability and longevity of working lands"	Ag Enhancement Grants Program for projects that enhance conservation values on qualified properties.	Competitive Grants for eligible working lands	Plan for early 2020 funding cycle
Land Conservation Grants	"Conservation Easements, land acquisition"	Conservation Easements and Land Acquisition	Opportunistic Grants or Competitive Biannually?	Build a program description / request for proposals Build a scoring rubric Build an application form with instructions

Attachment B: Common Ground Program Goals and Ranking Criteria

Strengthen forest health to protect community from severe wildfire, protect water quality and enhance wildlife habitat...through planning and execution of treatment activities	
Conserve and support working ranchers, farms and rural landscapes...through easements and tools to enhance economic viability/longevity of working lands	
Protect watershed health from the negative impacts resulting from outdoor recreation use through management, hardening, restoration, education and acquisition that both disperses use and supports conservation values.	
Encourage action across the landscape - at scale, across land ownership/management boundaries and across multiple funding categories.	
Fund successful programs	
Maximize overall program impact by working match CG Funds by two to one with cash and in kind match on all combined programs, with exceptions permitted for individual programs.	

Ranking criteria for all funding areas

	Forest Health and Fire Resilience	Sustainable Ag	Rec Impact Management	Points
1. Impact to Common Ground Goals / Community Visions				**60**
a) Agricultural Sustainability	Supports sustainable agricultural use on public lands (eg. enhancing grazing quality, wetland fencing)	Supports economic viability/longevity of Ag Operations	Mitigates impacts to agricultural sustainability associated with recreation growth	8
b) Forest Health and Fire Resilience	Supports forest health management / protects community from severe wildfire and post fire flood	Supports overall watershed health	Mitigates potential for human caused fire	8
c) Recreation Impact Management	Manages impact of recreation use to forest health or wildfire risk	Manages impact of recreation use to agricultural operations	Manages overall impacts of recreation use to the health of the watershed/ecosystem	4
d) Wildlife and Habitat	Impact to critical habitat, connected migration corridors, high quality and impact habitat (riparian, wetland), unique habitat (endemic species, high biodiversity), threatened and endangered species, aquatic habitats			8
e) Water	Potential impact to water quality (sediment, erosion, ability of land to filter water). Protects source water for communities. Protects communities from post fire flood events.	Impact to water quality (ability of land to filter water) and water quantity (ties water to the land, provides groundwater recharge).	Management of impacts to water quality (eg. sediment, erosion, fecal coliform).	7
f) Scenic Views	Impact to key public view corridors: major highways, river corridor, iconic views			7
g) Scale/connectivity of impact	Acres treated, connectivity across land boundaries (Discuss best measure with SME Boards)	Quality and connectivity of land conserved (discuss best measure with SME Boards)	Measure to capture the scale of impact (Discuss best measure with SME Boards)	8
h) Duration of Impact	Short (<10 years), Medium (10-50 years), Forever			10
2. Urgency and longevity				**10**
	Immediate wildfire risk, life safety risk, ability to act (NEPA ready, "shovel ready"	Potential for development, subdivision or separation of water rights from the land. Ability to act now (landowner support)	Threat to water quality/habitat/wildlife displacement, erosion. Ability to act now (NEPA ready, shovel ready)	
	What is impact or risk to program goals / watershed health if the project is not done in 1-2 years?			
3. Fit in Strategic Regional Planning				**10**
	Is the project part of a regional strategy to protect/enhance community values county wide and across land management boundaries? (eg. CWPP. If yes, where is it prioritized in that plan (bottom 25%, top 25% etc.)	Is the project part of a regional strategy to protect/enhance community values county wide and across land management boundaries? (eg. Keep Working Lands Working process). If yes, where is it prioritized in that plan (bottom 25%, top 25% etc.)	Is the project part of a regional strategy to protect/enhance community values county wide and across land management boundaries? (eg. RiB). If yes, where is it prioritized in that plan (Bottom 25%, top 25% etc.)	
	Does the project provide regional connectivity (across ownership boundaries, adjacent to protected lands, connects wildlife migration corridors) etc. and/or opportunity for additional protection/management on adjacent lands?			
4. Probability of Program Success				**10**
a) Competency of applicant	Staff experience, track record of success in local projects of similar scope/scale in last 5 years			
b) Planning and preparedness	Provided project schedule, budget, plan			
c) Public involvement & support	Letters of support, engagement in community planning process, ability to use the project to teach or demonstrate.			
d) Appropriate partnerships	Letters of support from land manager/agency, appropriate project partners for success			
e) Measures and metrics	Are program results measurable with available data or data that will be collected? Is there a plan to monitor and report impact?			
f) Project Sustainability	Is long term stewardship required to maintain benefit? If yes, what is the plan to fund future costs after the grant period.			
5. Funding Leverage				**10**
a) Cash Match (%) - Confirmed & Potential	* Confirmed requires commitment letter or proof of existing grant			
b) In Kind Match (%) - Confirmed & potential.	* As above. Includes Volunteer Time ($30/hr), Professional Time (market rate) and Donated Land/Easement Value			
c) Creates a transferable solution	Opportunity for state or region-wide impact			
d) Admin cost supported by other funding	% Admin cost requested (<25, 25-50, 50-75%, >75%)			
e) Cost to Benefit Ratio	Formula: Project cost to Common Ground / score on Section IA.			
6. Supports local resources and capacity				**10**
	Use of local contractors, local businesses, local mills, local non profit organizations, local staff etc. Keeps dollars in Chaffee County and develops local capacity to achieve program goals.			
			Total	**100**

