

Survey overview. Congratulations on completing your project, you will be asked some question to assist the evaluation of the BCRRF Program.

Dependent on the complexity of your project this survey may take 20 minutes or more to finish and is required to be completed by the project manager (or equivalent). The CEO (or equivalent) of your organisation is required to complete a digital signature at the end. If you exit out of the survey your progress will be saved.

If you have any issues please reach out to BCRRF@resilience.nsw.gov.au

Q1.1. How do you rate the overall success of your grant project?

- Very successful
- Successful
- Somewhat successful
- Not successful

Q1.2. Please elaborate...

The grant supported the delivery of the planned project. Due to the dynamic nature of the work, the sites and the environmental issues arising for the project ,several key deliverables: • Maintenance and re-potting of re-vegetation tube stock, for 18 months, • dynamic responses to weather events at several sites, and • contractor delays due to weather events meant that success was achieved although with a less protracted delivery period, possibly more could have been achieved.. The grant was most useful in focussing the community on work that could help prevent future waterway devastation. In this farming community adverse weather events are usually managed however these fires and floods impacted the community in ways never before seen. The grant funding enabled remedial activity to be focussed upon with the community joining Landcare to deliver preventative strategies for the future. Community support was great in spite of weather delays and contractual issues all sites were successfully remediated. The issues arising due to excessive rain and significant stream flows required sites to be re-engineered due to changes between initial scoping and planned construction however all sites were completed. Community engagement was very successful with community and district participants in workshops and very positive involvement in the re-vegetation planting days. Regular newsletters and district wide publicity through local print and radio avenues were all used extensively with positive feedback. Local organisations within the district like Local Land Services, Landcare Council and other organisations participated and supported the project. Contractural arrangements both small and larger enabled this small landcare group to focus on moving every component forward in conjunction with each other and landowners. The devolution of some aspects to a co-ordinator, Landcare Council officers and of course the major contractor being Soil Conservation meant volunteer effort could be relied upon without exhausting the small band of Landcare members. Support to maintain the 1500 tube stock for over 12 months and re-planting of seed for replacements was also a major contributor to finalising the re-vegetation aspect. Great community support enabled this aspect to be much less of an issue than it otherwise would have been.

Q2.1. To what extent was this grant appropriate to meet the community's bushfire recovery need?

- Exceeded
- Met
- Somewhat met
- Did not meet

Q2.2. Please elaborate...

The bush fire recovery of the community has been assisted by the in-stream works which have highlighted to the community the extraordinary damage fire and flood can do to the streams. Fragile banks de-nuded of trees (most not returning due to the heat of the fires) and fallen trees, huge root balls in stream resulting in altered stream channels has provided a canvas to demonstrate practical remedies that can help shield the streams for the future. Remediation of the extreme fire and flood damage in a braided valley with high and low channels, major/minor tributaries most with significant damage posed prioritising difficulties. This has left many sites very vulnerable with stretches where future damage is likely. The degraded valley floor from the gold rush era and the effect of dredging on the landscape means many, many sites within the valley need attention throughout their length. The valley environment prior to the fires and floods was stable with surrounding hills well treed and environmentally stable. The valley had 3 roads in and out, one road is now never to be available again (landslips have demolished the Major's Creek Road) The road to Moryua remains under repair (3 years on) and the road from the valley to Braidwood (our local centre) remains under repair and one lane only in places. This was another factor in preventing and delaying the floating of machinery to the sites. The remediated sites may prove a very useful incentive to landowners to increase remediation activity and to the community to assist in helping maintain a valley floor able to withstand climatic changes as they come. Additionally the management of livestock farming means a greater take up by farmers to water stock off stream will be needed. This of course requires take up by farmers with a commitment and also the resources to seek to protect this fragile landscape as much as possible.

Q3.1. To what extent did this grant provide sufficient resources to support your recovery project?

- Exceeded
- Met
- Somewhat met
- Did not meet

Q3.2. Please elaborate...

The grant provided sufficient funds for the described project. The issues arising with the delays and altered landscape mid project did result in overruns by contractors. The level of the NSW Soil Conservation Service overrun was not conveyed to us in a timely manner however we were able to negotiate and reduce the amount and successfully apply for further funding to meet the majority of the overrun. The ability to include contingency monies within the grant of 5-10% would in future be a sensible solution for both the funder and grantee. There are issues with dealing with a dynamic landscape and contracts with no flexibility with a grant amount or adjusting outcomes presents a significant risk for organisations. To fall short with outcomes or being unable to fund additional verified contractual overruns may result in loss of reputation within a community or as a negative outcome re future grants.

