

Final Sierra Nevada Conservancy-Progress Report

**Sierra Nevada Conservancy Grant Program
Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control
River and Coastal Protection Act of 2008 (Proposition 84)**

Grantee Name: Mother Lode Land Trust

Project title: Central Sierra Resource Mapping Project

SNC Reference Number: SNC070280 **Submittal Date:** 03-29-2012

Report Preparer: Ellie Routt **Phone #:** (209) 419-2861

Check one:

6-Month Progress Report

Final Report

<p>6-Month Progress Reports should reflect the previous six months. Final Reports should reflect the entire grant period.</p>

A. Progress Report Summary: (Please provide a general description of work completed during this reporting period.)

At the beginning of the grant period we conducted various public outreach meetings in the Counties we were covering; Amador, Calaveras and Tuolumne Counties. Several of the meetings we hosted as informational meetings to engage the public in the process of Conservation Mapping, and to gather input from the people in the areas, as to what they felt was important and worth protecting. But the majority of the meetings were of local organizations, which we attended to speak on behalf of our project and achieve the same results as we did from the public outreach meetings. We were able to reach a much broader range of people this way. Organizations we visited were: Fire Safe Councils, other Land Trusts, County planning departments, Board of Supervisors, Resource Conservation Districts, the CSRC&D, UC Co-Op Extension, County Ag departments, Rotary clubs, and special interest groups. The results were similar in each county. Areas of concern were development pressure, ag land conversion, water supply and quality, open space protection, and endangered species.

Once we gathered sufficient input from the public, we went to work determining the parameters of our project for the resource mapping. Seven parameters were selected based on the outreach: Potential development pressure, endangered species and habitats, farmland, large land parcels with single owner, protected land, riparian habitats, and water quality vulnerability zones. These parameters were then mapped for the region on a watershed basis, and priority parcels were identified based on the number of parameters they met. A summary of the mapping project was then developed to better describe the project and the methods associated with the

development of the parameters and priority parcels. The summary and several maps were generated as the final product of this grant. The priority parcel owners were contacted and we will continue to reach out to them and other willing landowners in the region, who would like to help conserve land.

B. Deliverables or Outcomes completed during this Reporting Period or Milestones Achieved: (Include specific information, such as public meetings held, agency participation, partnerships developed, or acres mapped, treated or restored.)

For the public/stakeholder outreach portion of this grant we hosted several public meetings and we also attended the meetings of Fire Safe Councils, other Land Trusts, County planning departments, Board of Supervisors, Resource Conservation Districts, the CSRC&D, UC Co-Op Extension, County Ag departments, Rotary clubs, and special interest groups in order to gather input from the communities. Through this outreach several partnerships were developed with other local non-profits, and supporters were identified.

For the GIS portion of this project, 125,331 parcels, for a total of 3,428,670 acres were assessed. A summary report of the mapping resources and methods was developed, and several maps were generated to show the parameters and the priority parcels.

C. Challenges or Opportunities Encountered: (Please describe what has worked and what hasn't; include any solutions you initiated to resolve problems. If your project is not on schedule, please explain why here.)

Outreach Challenges and Opportunities:

The main challenge we encountered during the outreach was getting people to soften up to the idea of assessing their land. There was a big misconception that we were "The Government" and we were going to come in and tell people what to do with their land. Private Property Rights was also a big issue for people. It took us some time to figure out the right way to address the public and still achieve the results we were looking for, and it was obvious that we needed to send a different message during our presentations. When we began to talk of protecting water quality and preserving the Agricultural viability of the region, people got on board. In the end, the outreach was very successful.

GIS Challenges and Opportunities:

- a. Data Availability and Acquisition
 - i. Parcel and Ownership Data

1. Determining quality and availability of parcel and ownership information for 8 counties provided a clear glimpse at the wide range of data standards extant in central California. Data quality ranges from complete, current, and integrated GIS data, to ownership information maintained at completely different levels than the GIS data, in non-compatible formats, with apparently suppressed information in some cases. Many entities required user agreements for their data which preclude sharing the parcel and ownership information.

