

Grant Proposal Report to Commission from Task Force

Recommendation:

Legal Applicant:

- Category:** AC Formula -- Standard
 AC Formula – Rural State
 AC Competitive
 Other Competition

Program Name:

- Type:** Planning
 Operating
 Fixed Amount
 Ed Award Only

Federal Focus Area:

- Applicant type:** New (no prior AC experience)
 Re-compete (# of yrs: 24)

Local Share Required: Yes No

Proposed Dates: 1/1/2025 to 12/31/2027
 Submitted request is for Yr 1

Requested Resources: Funds and Slots (*indicates sections with calculation errors)

	CNCS		Local Share				
Operating	1,173,500						
Member Support							
Indirect (Admin)							
CNCS Award amount	\$1,173,500	Total Local Share (cash + in-kind)					
% sharing proposed							
% share required							
Cost-per-member proposed	\$25,000						
max allowed	\$25,000						
Total AmeriCorps Member Service Years:							
	Slot Types Requested						
	1700	1200	900	675	450	300	Total
Slots With living allowance	15	12	10	32		30	99
Slots with only ed award							

Program Description (executive summary):

The Maine Conservation Corps will have 99 AmeriCorps members who will complete vital environmental stewardship and capacity building activities. Team-based placements will focus on recreational trail rehabilitation and construction as well as habitat restoration; individual placement members will be engaged in host site-specific objectives rooted in community need, such as ecological monitoring, environmental education, community forestry projects, volunteer engagement, and expanding volunteer management practice in Maine. At the end of the first program year, the AmeriCorps members will be responsible for treating or constructing 200 miles of trail and providing capacity building services to 20 host sites. In addition, the AmeriCorps members will leverage 600 community volunteers who will gain skills and knowledge to perpetuate the stewardship efforts of members. The AmeriCorps investment will be matched with \$1,550,277, \$1,085,194 in public funding, and \$465,083 in private funding.

Service locations: local, state, and federal agencies, government and non-profit sector

Other than the legal applicant, please list the agencies or organizations that appear to be the major collaborators or partners in this grant.

Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, Dept. of Env. Protection, National Park Service.

Will the applicant place AmeriCorps members with other agencies? Yes No

Applicant proposes to deliver services:

- Within a single municipality Within a single County but not covering the entire County
 County-wide in a single County Multiple Counties but not Statewide Statewide

Performance measures (targets proposed for Year 1; targets for years 2 and 3 set in continuations):

SERVICE ACTIVITIES

OUTPUT: Performance Measure EN5

Proposed target: 200 miles of trails or waterways will be treated and/or constructed.

OUTCOME: Environmental Steward Performance Measure EN5.1

Proposed target: 180 miles of trails will be improved.

MEMBER DEVELOPMENT

(measures listed in the RFP not entered and targets were not proposed because CNCS does not allow them)

To be entered in state award if selected nationally for funding.

CAPACITY BUILDING

Output: Volunteer Management: Capacity Building Performance Measure G3-3.4

Proposed Target: 20 host sites will receive capacity building services.

Outcome: Capacity Building Performance Measure G3-3.10A:

Proposed Target: 15 hos sites will increase their efficiency, effectiveness, and/or program reach

Scoring Detail:

Peer Reviewer Consensus Score. *Assessment of narrative using point distribution from federal agency. Major categories (Program Design, Organizational Capability, Budget and Cost) are dictated by CFR rubric for scoring.*

	Quality Rating	Score
Program Design		
Community and Logic Model	Adequate	18
Evidence tier – category points	Strong	12
Evidence quality	Strong	8
Notice Priority	Adequate	0
Member Experience	Strong	6
Organizational Capability		
Organizational Background & Staffing	Strong	15
Commitment to DEIA	Adequate	3
Member Supervision	Strong	6
Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy		
Member Recruitment	Adequate	5.25
Member Retention	Strong	8
Data Collection	Adequate	5.25
Budget Alignment to Program Design	Adequate	6
Evaluation Plan	Adequate	
Total Peer Reviewer Score		92.5

Task Force Consensus Score. *The Task Force reviewers assess the additional technical criteria that states are directed to consider by the CFR.*