Q4. In what ways would you use the grant differently next time? Please elaborate if applicable.

UDCLG would again use a grant for in-stream works to address in-stream erosion post fire and flood damage. However an added value approach would be that we could have gathered the overwhelming evidence available by many agricultural studies that off-stream stock watering is both better for the environment but also results in significantly improved stock health, less drenching required, improved weight gain etc. This could have supported greater take up of off stream watering thus helping to support more stable stream banks.

Q5. Do you believe any additional programs are required to support the community's bushfire recovery?
Please elaborate if applicable.

The twin environmental issues in this valley are the instability of the braided streams, and the instability of the surrounding mountains which largely consist of de-composed granite. The removal of trees and vegetation by either fire or flood thus impact farming outcomes significantly and indeed community life generally. Thus programs that target a concerted effort to build an adapted approach to a landscape which is likely to experience similar or greater assaults like these fires and floods. Programs that build on proven approaches to managing a degraded environment, maintains native flora and fauna, assesses potential damage and plans to adjust and manage all identified risks.

Q6.1. Please select your organisation type below.

- Business and industry organisations

- Regional and joint organisations
- Local councils
- Community organisations and NFPs

Q6.2. Please select all that apply in relation to the outcomes achieved by your grant project. (Community organisations and NFPs)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Returned to 'business as usual' | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supported the community to improve capacity and capability to respond to future disasters |
| <input type="checkbox"/> The organisation has adequate mitigation practices (e.g. continuity plans) for disaster risks and threats | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public events and commemorations to support recovery and build social connection |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The organisation was able to contribute to the recovery process | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Digital initiatives and commemorations to support recovery and build social connection |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The organisation was able to implement or enable local solutions to recovery | <input type="checkbox"/> Programs and initiatives that support community well-being |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Made sure the needs of vulnerable groups are addressed in disaster recovery | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Initiatives that support community attachment to place and cultural heritage |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made the community aware of the disaster recovery processes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community education programs to improve regional knowledge and resilience in response and preparedness to future disasters |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Made sure the community can express its changing disaster recovery needs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Neighbourhood and community strengthening activities that focus specifically on capacity building and knowledge building and sharing |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made community members aware of the risks of future disasters | |

Q6.2. Please select all that apply in relation to the outcomes achieved by your grant project. (Business and industry organisations)

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Q6.2. Please select all that apply in relation to the outcomes achieved by your grant project. (Local councils)

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Q6.2. Please select all that apply in relation to the outcomes achieved by your grant project. (Regional and joint organisations)

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Q6.3. Please elaborate...

Supported the community to improve capacity and capability to respond to future disasters. Workshops on Geology and Stream stabilisation including remedial strategies for small scale erosion on farms, blocks and large village blocks has provided information and possible preventative solutions. Public events and commemorations to support recovery and build social connections. The workshops and the public launch of the project along with monthly newsletters provided updates, dates for workshops and re-vegetation planting days which kept the community involved. The organisation was able to contribute to the recovery process. The landowners have expressed their appreciation of the whole community coming together to assist them restore some of the major degradation sites. Workshops have also helped the community respond to some of the consequences of the floods where weed infestations carried by the floods have been identified and targeted for treatment thus preventative of at least some future problems. Digital initiatives and commemorations to support recovery and build social connection. Newsletters sent out digitally, film will be available on Landcare web site, a power point presentation has been used to highlight the project and will be available later on the Landcare web site. The organisation was able to implement or enable local solutions to recovery. Local solutions that involved volunteers re-growing re-vegetation stock (needed due to the delay) was successful. Initiatives that support community attachment to place and cultural heritage. The history of the Araluen Valley is rich and visitors are frequent, local district communities also visit from time to time. Many family history gatherings are held annually and restoration of the Creek line with banks lined with She Oaks is what families are seeking and is now beginning to re-establish again. Made the community aware of the disaster recovery process. Community awareness has been raised with nearly 2 years of newsletters, community radio sessions and wider district print media reflecting the project's newsletters. Community education programs to improve regional knowledge and resilience in response and preparedness to future disasters. The information provided has been welcomed by the community and the wider district has attended many of the workshops and re-planting days. Neighbourhood and community strengthening activities that focus specifically on capacity building and knowledge building and sharing. Landcare is partnered with the Upper Shoalhaven Landcare Council, Local Land Services, Waterwatch, and Araluen Progress Association. The involvement of this organisation in all these groups ensures cross knowledge sharing and community capacity building has developed over the life of the project and unlikely to dissipate now. Make community members aware of the risks of future disasters. The community is alert to the dangers posed by climate change, now is across the geology that poses risks for the Valley and has developed an appreciation of how to share preventative approaches for the future.