In the end, data for the study area was located, requested, and acquired, after negotiation for the best possible price, for fees ranging from \$610 to free. It is interesting to note the highest quality data was free.

In the end, the GIS parcel data was available for 100% of the study area. Ownership information was available for approximately 95% of the study area.

Please see the chart for costs and other details of the data acquisition.

County	Data Owner	Transfer Method	Data Type	Use Agreement Required	Date Data Acquired	Fee
Alpine	Community Development	Email Attachment	CSV, SHP	Yes	27-Oct-11	\$0
Amador	IT	Download	SHP	No	22-Sep-11	\$0
	Assessor	CD via USPS	XLS	Yes	30-Oct-11	\$450
Calaveras	Planning	Public FTP	SHP	No	20-Oct-11	\$0
El Dorado	GIS	Google Docs	SHP	No	10-Nov-11	\$60
Sacramento	GIS	Secure FTP	SHP	No	20-Oct-11	\$0
San Joaquin	GIS	CD via USPS	SHP	Yes	3-Nov-11	\$85
	Assessor	CD via USPS	MDB	Yes	10-Nov-11	\$610
Stanislaus	Public Works	Public FTP	SHP	No	19-Oct-11	\$0
	Assessor	Secure FTP	MDB	Yes	26-Oct-11	\$220
Tuolumne	Community Development	Secure FTP	SHP	Yes	10-Nov-11	\$0
						\$1,425

ii. Data Quality

1. Endangered Species and Habitats

- a. Exhaustive data does not exist for endangered species and habitats. The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) does provide sightings, but the areas covered are not systematic or complete. The California State Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) VegCAMP data is useful, with detailed vegetation data, but is available for a limited elevation range in the MLLT study area, approximately 500 ft to 3,000 ft.

The CDFG data was combined with the less detailed, but available for a larger area, U. S. Forest Service (USFS) eVeg data. This provided complete coverage, with various levels of detail, for the whole study area.

2. Water Quality Vulnerability Zones (WQVZ)

- a. The methodology for analyzing water quality vulnerability zones included four parameters – soil composition, vegetation cover, proximity to surface water, and slope. For the MLLT study area, the soil data quality was incomplete. For all of Tuolumne County, or 44% of the Project area, no usable soil data was available.

After reviewing the methodology and results, it was determined that the compositing process would only add more areas to the final result if soil data was included, and so the analysis was completed without the soil parameter. When the soil data becomes available, it can be incorporated into a revised analysis. But the existing analysis results will not change, and are accurate.

iii. U.S. Census Data from 1990 and 2010 is not Compatible

1. To analyze population growth over time using US Census data, the problem of census boundaries changing over time must be overcome. Various companies provide census data interpolated to a common boundary, each using its own algorithms and assumptions, and at various prices.

The method most suited to the needs of the MLLT was found in ESRI's Community Analyst tools. In order to reduce costs to MLLT, the free evaluation copy was used for the allowed two week time span, to convert the 1990 U.S. Census population data to the U. S. Census 2010 boundaries. The tool was used at its maximum 20 records at a time limit, for more than 2000 Census blocks.

The resulting GIS and XLS files are permanent, and available for future use.

b. Project Schedule Constraints

- i. Because the deadline for the GIS portion of the MLLT project allowed 7 months for completion, the desired components of the project had to be prioritized.

In addition to the conscious allocation of resources to prioritized components, GIS technical support from SNC was helpful in evaluating and completing several aspects of the project. SNC reviewed potential data sources for the Historic and Cultural Resources layer, and determined usable data was not available to meet the needs of the Project. SNC also provided farmland data, extracted from their Working Landscapes study, for the MLLT Project area.

In addition to technical support, SNC has provided data and methodology review during the process, as well as other support in administration and reporting.

D. Unanticipated Successes Achieved: (Please describe any additional successes beyond completing scheduled tasks or meeting scheduled milestones.)