	Quality Rating	Score
Proposal Alignment		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignment of community need targeted and funding priorities 	Strong	12.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent to which the applicant proposes to serve communities described in 2522.450(c). 	Strong	12.5
Program Model		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal adds to the AmeriCorps grant portfolio goal of being programmatically, demographically, and geographically diverse 	Strong	3.33
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal is innovative use of AmeriCorps and might be replicated 	Strong	3.33
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence the program can be sustained beyond initial start up 	Strong	3.34
RFA Preference		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal is from a partnership or coalition 	Adequate	11.25
Past Performance		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can comply with requirements, info consistent with other grant administrator's info, consistent with externally verified past performance 	Adequate	1.88
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RECOMPETE ONLY: applicant used member positions 	Adequate	1.88
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RECOMPETE ONLY: used financial resources allocated 	Adequate	1.88
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RECOMPETE ONLY: implemented program effectively 	Adequate	1.88
Financial Plan		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan anticipates operational costs and provides sufficient resources to implement program 	Strong	10
Fiscal Systems		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity of Financial mgt system to comply with fed requirements 	Strong	5

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strength of orgz financial mgt practices as evidenced by audits, etc. 	Strong	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strength of sponsor orgs financial status/stability per audit, 990, etc. 	Strong	5
Grant Readiness		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant's systems, policies, experience, partnerships, leadership support, financial and personnel resources, etc. are fully prepared to implement the program 	Adequate	11.25
Total Task Force Score		90
Peer Review Score		92.5
Final Score for Applicant (200 possible)		182.5

Final Assessment of Application:

- Forward or fund with no corrections/modifications
- Forward or fund with corrections/modifications
- Do Not Forward or fund

Peer Reviewer Notes and Appraisal Summary:

Program Design. *This section covers the community need, service to be performed in response to need, evidence the service will be effective, roles for AmeriCorps and partners, performance measures, and anticipated results for year one.*

Community and Logic Model

<p>The logic model presented by MCC was extremely comprehensive with abundant information provided for each of the columns: Problem, Inputs, Activities, Outputs, Short-Term Outcomes, Mid-Term Outcomes, and Long-Term Outcomes. It would have been helpful to this reviewer to expand in either the Logic Model or Narrative with more specific information on partnering agencies and placement sites. The content provided adequate description of the core activities and the benefits to both AmeriCorps members and improvements to project sites. I might have been persuaded to rate the Logic Model higher if the content was less in long narrative format and more in bullet point outline. The logic model did correspond consistently with the program narrative but I felt like I was reading much of the same content twice.</p>
<p>No clear focus area from the applicant. We know 200 miles of trail at 20 sites, but it is unclear where those sites are. The only clear indication is in the evidence, and that is that the sites will be within 60 miles of Augusta in South-Central Maine.</p>
<p>The narrative and logic model outline in detail: - The community problem that the interventions are designed to address (aging workforce, trail infrastructure, challenges due to climate change, need for skilled workers to maximize environmental stewardship in the state) - The inputs/ resources necessary to deliver program activities(partnering agencies, locations/sites where members will provide services, number of americorps members needed, characteristics of americorps members, and the setting where interventions will take place). - The core activities that define the intervention (environmental stewardship activities, environmental education, training in leadership and job readiness) The duration and dosage of interventions. - Measurable outputs that result from delivering the intervention (200 miles of trails or waterways will be treated and/or constructed, members will complete the WorkReady curriculum, 20 host sites will receive capacity building services) - Outcomes that demonstrate meaningful changes in knowledge/ skill, behavior, or condition (trail systems have increased sustainability, members will find post-service opportunities, community volunteers move from episodic engagement to ongoing).</p>