Q7. Were there any unexpected (positive or negative) outcomes that emerged as a result of your project?
Please elaborate.

The delays with heavy rain events meant many events were moved and work delayed by the contractors. No access to sites and/or road closures. The primary contractor NSW Soil Conservation Service who remediated the sites was delayed significantly and sites were changed necessitating re-engineering of remediation construction strategies. This was the reason for the cost overruns with the contractor failing to alert us in a timely manner. This necessitated negotiation around the contract clauses which we successfully managed to reduce the amount and still complete the sites.

Q8. Describe any challenges or barriers to the success of the project.

The challenges have been identified previously, weather delays etc. Re-vegetation delays however the group was able to move forward by adjusting quickly and seeking support from others in the organisations and community.

Q9. How likely are the outcomes of your project to continue without further grant support?

- Very likely
- Likely
- Unlikely

Q10.1. Were partnerships (formal or informal) developed during the project with other organisations?

- Yes
- No

Q10.2. Describe any outcomes achieved through these partnerships and whether these partnerships are likely to continue.

Our partnerships with Upper Shoalhaven Landcare Council resulting in us subcontracting several aspects of the project to them has been very beneficial. Their ability to bring in other smaller Landcare groups, ready access to experts and staff with credentials within the environmental landscape has been very profitable and will continue into the future. It also kept the group from burning out. Partnership with Local Land Services enabled erosion and on ground issues resulting from the fires and floods to be addressed in a practical and very accessible manner. Much appreciated by the community. Our engagement with Waterwatch has now resulted in us monitoring monthly the health of the streams which in turn will enable landowners to be alerted to changes in turbidity etc etc. The group is moving forward to tackle with Council, NSWPW and others a growing issue of weeds invading this area from northern areas which have arrived via the floods and present another issue to be tackled.

Q11.1. What kind of engagement did you do to promote the project? Describe some effective strategies used during the project to raise awareness and contribute to community recovery?

A launch was the initial promotion approach which was very successful. The contracting of a co-ordinator meant a single point of contact was established very early and all landowners and community soon were aware of the co-ordinator role. Monthly newsletters distributed through Facebook, digital newsletters, district papers and community radio kept the community informed. Our co-operation with the Araluen Progress Association on general community issues cemented a solid partnership with that organisation.

Q11.2. What tools or support could you suggest that would have enhanced your engagement and communications to raise awareness of your project?

Nil.

Q12.1. Did this grant enable you to develop and/or deliver any additional things – such as infrastructure, outputs, products or events - to support the community? (Relating to things not funded by the grant)

Yes

No

Q12.2. Please elaborate.

The issue of a major delay in the program of re-vegetation due to delayed construction at the sites meant plants needed to be re sown from seed or re-potted and managed with a 12 month delay. This meant we and USLC each funded from our own funds seed raising workshops which included seed collecting from the local area, developing a suitable seed raising mix and caring for the plants till June for planting.

Q13. What are some key learnings about the grant program for recovery agencies? For example, how could this grant be implemented and designed differently next time?

Firstly, this outcome statement does not take 20 mins to complete, it is cumbersome, repetitive and could be much more succinct and precise and possibly more useful for the grant program. The reporting is basically not an issue however the methodology of submitting the reporting has been fraught. The use of Exel spread sheets for reporting text is pretty useless, the financial reports would have been easier if we had been warned of the level of detail required in which case we would have used a separate account. This organisation has limited internet at times and with variations required during the project and normal reporting deadlines it is not always easy to meet deadlines. It maybe useful for any grant program that is seeking to rehabilitate the environment with Projects to be much more in tune with the vagaries of weather, rural lifestyles and volunteer groups with a) limited members and b) volunteers with other lives. There are "dead" times in projects like this one when weather shuts everything done sometimes for a month or so. Thus the projects should be able to alert the funder prior to commencement that the weather or whatever will be likely impactful and extended time maybe needed without needing to do endless variations.