Through the public outreach we were not only able to satisfy the requirements of this grant agreement, but we also spread the word about our organization and gathered a group of new supporters/members. We also connected with several landowners who have been working with us to donate or sell Conservation Easements on their land. This unanticipated support has been amazing in helping our organization increase its capacity.

Through the GIS portion of this grant we were able to increase cooperation with the local governments in data sharing. Some counties didn't charge for data, others reduced rates for us, and others even updated their data partially based on recommendations from us. These developing relationships with the Counties have been beneficial to us in that they now have a better idea of what we do in the community, and can now appreciate the importance of this project.

E. Compare Actual Costs to Budgeted Costs: (Please refer to your grant agreement to list your deliverables/budget categories and budgeted costs compared to actual costs incurred during this reporting period in the table below.)

PROJECT BUDGET CATEGORIES	Budgeted SNC Dollars	Actual Dollars
Staff Salary	\$20,000	\$17,569.25
GIS Development and Printing	\$16,000	\$19,600
Information & Resource Development	\$4,000	\$4000
Stakeholder Meetings	\$3,000	\$2330.75
Administration	\$4,350	\$4350
GRAND TOTAL	\$47,850	\$47,850

Explanation: (if needed)

The costs for the GIS Development and Printing went higher than expected, but a portion of those funds were to pay the GIS Specialist for her time. Therefore, some money was pulled from the Staff Salary to cover her costs, and the remainder was pulled from the Stakeholder Outreach as the GIS Specialist was meeting with the local governments to gather data and information.

F. Do you have information to report on the project-specific Performance Measures for your project? (If so, please list the Performance Measures below and describe your progress.)

1. Develop GIS Resources and Reproduce for Staff Use

An extensive GIS mapping project has been completed. The attached project mapping summary with maps details the procedures used for the project.

2. Identify key areas/resources to be assessed.

Through extensive public outreach and internal discussions, we developed a set of parameters that were most important to the people in our region. The seven parameters we came up with are: Potential Development Pressure, Endangered Species and Habitats, Farmland, Large Land Parcels with Single Owner, Protected Land Adjacent, Riparian Habitats, and Water Quality Vulnerability Zones.

3. Conduct meetings with interested landowners/stakeholders.

At the beginning of the grant period we conducted various public outreach meetings in the Counties we were covering; Amador, Calaveras and Tuolumne Counties. Several of the meetings we hosted as informational meetings to engage the public in the process of Conservation Mapping, and to gather input from the people in the areas, as to what they felt was important and worth protecting. But the majority of

the meetings were of local organizations, which we attended to speak on behalf of our project and achieve the same results as we did from the public outreach meetings. We were able to reach a much broader range of people this way. Organizations we visited were: Fire Safe Councils, other Land Trusts, County planning departments, Board of Supervisors, Resource Conservation Districts, the CSRC&D, UC Co-Op Extension, County Ag departments, Rotary clubs, and special interest groups. The results were similar in each county. Areas of concern were development pressure, ag land conversion, water supply and quality, open space protection, and endangered species.

4. Conduct on-the-ground assessment of Targeted Properties.

The completed mapping project highlighted 9 parcels that met all 7 of the parameters. Additionally, there were 109 parcels that met 6 of the 7 parameters. These 118 landowners were contacted and given information on Conservation Easements and the Mother Lode Land Trust. Maps were generated of specific parcels, and ground truthing occurred to ensure that the parameters mapped were accurate. Part of our ongoing outreach in the future will be to reach out to these landowners again in order to generate more interest. Future workshops will also occur as mentioned in #9: Post Grant Plans, below.

5. Develop and produce informational resources for distribution.

At the conclusion of this project a mapping summary and maps were produced to share with the public and stakeholders in the region. Several copies of the summary were produced which will be placed in various Natural Resource libraries in the region (NRCS office, RC&D office, MLLT office, County offices) for the public to access. Maps highlighting areas of concern were also shared with the public and various local agencies.

G. Were there any other relevant materials produced under the terms of this Agreement that are not a part of the budgeted deliverables? If so, please attach copies. (Include digital photos, maps, media coverage of project, or other work products.)