Evidence Tier

The application made a convincing case the AmeriCorps program model – when compared to non-AmeriCorps one - has successfully been used regionally and nationally to demonstrate strong outcomes. Applicant cites several studies (Public Lands Service Coalition Partnership Impact Evaluation (2022) and another by the same group (2013) to justify the proposed project model.
The training and counseling Americorps members [receive] is exceptional. The success of the improved trail design and diminished number of off-shoot trails, and improvements to structures as well as increased number of structures is exceptional. High erosion after completion of the trail work caused by 2023 heavy rains was disappointing. The applicant failed to indicate whether the increased capacity of volunteers and their enhanced skills addressed the heavy trail erosion, thus failing to proving increased capacity was successful.
Looking at the assessment criteria, the interventions evaluated in the submitted reports do match the interventions proposed by the applicant in the areas of 1) characteristics of the beneficiary population (americorps members), 2) characteristics of the population delivering the intervention (conservation corps groups), 3) dosage and design of the intervention (partial or full year americorps service terms focusing on environmental conservation and leadership/ career development), and 4) the context in which the intervention is delivered. In addition, the applicant did summarize the study design and key findings of the submitted reports, and did include past performance measure data & other research studies that inform their program design by including the Outcomes Evaluation of Maine Conservation Corps' Trail Rehabilitation efforts. I am rating the evidence tier as 'strong' because the applicant has submitted the required three evaluation reports demonstrating that the same interventions described in the application have been tested nationally or at the state-level using quasi-experimental design with comparison and treatment groups. The overall pattern of evaluation findings is consistently positive on one or more key desired outcomes of interest as depicted in the applicant's logic model, and findings from the QED evaluations may be generalized beyond the study context.

Evidence Quality

The "Public Land Service Coalition Partnership Impact" provided a comprehensive evidence based study that demonstrates the outcomes with similar/same project model, goals, activities and outcomes.
The evidence clearly demonstrates comparable Americorps Members experiences and attest to an extremely well designed program destined to succeed. It does fall short on addressing or supporting success in capacity building.
The submitted reports are of satisfactory methodological quality for the type of evaluation conducted, in that they have adequate sample size and statistical power and have appropriate use of control or comparison groups. The submitted reports show a meaningful and significant positive effect on americorps members in several key outcomes of interest (community engagement, leadership, confidence in employment opportunities). Two of the three submitted reports were conducted relatively recently (within the last six years), but one of the reports was not very recent (from 2013).

Notice Priority

MCC proposed project is consistent with the funding priorities for this competition. The applicant targets communities with concentrated poverty, rural communities, has indicated a committed value to underrepresented and underserved individuals with regard to diversity, equity and other characteristics. MCC provides solid understanding of ensuring the AmeriCorps members are paid a living wage and the experiences contribute to a workforce pathway for career through training, experiences, etc.
Fits extremely well into Environmental Stewardship
The narrative states that the program fits within four different funding priorities: environmental stewardship, workforce pathways, additional member benefits, and underserved communities. The

logic model explains in more detail how the program will meet the requirements for that funding priority.

Member Experience

Member Supervision – (page 7) The ratio of 1:3 (staff to volunteer) is impressive especially to provide guidance and support. There appears to be adequate focus on allowing members both give and receive feedback. Staff and host site supervisors receive orientation and training. There seems to be sufficient attention to interacting and problem solving at all levels of staffing: members, host site, partner agencies, to contribute to training, organizational capacity building and professional development.

Training, Education, Supervision and preparedness for entry into the job market are ALL exceptional.

The narrative included information about how AmeriCorps members will be provided opportunities to be leaders and gain employable skills. The narrative states that MCC will coordinate in-house workshops, 50+ trainings, and events that “increase the skills, knowledge, and abilities of members each year”. The narrative demonstrates how members will be provided a high quality orientation to the community they will serve by stating that MCC will work with community partners to place members and community volunteers in service projects that address community needs. It is also stated that priority will be given to projects in underserved communities (which ties in with americorps funding priorities).

Organizational Capability.

Organizational Background and Staffing

Applicant indicates in the budget sheet, they have been a recipient of CNCS funding for 7 years. It would be useful to know what the funding was used for and the outcomes. In the Application for Federal Assistance #8 – Type of Application shows the proposed project is “new” - though in the narrative (page 6) it is stated “as a current State AmeriCorps grantee”- indicating this is a different project than what MCC has been funded in the past. The application outlines the organizational background and staffing (pages 5 & 6) and provides a comprehensive overview of capacity. It appears to have sufficient background and experience for internal and external controls and professional staffing, executive, managers, coordinators to successfully support the project. Demonstration of volunteer management, engagement, implementation, etc. is sufficient.