Evaluation Criterion	Rating	Point Score	Weighted Score
I. Scenic Landscapes and Vistas *Factors:* *Location* *Visibility* *Quality* *Relative Contribution* *Contiguity* *Size (relative)* Region Weighting Factor: For this Open Space Value multiply the Point Score by the Weighting Factor shown for the Region in which this Project is located: Ag. and Ranching [x3] Development Corr. [x3] Upland Watershed [x2]	<u>High (4 points):</u> Relatively larger tract, the size is significant relative to its location and surrounding parcels. High visual exposure from primary highway or travel route. Outstanding and/or unique scenic quality of regional importance or scale. Contains prominent Eagle County features, ridgelines or landmark(s), strongly associated with County's identity or sense of place. Land is contiguous with other highly valued existing or potential open space lands. Preservation enhances perceived and economic value to residents and tourists and supports the reasons for living/visiting here. Property generally undisturbed, in natural state. Long term visual benefits are free of obstruction from potential uses on adjacent or surrounding properties. Geology and vegetation is stable. Property an "in-holding" whose protection from development would greatly add to the community and the open space surrounding it. <u>Med (2 points):</u> Significant visual exposure from secondary travel route. High visual quality, diversity, contributes to community identity or sense of place. Contains prominent local features, ridgelines or local landmark(s). Of more local importance or scale. <u>Low (1point):</u> Witnessed only from less traveled roads. Low visual diversity, interest. Disturbances or improvements on the land lessen scenic quality. Contribution to scenic quality in a very limited geographic area. <u>NA (0 points):</u> Land cannot be seen by the public, provides no contribution to the landscape.		

Evaluation Criterion	Rating	Point Score	Weighted Score

II. Regional Heritage, Agriculture and Ranching
 	
Factors:
 	
Agricultural production
Economic viability
Water rights
Historic uses/ structures
Relative total size and fraction that is in production
 	
Region Weighting Factor: For this Open Space Value multiply the Point Score by the Weighting Factor shown for the Region in which this Project is located:
 	
Ag. and Ranching
          [x3]
 	
Development Corr.
          [x3]
 	
Upland Watershed
          [x2]
	<u>High (4 points):</u> Historic working ranch with long term viability. Large size (500 acres or greater). Extensive areas of pasture, irrigated land, prime soils. Productivity predominately rated as 10 or above according to the State of Colorado uniform productivity evaluation system, which includes assessment of water quantity and availability. Site of significant historical or cultural value. Preservation enhances perceived and economic value to residents and tourists and supports the reasons for living/visiting here. Senior water rights intended to stay with the land. Excellent water delivery system. Contiguous to other ranches or protected open space. No present or proposed non-ranching businesses or activities that would diminish values important to open space preservation.
	
	<u>Med (2 points):</u> Working ranch of smaller scale. Productivity predominately rated as 7 or above according to the State of Colorado uniform productivity evaluation system. Long term viability less certain. Adequate water, perhaps less senior in right, will stay with the land. Historical or cultural value of less significance. Contiguous to other ranches or protected open space. No adverse non-ranching activities that place or would potentially place ranching as a secondary activity on the land.
	