N/A

H. Next Steps: (Work anticipated in the next 6 months, including location and timing of any scheduled events related to the project.)

N/A - Final Report

Please Complete this Section for FINAL Report ONLY

Capacity-Building Results and Collaboration and Cooperation with Stakeholders:

(What partnerships did you initiate or strengthen as a result of this project? How did they affect the project outcome? If applicable, how did this grant increase your organization's capacity? What is your plan to sustain this increase?)

With the Resource Mapping Project, the MLLT has expanded their capacity to include more complete data in their decisions and management choices. The Project's resultant GIS database for the MLLT area remains as a useful tool for future reference, ready to address questions of a demographic, environmental, or topographical nature, among others.

Initially the MLLT Project provided opportunities for collaboration between MLLT, SNC, and local agencies. In a second phase of the project, involving contact with property owners identified in the Project analysis, private land owners will be presented with the same opportunities.

The collaboration between MLLT, SNC, and local agencies has helped strengthen regional relationships. These contacts can support future projects or endeavors, for any of the collaborators.

As an example, MLLT was one of multiple entities to request parcel and ownership data from County agencies. Toward the end of the MLLT Project's data collection phase, the county of Calaveras, began providing free, complete, integrated GIS parcel data with owner information. Previously, Calaveras had separate GIS parcel data and owner information, which it also charged a fee to provide. While this change is not a result of pressure solely from the MLLT project process, we are pleased to see this increased data sharing and cooperation, and we are pleased with any impact our actions may have added.

Description of Project Accomplishments:

1. Most Significant Accomplishment

Describe in one concise, well-written paragraph, the most significant accomplishment that resulted from this grant.

Mapping priorities in our region is critical for us as we work on a regional level and need to have this priority ranking in order to be the most effective in our conservation efforts. When we developed the priority ranking, we used parameters that the land trust felt was important, and parameters that the public felt were important. Once we ranked everything and came out with 9 Highest Priority parcels, it was evident to us that we developed this highly narrowed down result due to our good choice of parameters. This would not have been possible without the input and collaboration of our stakeholders. Useful maps that truly reflect the priorities of the region, have given us a good starting place for future, effective conservation work and are definitely our most significant accomplishment.

2. WOW Factor

If applicable, please describe anything that happened as a result of the project or during the project that is particularly impressive.

N/A

3. Design and Implementation

When considering the design and implementation of this project, what lessons did you learn that might help other grantees implement similar work?

In the end, it was the extensive public outreach that really shaped our project. Without buy in from the stakeholders, we would not be able to move forward after completing this project. No one would work with us if we came up with the parameters on our own, and funders will like that we can bring them projects that have community buy in and support.

4. Indirect Impact

Please describe any indirect benefits of the project such as information that has been developed as a result of the project is being used by several other organizations to improve decision-making, or a conservation easement funded by this grant that encouraged other landowners in the area to have conservation easements on their property.

During the public outreach we were able to gain new supporters/donors. We also began working with a few families who wanted to place conservation easements on their property as a result of this project. The public outreach also helped us identify other

areas where the public wanted information. We would like to do additional workshops in our communities such as, “protecting ag lands to protect the local economy”, and “the importance of land management as it pertains to water quality and quantity”.

Also, on the GIS side, toward the end of the MLLT Project’s data collection phase, the county of Calaveras, began providing free, complete, integrated GIS parcel data with owner information. Previously, Calaveras had separate GIS parcel data and owner information, which it also charged a fee to provide. While this change is not a result of pressure solely from the MLLT project process, we are pleased to see this increased data sharing and cooperation, and we are pleased with any impact our actions may have added.

5. Collaboration and Conflict Resolution

If you worked in collaboration or cooperation with other organizations or institutions, describe those arrangements and their importance to the project. Also, describe if you encountered conflict in the project and how you dealt with it, or if there was conflict avoided as a result of the project.