Q14. In what ways did this grant project increase community members' sense of belonging and connectedness to place? Please specify. If not applicable state N/A

The newsletters and engagement offered through workshops (eg seed raising) and planting days gave everyone several opportunities to be involved. Feedback to the group indicates the community enjoyed the various aspects and are now very aware of the fragility of this environment and how we can all help prepare for future climatic changes. Discussions re growing climate resistant resilient native plants will be a built upon by the group into the future.

Q15. In what ways did this project support vulnerable communities affected by the bushfires, and how might this continue to benefit them in the future? Please specify. If not applicable state N/A

This community is now alert to the issues associated with rain events that dramatically increase stream flows and damage banks and bring both turbidity and weed seeds into the Valley. Good husbandry of the stream banks increasing and keeping multi-storey vegetation in place and alertness for any new weed appearances will enable the streams to be better maintained. Awareness that the environment does need assistance is a major factor in future proofing the valley from more disasters.

Q16.1. Were the community groups that you intended to work with as defined in the application, those that were finally involved?

- Yes
 No

Q16.2. Please describe why this was the case, and which final groups you worked with.

The groups we partnered with for the submission for funding were maintained as partners and will remain ongoing partners into the future. As previously stated Upper Shoalhaven Landcare Council, Local Land Services, NSW Soil Conservation Service, Araluen Progress Association.

Q17.1. Did your project involve the provision or use of Emergency Services

- Yes
 No

Q17.2. In what ways has it impacted on their ability to respond to future disasters and added to their resources? Please describe.

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Q18.1. As a direct result of your project, rate the extent to which your community is better able to recover from future bushfire events.

- Above able
- Able
- Somewhat able
- Not able

18.2. Please elaborate.

The community is now very aware of the importance of stream bank stability for future stream health. Bank vegetation is critical and any fire damage to bank vegetation will be a clear signal for rapid replacement of multi-storey vegetation with an emphasis on She Oaks being planted immediately. These trees are the backbone of the stream banks stability and do grow very rapidly even when planted water/alluvial soil.

Q19.1. As a direct result of your project, rate the extent to which your community is better able to respond to future bushfire events.

- Above able
- Able
- Somewhat able
- Not able

Q19.2. Please elaborate.

Refer to 18.2 above.

Q20. In what ways has this project contributed to local community to assist with bringing the community together to find local solutions to improve disaster resilience?

By the use of effective partnerships coupled with significant community and landowner involvement. This approach has cemented a community sense of "what can we do and how" and once strategies are defined the community responds.

Q21. Are particular community members and organisations better prepared for disasters because of the grant project? Please describe.

Landowners are able to expect the unexpected, possible events outside their lived experience and now have a ready reliance on the backing of their community. Their community will deliver support but most importantly practical solutions to post disaster issues.

Q22. What local solutions to recovery were discovered through the project? Please describe.

Restoration of stream patency was viewed as near impossible however with discussion and scoping led by UDCLG ways were defined that would enable bank restoration to be achieved and sustained.

Q23. How did the project enable local solutions to recovery? Please describe.

By funding the developed strategies.

Q1. Local Community Grant program value (% of total grant awarded). This amount must be at least 25% of your total grant.

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Q2. Number of Local Community Grants awarded.

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Q3. Total funding awarded under Local Community Grant program.

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Q4. Number of organisations that received a grant under the Local Community Grant Program.

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Q1.1. How did you hear about this grant? Please select all that apply

- Community Recovery Officer
- Local Council
- Local MP
- Website
- Media release
- Social media
- Other

Q1.2. You have selected other, please specify.

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Q2.1. How easy was it to understand the guidelines and application process?

- Easy
- Neutral
- Difficult
- Very difficult

Q2.2. Please elaborate.

These were easy to understand however the application process questions did carry a significant level of questions that seemed repetitive. The approach with the application questions seemed at times to be seeking to ensure internal consistency in responses and was at times frustrating. Indeed similar to this outcome statement questions.

Q3.1. Please rate the communication with the NSW Reconstruction Authority during the grant program?

- Exceeding
- Very Good
- Satisfactory
- Poor

Q3.2. Please elaborate.

Initially communication via only email was grossly unsatisfactory with little or no help that was independent of what appeared to be set responses to set questions. This felt like one of the best of Monty Python. The eventual connection with an officer who was contactable by phone and interested in solving presented issues was a significant step forward. The reporting requirements were very understandable and accepted however with the project extending out as this one did meant a level of reporting on inactivity was annoying. Perhaps a timetable of what would be required at points in the project rather than dates on the calendar could have been useful. Most projects have ebb and flows of activity although this one completely stalled often so requiring responses at key points pre determined at the start could have made this much easier and reduce the necessity for many variations.