	<u>Low (1 point):</u> Productivity predominately rated as 5 or below according to the State of Colorado uniform productivity evaluation system. Relatively small. Minimal water rights. Some history or cultural connection, but of minimal value
	
	<u>NA (0 points):</u> Land with no ranching activities, agricultural production, or connection to Eagle County history		

Evaluation Criterion	Rating	Point Score	Weighted Score

III. Wildlife, Wildlife Habitat and Migration Routes
 	
Factors:
 	
Quality of Habitat
Species
Intensity/type
  of use
Contiguity to Other
Sensitive Habitats
Size (relative)
 	
Region Weighting Factor: For this Open Space Value multiply the Point Score by the Weighting Factor shown for the Region in which this Project is located:
 	
Ag. and Ranching
        [x3]
 	
Development Corr.
        [x3]
 	
Upland Watershed
        [x3]
	High (4 points): Relatively larger tract. Contains significant mapped winter range or winter concentration areas for elk and deer. Contains significant big game calving areas or migratory routes. Contains critical habitat, breeding or nesting areas for grouse, waterfowl, or raptors. Known presence of threatened or endangered species. Excellent species and habitat diversity. Has significant water in the form of streams, rivers, ponds or lakes for wildlife use. Is contiguous with other existing or potential open space or public lands of importance to wildlife. Long term wildlife benefits are free of obstruction from potential uses on adjacent or surrounding properties.
	
	Med (2 points): High quality habitat, but land somewhat fractioned or isolated in nature. Used extensively by deer and elk as summer range, but less in winter. Less species and/or habitat diversity. Significant use by non-game species.
	
	Low (1 point): Only occasional use by non-game wildlife, little use by deer and elk. Poor diversity. Habitat disturbed/degraded by historic activities, uses, improvements.
	
	NA (0 points): Little or no documented current use by, or value to, wildlife.		

Evaluation Criterion	Rating	Point Score	Weighted Score
IV. Sensitive Lands & Environments *Factors:* *Riparian areas* *Floodplains* *Geology* *Watershed characteristics* *Vegetation communities* *Sensitivity* *Contiguity* *Size (relative)* Region Weighting Factor: For this Open Space Value multiply the Point Score by the Weighting Factor shown for the Region in which this Project is located: Ag. and Ranching [x3] Development Corr. [x3] Upland Watershed [x3]	High (4 points): Large property, contains significant undisturbed areas designated (mapped) as riparian or wetland, and/or areas within mapped flood plain. Significantly areas of potential geologic hazard. Contains ground water re-charge or surface source water areas. Contains outstanding example of native plant community, or known presence of rare and/or endangered plant species. Benefits are free of obstruction from potential uses on adjacent or surrounding properties. Protection would contribute to the long-term viability of larger ecosystem. Is contiguous with other existing or potential open space or public lands. Med (2 points): Smaller property, contains riparian, wetland or flood plain or geologic hazard areas, but to a lesser degree. Smaller pockets of rare, threatened or endangered vegetative species. Potential contribution to ground water/surface water quality, though less significant. Less contiguity with other open space or public lands. Good example of native plant community, some contribution to viability of larger ecosystem. Low (1 point): Limited amount of riparian, wetland or flood plain area. Vegetation previously disturbed, non-native. Does not contain threatened or endangered vegetative species. Isolated from existing or potential open space or public lands. NA (0 points): No unique or endangered environments. No contribution to larger ecosystem, no wetlands or contribution to ground or surface water system		

Evaluation Criterion	Rating	Point Score	Weighted Score

V. Physical and Visual Buffers
 	
Factors:
 	
Position in County
Proximity to sensitive lands
Master Plan
Contiguity
Size (relative)
 	
Region Weighting Factor: For this Open Space Value multiply the Point Score by the Weighting Factor shown for the Region in which this Project is located:
 	
Ag. and Ranching
    [x1]
 	
Development Corr.
    [x3]
 	
Upland Watershed
    [x1]
	High (4 points): Relatively large tract. Of itself, or in combination with other contiguous open space lands, would provide significant separation between developed communities, promoting separate community identity and distinction. Preservation would provide separation between identified sensitive lands and existing or proposed development areas. In close proximity to identified urban growth boundary, or areas proposed for urban development. Land is in natural state or generally undisturbed. If disturbed, needed restoration is economically viable.
	
	Med (2 points): Contribution to goal of separation still considerable but less significant. Properly positioned, but somewhat isolated from development centers, development corridors. Less contiguity with other existing or potential open space tracts that could contribute to creation of buffer.
	
	Low (1 point): Property properly positioned, but overall contribution would be minimal.
	
	NA (0 points): Would provide no buffer.		