The extent of our collaboration was with the Counties where we gathered the majority of our parcel data. We would not have been able to complete accurate priority ranking without their data. Additional information on collaboration can be found in our answer to the “Collaboration and Cooperation with Stakeholders” question above.

6. Capacity-Building

SNC is interested in both the capacity of your organization, as well as local and regional capacity. Please describe the overall health of your organization including areas in need of assistance. SNC is interested in the strength and involvement of your board, significant changes to your staff, size and involvement of membership. In addition, describe how your project improved capabilities of partners, or the larger community.

The Mother Lode Land Trust is a small organization with 1 part time staff person, a bookkeeper, and a strong all volunteer board or directors. We work mostly with landowners willing to donate a conservation easement as we normally do not have the capacity to take on big acquisition projects. Through this project and others we have increased our volunteer base as well as our membership. At times it is hard enough just to keep up with the day to day, so things like outreach get pushed aside. This project gave us the funds to hire someone to help with the outreach portion, and in turn we accomplished the requirements of the grant, as well as spread the word about our organization. This project has, and will continue to increase our capacity as more and more people recognize our importance. We can help with planning and education

as well as land protection. It is our hope that this project will assist the local Counties in their planning processes.

7. Challenges

Did the project face internal or external challenges? How were they addressed? Describe each challenge and any actions that you took to address it. Was there something that SNC did or could have done to assist you? Did you have to change any of your key objectives in response to conditions “on the ground”?

The big challenge was sorting through the copious amounts of Data out there and determining what was useful and pertinent. SNC was integral in helping us with a lot of the data collection as they had previously completed projects of a similar nature. We were able to look at that data and either fill in gaps, or add or omit data based upon our needs. Some of our original parameters were changed once we looked at this additional data. For example, we originally had Riparian Habitats mixed in with Endangered Species and Habitats but we found that other projects missed big areas of importance when riparian wasn't called out specifically.

8. Photographs

Grantees are strongly encouraged to submit photos, slides or digital images whenever possible. These images will be used for SNC publications such as annual reports or on the website. Please make sure you clearly identify location, activity, and your project with each submitted image. Images will be credited to the submitting organization, unless specified otherwise.

N/A

9. Post Grant Plans

What are the post-grant plans for the project if it does not conclude with the grant? Include a description of the following (if applicable): (1) Changes in operations or scope; (2) Replication or use of findings; (3) Names of other organizations you expect to involve; (4) Plans to support the project financially, and; (5) Communication plans?

This Central Sierra Resource Mapping Project is the first step in the prioritization of areas in our region. We will definitely move forward with reaching out to the landowners in our priority areas in the hopes of securing conservation easements or deed restrictions. We are also willing to assist landowners on restoration projects that will improve these priority lands. We also hope to develop a C.A.P.P. in the areas where we have priority parcels so that we can hopefully secure funding for some projects.

10. Post Grant Contact

Who can be contacted a few years from now to follow up on the project? Please provide name and contact information.

Ellie Routt, Executive Director
PO Box 1435
1316 Jackson Gate Rd.
Jackson, CA 95642
(209) 223-1718 office
(209) 419-2861 cell
ellieroutt@sbcglobal.net

**Mother Lode Land Trust
Central Sierra Resource Mapping Project
SNC 070280**

**Final Performance Report
Exhibit B**

1. Resources leveraged:

a. Resources leveraged to complete this Project (matching funds, in kind contributions, etc.).

The MLLT was fortunate enough to receive data from the SNC for various parts of this project. Other SNC grantees had completed mapping projects previous to ours, and while our project was specific to our region and our needs, we were able to use some of the data and parameters to make our work easier. It is assumed that we would have had to spend a lot of more money on Staff time, had we not been able to get this data from SNC. Likewise, we spoke with the Sierra Cascade Land Trust Council and they shared their pros and cons of their mapping project, and we were able to better shape our project as a result of their input.

Several of MLLT's board members donated their time to reach out to their specific member organizations, further spreading the word about our project and gathering additional input. This saved time and money on the stakeholder outreach portion of our grant.