Applicant outlines an exceptional level of qualifications and quality and abundance and career history the supervisors and MCC staff

The applicant meets all assessment criteria for the organizational background and staffing section. They describe the roles and responsibilities of each of the staff (MCC director, program managers, and training coordinator). They describe how they have provided workforce development programs through their partnership with the Maine dept of Education by implementing the WorkReady curriculum for americorps members, where members develop concrete skills and learn basic qualities that constitute a good employee. The applicant describes their mission, and their experience in volunteer management (engaging 500 community volunteers annually, maintaining a diverse group of community connections to solicit feedback). The applicant describes how project implementation challenges (economic downturns, administrative changes, the pandemic) have brought opportunities to strengthen operations by increasing safety measures, diversifying funding, and expanding strategies to attract program participants. Names and qualifications of staff who will lead the program are listed. Qualifications that the organization will use to select unknown team members (field coordinators and host site supervisors) are listed.

Commitment to DEIA

There is some information of a commitment to DEIA (page 8) which is provided in mostly generalities. For this reviewer it would be more compelling to know who (internal or external) provides the training on diversity and their level of expertise. Reference to “inform and deconstruct inequity and increase access” and “non-harassment, non-discrimination, connecting people of diverse backgrounds” etc. might have been more compelling/convincing if more detail was provided.

Demonstrated by the actual percentages of LGBTQIA+ within the organization

The narrative describes how the leadership and staff of MCC have similar lived experience as the beneficiary population (americorps members) in that 89% of staff have dedicated a portion of their lives to service, specifically to conservation corps service. The included descriptions of current staff demographics such as 22% identifying as non-binary/ gender fluid, 44% identifying as LGBTQIA+, and as coming from various communities, socioeconomic backgrounds, and generations also provides evidence of ways in which leadership and staff could have similar lived experiences as the beneficiary population and/ or communities being served. The applicant does not specifically state their definitions of diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility, so it is unclear whether the organization is demonstrating those values in its staff. The applicant describes how the organization strives to provide a supportive and safe environment for individuals of diverse backgrounds by 1) reducing barriers to participation, 2) assessing policies and practices to inform and deconstruct inequity and increase access, and 3) training members and staff on diversity and non-violent communication. The narrative could include more information on whether these efforts have succeeded in the past in order to predict whether they will be effective in this upcoming program.

Member Supervision

(page 7) The ratio of 1:3 (staff to volunteer) is impressive especially to provide guidance and support. There appears to be adequate focus on allowing members both give and receive feedback. Staff and host site supervisors receive orientation and training. There seems to be sufficient attention to interacting and problem solving at all levels of staffing: members, host site, partner agencies, to contribute to training, organizational capacity building and professional development.

Applicant clearly outlines the experience and skill levels of the supervisors

The applicant appears to have a thorough plan for member supervision, guidance, and support. In terms of supervision, the narrative describes that “individual placement members will have day-to-day direction from host site supervisors”, and that MCC staff will conduct onsite monitoring, field visits, and use remote tools to support the success of members. The narrative describes the cadence and format of supervisor/ americorps member check-ins. The applicant describes member and supervisor opportunities to assess strengths and opportunities for growth through quarterly reports, a project liaison, field visits by MCC staff, and mid/ end of term feedback of members from supervisors. The applicant describes efforts to ensure that americorps supervisors will be adequately trained/ prepared to follow americorps program regulations through staff and host site orientation and training, and cooperative agreements. Americorps supervisors will have opportunities to assess strengths and opportunities for growth through quarterly reports.

Budget Adequacy and Cost Effectiveness.

Member Recruitment

(page 8) A general outline of process to recruit members is provided. This reviewer found it to be very general and left me with a yearning for more details such as are specific Maine towns and counties targeted, are there out-of-state activities, what role do alumni play, more information about “Do

Good, Be Good” contracted technical assistance. The budget narrative provides information on how members are compensated but doesn't provide compelling information specific to recruitment.

The applicant clearly outlines a program which is well designed, solidly funded, and experienced.

The narrative describes specific ways in which budget expenses will support recruitment of americorps members best suited to serve the community. Recruitment specifically from geographic or demographic communities in which the program operates will occur through attending community events, organizations, career fairs, school districts, and handing out flyers and brochures. Other techniques listed such as a monthly recruitment workgroup, online advertising and job boards, and staff development training will further support recruitment of americorps members.