Evaluation Criterion	Rating	Point Score	Weighted Score
VI. Access to Streams, Rivers, Public Lands and Dispersed Recreation Opportunities *Factors:* *Existing access* *Need for access* *Desirability* *Sensitivity of resource* *Maintenance* Region Weighting Factor: For this Open Space Value multiply the Point Score by the Weighting Factor shown for the Region in which this Project is located: Ag. and Ranching [x2] Development Corr. [x3] Upland Watershed [x1]	<u>High (4 points):</u> Acquisition would permit or significantly improve access to area of high desirability and suitability for dispersed-recreational uses. Negative consequences to sensitive lands or environments non-existent, or easily mitigated. On primary travel route, close to a community center, sufficient parking would be available. Proposed or existing dispersed-recreational use compatible with uses on surrounding properties, and not threatened by potential uses on adjacent lands that would diminish its value. Necessary improvements / maintenance / monitoring projected to be reasonable, within budget. <u>Med (2 points):</u> Access already exists but would be improved or enhanced. Target use area less desirable, less utilized. Land suitable but less durable, considerable care / expense required to avoid impacts to sensitive lands/ environments. Located on secondary travel route, some distance from a community center, sufficient parking would be available. More difficult to monitor. <u>Low (1 point):</u> Adequate access already exists. Area is not desirable. Development of access would be overly expensive. Remote location. Environmental or maintenance costs would be prohibitively high. Dispersed recreation use problematic given sensitivity of land. Other open space values would be materially compromised by dispersed-recreational use. <u>NA (0 points):</u> Would provide no access. Recreational uses are not available.		

Attachment D: Outstanding Questions for SME Board Input

Question	Initial Recommendation for input / Best Practice	SME Board Input
Sorted - questions for SME Board Input		
Should we consider funding agency or non profit staff positions or NPO/Business capacity development?	**Yes,** capacity development is needed to achieve program goals. Decide how to structure for best results - may include match requirements, be limited to 3 years, require a sustainability strategy.	
Should we have cash grants or should they be reimbursable? Or reimbursable at some specified limit?	Develop a system that allows for some level of cash up front combined with either a percentage reimbursable for grants over a specified amount and/or penalties for non-performance	
Is Capital Equipment Funded? (For example, fire equipment, agricultural equipment)	**No,** with the exception of supplies supporting projects (eg. tools, trail counters). This is because it is not generally best practice and other funding sources are available.	
Are individual Landowners Funded? (for example for fire remediation, ditch enhancement)	**With conditions:** Consider when the project serves a broad community purpose, fits with regional strategic priorities and our funding is managed by a NPO, Government group or HOA.	
Who can apply? Can individual landowners apply or must funds run through a NPO/Agency?	?	
How might we help funded organizations communicate results to the community, what is standard for reporting on results to CAC?	Develop Common Ground support for press releases and communication, guidance for project reporting	
How might funds be provided to agency run programs without having unintended consequences in terms of management admin costs or decreased agency funding?	Consider a learning call on this with Flagstaff (Fire), Pitkin Co (recreation management)	
Do we need learning calls: Pitkin Co., Grand Co., Ashland OR, Flagstaff AZ		
Questions the CAC has resolved		
Should we consider multi- year funding and under what conditions.	**Yes** this should be included, develop criteria.	
Do we/when do we consider finance structures such as certificates of participation with future revenue as collateral?	**Yes** - Part of the intent of fixing 25% of funds for forest health was to enable this sort of mechanism. We will revisit this in Year 2 - parked for now.	
How do we be nimble and not miss opportunities? (for example with Easements, Acquisitions)	Provide minimum score for out of cycle approval and/or approve conditional grants and/or have multiple annual funding cycles.	
What are guidelines for Fee Acquisition?	Must have shared conservation and community benefit (eg. resolving a current conflict and protecting/enhancing water resources or habitat values). Note that acquisition is a program tool vs. a goal.	
How do we create leverage for Common Ground funds, help community leverage funds? Should overall program and individual programs have match/leverage target	We will require: a) Minimum match requirement (does not have to be in hand) and strong ranking points for leverage, b. Include funding development as a use of funds, c. provide letters of support for grant opportunities (with a simple/quick process).	
What is the feedback loop to assess progress of grantees in order to continue/stop funding?	Require reporting milestones for large grants and/or phased grants. Grants should have term limits, with the opportunity to extend with CAC approval.	
Do we want to include site visits or face to face evaluation on some/all projects?	We will do this only selectively, with criteria dependent on the total request amount and the track record of the applicant in similar projects	