Lastly, the local NRCS office donated some time and resources into the preliminary map creation. We needed to generate maps of each County for the public outreach and they created these at no charge to us. Additionally, the NRCS office has offered to print maps from the final product as we need them in the future, thus helping to carry our project beyond the scope of this grant.

b. Resources leveraged as a result of this Project.

Through our public outreach we were able to secure a conservation easement on a 100 acre parcel adjoining some other protected lands that MLLT and DFG hold easements on. This brings our total protected area in the O'Neill Creek Watershed of Calaveras County, to 1100 acres!

2. Impact on collaboration and cooperation among stakeholders:

a. Number of people/entities involved in Project.

In the actual project development there were two people running the program. Ellie Routt, Executive Director of the MLLT led the Public Outreach, identified the key areas/resources to be assessed (project

parameters), and completed on the ground assessments of targeted properties. The MLLT contracted with a GIS Specialist, Kim Grissom to complete the GIS mapping and informational resources.

In addition to the two hired people, we were able to reach out to hundreds of people in the community through our outreach. The two big public outreach meetings brought in about 150 people, while the smaller meetings we attended reached out to an additional 100 or so. These 100 people were members of groups such as the Calaveras Consensus Group, Amador Citizens for Smart Growth, Local RCD's, County Governments and Planning Departments, Tuolumne Co. Land Trust, FOCUS, Foothill Conservancy, EBMUD, local Rotary Clubs and Community Associations. All together we reached out to 10+ organizations for information and input.

b. Increased cooperation/decreased conflict among stakeholders. Some of the Counties were not very forthcoming with their parcel data. Several changed and others claimed it wasn't available as we needed it. In working with the Counties, specifically Calaveras, we were able to help them understand how our project could help them and as a result the eventually released free, complete, current, integrated GIS parcel and ownership data.

3. Capacity building within region:

a. Description of how completion of this Project improved capabilities of grant recipients, partners, or larger community.

We now have the resources to quickly find priority parcels in the event that someone calls us for mitigation purposes, and we are better prepared to prioritize our projects based on the results of our project. Previously when a landowner contacted us we worked on a first come first served bases, but now we can identify their parcel on our maps, determine it's parameters, and see if it would qualify for funding or other special projects. We can also target our direct mailings to people in areas of specific concern. For example if we co-sponsor a meeting on Tiger Salamander mitigation, we can specifically contact landowners that have suitable habitat as opposed to just sending out a blanket mailer.

Several of our partners are benefiting from the mapping as well, in that now they have a lot of useful data all in one place. We are also developing a web page that contains the summary and some maps so that people can easily access our information. It is our hope that this mapping information can be used in County General Plan Updates and in Planning Departments when special projects come forward.

4. One-page description of Project accomplishments:

a. Description of how the project succeeded in accomplishing its intent and the direct benefits that resulted from the Project.

Please see our Final Report #'s: A. Progress Report Summary; B. Deliverables and Outcomes; and F. Project Specific Performance Measures.

b. Description of the follow-on or indirect benefits of the Project.

Please see our Final Report # D. Unanticipated Successes Achieved.

c. Description of any significant positive experiences and unanticipated occurrences, or other noteworthy events that happened during the Project and anything about the project that gives you “goose bumps”.

The big “goose bump” moment came when the 7 parameters were assessed and it turned out that the highest score (7 out of 7) resulted in only 9 parcels! A highly narrowed down result. This points to a good choice of parameters, and provides a very useful starting place.

Additionally, the Public Outreach portion of this grant was amazing for us in that we were able to spread the word about our other projects and work while pitching this project. It turns out many people in our region had a misunderstanding of who we are and what we do. A lot of folks thought we were the Government and “took” conservation easements in an eminent domain type situation. Others who didn’t own large tracts of land had a hard time seeing where the land trust could benefit them. Through the outreach and subsequent conversations with people we were able to help them see: we worked only with willing sellers and tailored contracts to their specific needs, we support the continuation of Agriculture in our region and promote working landscapes, and we offer educational opportunities through workshops on topics such as smart growth, open space protection, ag sustainability, etc. In the end this outreach helped us gather new supporters, volunteers, and a new conservation easement.

d. Description of lessons learned during the course of completing the Project.