Member Retention

(page 8, 9,) Retention evidence is shown though paid living allowance (\$23,625), housing at training, basecamps. Emphasis is shown by the WorkReady program providing soft skills training and promoting teamwork. Support for mental health first aid, safety, (operating chain saw, Wilderness First Aid) is beneficial for members and reinforce their importance to successful program management and encouraging career development. The budget narrative doesn't provide information specific to member retention.

Americorps members are paid above federal minimum and exposed to an exemplary learning experience.

The applicant describes several ways that the budget expenses will support retention of americorps members. These include a living allowance that is higher than the federal minimum, housing and basecamps for teams, WorkReady curriculum, events for community service and member accomplishments, and online training for technical and soft skills courses.

Data Collection

While this reviewer is guardedly confident MCC has staff experienced in data collection/analysis and likely has sufficient software and processes to succeed it is not clear in project or budget narrative. (page 9) The reference to “MCC has a number of systems to collect data.....” For this reviewer it would be helpful to know what the systems are, software, data bases and kinds of reports generated. Surveys are a major activity to collect data.

Applicant provides a strong funding and organizational program for data collection

The applicant explains that MCC has various electronic and paper-based methods of data collection. The data collected will evaluate volunteer engagement, project outputs, member demographics, land manager feedback, and community input. These data categories seem to adequately support continuous improvement activities as well as evaluate interventions, community impact, and member experience.

Budget Alignment to Program Design.

The proposed budget seems sufficient to meet the needs for program design and implementation to meet the project goals and objectives. What follows is this influences this reviewers to request applicant provide more clarity and less ambiguity. (page 9) The budget request of \$1,173,500 corresponds to 99 proposed AmeriCorps members as indicated in the Executive Summary. The budget page shows a total of 46.94 MSYs a cost/MSY of \$25,000/each. With the reference to 99 members the cost is \$11,853/ea. (There’s likely an explanation which is not obvious to this reviewer.) Some ambiguities cause me to request a rewrite and clearer understanding for review and comprehension. The Executive Summary also indicates a match of \$1,550,277 (\$1,085,194 in public funds and \$465,083 in private funds.). This exceeds the 38% required match and reflects a match of 132%. For this reviewer it would have been helpful to identify both the public and private funders (even if

proposed) . The budget narrative offers some justification but it is not entirely clear how this corresponds. (Again, there’s likely an explanation which is not obvious to this reviewer.)
Applicant provides strong funding for a successful program. THE APPLICANT IS NOT CLEAR ON ALL THE SOUCES OF THE FUNDING, NOR THE WHETHER THE FUNDING IS FULLY SECURED.
Activities in the overall narrative are incorporated in the budget in the applicant share. It would be more compelling if specific aspects of the budget were described in more detail- particularly the “member trainings”, “field supplies”, and “member gear”, as those aspects will likely take up 80% of americorps member time in direct service activities to environmental stewardship, according to the logic model.

Evaluation Plan Feedback

This reviewer assumes the page 10 ("Performance Measures" is provided to satisfy the "Evaluation Plan." Only providing charts and "fill in the blanks" leaves me craving for narrative that provides more explanation,
Not included in the narrative. This was under the evidence base, at which point the applicant points out their own shortcomings the study, and applicant does not provide full evaluation plan.
The applicant’s evaluation plan meets almost all assessment criteria. The theory of change proposes that direct trail interventions will ultimately result in increased trail sustainability and better trail experiences for users with minimal impact to the environment. The scope of the evaluation describes how a repeated measures design including a treatment group and a control group will better assess the efficacy of MCC’s direct trail interventions. The outcome of interest lists clear and measurable outcomes that are aligned with the theory of change. The research questions are clearly connected to the outcomes. The evaluation design section describes the proposed research design and the main coomponents, but does not include an assessment of its strengths and limitations. Descriptions of sampling methods, measurement tools, data collection procedures, and an analysis plan are included. Evaluator qualifications, a timeline, and an estimated budget are outlined.

SUMMARY APPRAISAL 1. Having reviewed all elements of the proposal provided to you, do you think that this applicant would be effective in this category of grant? Yes () No ()

Comments:

MCC is experienced in managing AmeriCorps projects, is effective in its commitment to environmental stewardship, trail remediation, capacity building and volunteer management. MCC past programming has been successful.
The applicant expresses an Americorps Member experience in this project that is ideal to the goals of the Americorps Program.
Applicant has an exceptional logic model detailing the community problems, program inputs and activities, and expected outputs and outcomes. Applicant provides strong evidence through evaluation reports of similar interventions that had success across the nation as well as evidence of the applicant’s interventions being successful in the past. The quality of the evidence provided is strong. The program fits within four different Americorps funding priorities. The applicant describes how the program will enhance member experience through various trainings and high quality orientation to the communities they will serve The applicant appears to have exceptional organizational background and staffing as well as member supervision. The applicant’s plans for member recruitment, member retention, and data collection appear strong enough to be effective. The program’s budget aligns with the program design and the applicant seems to have a detailed understanding of which aspects of the program need to be budgeted for. The program’s

evaluation plan is detailed and the applicant has experience with this type of evaluation for this type of program.

•
What elements of the proposal are unclear?

As previously stated; 1.) throughout application I expected to see a list of committed or prospective community partners. In the logic model (page 17) there is some information on “Host Sites and Team project partners”.
2.) There were a few inconsistencies in the proposal such as on the facepage of the Application for Federal Assistance #8 – Type of Application shows the proposed project is “new” - though in the narrative (page 6) it is stated “as a current State AmeriCorps grantee”- For me this is not clear whether the proposed activities are different project than what MCC has been funded in the past.

The location. The success of the project in the absence of Americorps members.

N/A

What else do you have to say about this proposal?

As a long time grant reviewer for local, state and federal government I believe I have experience to understand and appreciate the goals and objectives necessary for successful program management. I believe MCC has the experience, staff, infrastructure, passion and commitment to the proposed project. My concern is the application, I believe, made many assumptions that each reviewer would already be familiar with and supportive of MCC's continuation of a successful project. This was not my situation and I had hoped to learn more specifics about MCC and its AmeriCorps program.

It is clear from the information provided by the applicant any person selected by MCC as an Americorps member to work on this project, will be gifted with an enriching experience which will enhance their education and life experience, as well as benefit their personal growth. It is further clear from the narrative Americorps members will be exceptionally prepared, trained, mentored, supported and supervised. This particular program provides them with an amazing opportunity to increase their personal attributes to increase their attractiveness to future employers. Unfortunately for this program, Maine received record rainfalls in 2023, with many roads washing out around the state. The applicants claims to support their claims of increased sustainability, reduce erosion, and improve trail quality would have been a herculean task in 2023. The applicant did not adequately describe, in either the narrative or the evidence how an increased capacity built through more volunteers and better trained local volunteers were able to repair, or plan to repair, the unusually high amount of erosion in 2023 — in the absence of Americorps members. Building capacity, a pillar goal, could have been highlighted in a year like Maine experienced in 2023. The Applicant also did not adequately state whether this is a state, regional, County, or regional application. From the evidence, the reviewer is left to assume in is a south-central regional project of within 60 miles of Augusta.

N/A

Task Force Review Notes and Appraisal Summary:

Proposal Alignment, Program Model, RFA Preference, & Past Performance

- Program has established credibility and meets state needs
- Great proposal to serve communities especially that are historically disadvantaged - so many river/mill towns especially that could benefit from this to combat rural poverty or environmental stewardship

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statewide impact for possible • Wide geography • Longevity of program reflects impact and strength.
<p>Public/Private Partnership is strong</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All areas could use a little more HR, and program implementation supervision and guidance from agencies involved dealing with Americorp staff - maybe co-training sessions, or workshops together to share ideas. • Note: No current advisory committee
<p>Financial Plan</p>
<p>Realistic plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seem to be good on anticipating operational costs - Maine higher than Federal allowances
<p>Fiscal Systems</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete credibility • State Agency helps with accountability • More work needs to be done on following through with goals - I believe that an advisory group is important to balance existing volunteer/staff structures. In Performance Measures - many of the past year 2021/22 were better measures - for example - trails improved/created only 56 miles out of the 200 target goal were done in 22/23