I think the next time around it would be nice to hire the GIS Specialist prior to the public outreach so that possible parameters could be better understood. For example if we had known how easy it was to develop water quality vulnerability zones, we could have done more outreach to water agencies and potentially garnered more support there as our project could benefit them. Additionally it would have been nice if the GIS Specialist could have heard from some of the public and then been

given some free range to develop parameters based on what she was hearing. The learning curve for our staff on the GIS end was substantial and who knows what else we could have come up with if someone who knows the system had gathered some public input.

5. Number of properties or parcels assessed and estimated acreage.

125,331 parcels were assessed, for a total of 3,428,670 acres.

6. Number of individual resources identified and recorded in the assessment (i.e., endemic plants)

Seven resources were identified and recorded, as parameters in the study:

1. Potential Development Pressure
 - a. 63,632 parcels, for 378,628 acres
2. Endangered Species and Habitats
 - a. 35 sensitive plant species
 - b. 24 sensitive animal species
 - c. 10 sensitive habitat types
 - d. 1,433 areas, for 9,341 acres
3. Farmland
 - a. 412 areas, for 46,710 acres
4. Large Land Parcels with Single Owner
 - a. 912 parcels, for 910,989 acres
5. Protected Land Adjacent
 - a. 12,669 parcels for 549,571 acres
6. Riparian Habitats
 - a. 5,370 miles
7. Water Quality Vulnerability Zones
 - a. 57,408 Very High zones, for 430,155 acres.

7. Number, estimated acreage and description of new conservation easement project(s) initiated as a result of the assessment.

Potential candidates identified, 9 Highest priority parcels (score 7 of 7) 4,248 acres, and 109 High priority (score 6 of 7) 30,469 acres.

Table from summary page 15

Score	Number of Parcels	Acres
0	85,126	2,026,434
1	24,046	235,625
2	8,903	294,580
3	4,608	381,782
4	1,961	329,921

5	569	125,619
6	109	30,469
7	9	4,248

The 9 landowners with parcels meeting all 7 parameters were contacted and given information about the Mother Lode Land Trust. In our region, conservation easements can be a sensitive subject so we have learned it is better to go slow with people. The end result of this project was not to get new conservation easements, but to help us plan for future projects and plans.

SNC-approved Performance Measures: (Please list each Performance Measure for your Project, as identified in your Grant Agreement, and the results/outcomes.)

Sierra Nevada Conservancy Grant Program Project Reporting Guidelines

Progress Reports are required periodically throughout the term of the Grant Agreement (Refer to Exhibit B of the Grant Agreement). These reports will allow you and the Sierra Nevada Conservancy (SNC) to see the degree to which the project is on track and achieving your projected outcomes. Your Progress Reports will further provide the SNC with information that will help us to explain your work to the Board Members and various other audiences. Timing of Progress Reports is specified in the Project Schedule included in Exhibit A of the Grant Agreement, but generally every 6 months until completion of the project.

A Progress Reporting Form is provided to Grantees on the SNC Website. **Six-month Progress Reports** should reflect the previous 6-month period; **Final Reports** should address each question for the entire grant period – looking at the project as a whole.

The form specifies the items you will need to report on. For the Six-Month Interim Report these include, but are not limited to: *A Progress Report Summary of work completed, Deliverables or Outcomes Completed, Challenges or Opportunities Encountered, Unanticipated Successes Achieved, Actual Costs compared to Budgeted Costs, Any Additional Relevant Materials Produced, and Next Steps.*

The Final Report will include additional information, such as: *Resources Leveraged, Capacity-Building Results and Collaboration and Cooperation with Stakeholders, a Description of Project Accomplishments, and SNC Approved Performance Measures.*

Please make sure that you submit complete reports by the dates requested in your Grant Agreement.