Q4.1. Please rate the administration of the Grant Process e.g. reporting and payments?

- Exceeding
- Very Good
- Satisfactory
- Poor

Q4.2. Please elaborate.

See answer to Q3.2 above plus: The payment schedule was fine except the last payment being made post completion and final reporting does leave some outstanding accounts needing payment. Not a look this organisation wishes to wear.

Q5.1. How easy was it to understand and adhere to the funding agreement conditions?

- Easy
- Neutral
- Difficult
- Very difficult

Q5.2. Please elaborate.

The requirement for logos to be attached was obviously necessary however perhaps pre designed pages set to the standards required would have been extremely useful.

Q6.1. How easy was it to use the NSW Reconstruction Authority grants management system Enquire?

- Easy
- Neutral
- Difficult
- Very difficult

Q6.2. Please elaborate

As previously noted the use of Excel for prose is unsatisfactory. This outcome statement is an example of a questionnaire gone mad, many questions appear to be asked to ensure the responder remains consistent. It would be important given the wealth of data collected by these outcome statement to receive a final report which aggregates the project responses. We look forward to receiving such a report.

Q7.1. Were there any particular challenges in the delivery of your project?

- COVID
- Stakeholders
- Cashflow
- Resources
- Community engagement
- Other

Q7.2. You selected other, please specify.

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Q8.1. Did you require any variations for the delivery of your project?

- Yes
- No

Q8.2. How many variations have you received?

Total

Q8.2. Types of Variations received

- Milestone
- Budget
- Scope
- Other

Q8.3. You selected other, please elaborate.

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Q9.1. Would you like to be added to the NSW Reconstruction Authority newsletter to find out about other programs?

Yes

No

Q9.2. Please enter your email.

phhayman@pcug.org.au

File 1. Please upload supporting documents relevant to your project (photos, links to websites, evaluation reports, transaction listing or general ledger, project materials)

[20230424-Landcare-Muster-Presentation-FINAL.pdf](#)

3.4MB
application/pdf

File 2.

[20220907-ConsultancyAgreement.pdf](#)

1.2MB
application/pdf

File 3.

[UDLCG - Final Works Costings 05Sep22.pdf](#)

1.1MB
application/pdf

File 4.

[Draft-UDCLG REF Project-.docx](#)

269.4KB

application/vnd.openxmlformats-officedocument.wordprocessingml.document

File 5.

[WorkshopFlyers.docx](#)

2.5MB

application/vnd.openxmlformats-officedocument.wordprocessingml.document

File 6.

[AraluenCreekRestorationProjectReportMay23Part1.docx](#)

51.6MB

application/vnd.openxmlformats-officedocument.wordprocessingml.document

File 7.

[AraluenCreekRestorationProjectReportMay23Part2.docx](#)

84.2MB

application/vnd.openxmlformats-officedocument.wordprocessingml.document

Declaration. We certify that:

1. All information contained in this report including supporting documents is correct and complete;
2. An electronic copy of all the Project Materials has been submitted to You (State of NSW acting through NSW Reconstruction Authority);
3. A pdf copy of this report has been signed by the person that completed this report and the Chief Executive Officer or equivalent and uploaded in the Supporting Documents section;
4. There is no matter or circumstance of which I am aware, that would constitute a breach by Us or, if applicable the End Recipient, of any term of the Funding Agreement between US and You dated (insert date) that has not been notified by You, and

We acknowledge:

*The information provided in this report including the supporting documents will be audited by NSW Reconstruction Authority and may be audited by the Commonwealth Government of Australia and other external auditors directed to do so on behalf of NSW State Government and the Commonwealth Government of Australia.

Giving false or misleading information is a serious offence under Part 5A of the Crimes Act 1900 (NSW). In

particular I acknowledge that the provision of false or misleading information in relation to the project or this acquittal may be an offence under s 307B of the Crimes Act 1900, which, like all the offences under Part 5A of the Crimes Act 1900 (NSW), carries a maximum penalty of imprisonment for 2 years, or a fine of 200 penalty units (presently \$22,000) or both.

I accept this declaration

Identity 1. This report prepared by

Title	Secretary UDCLG
First Name	Penny
Last Name	Hayman
Job title	Secretary
Date	23/07/2023

Signature 1. This report prepared by



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Penny Hayman', is written over a horizontal line. To the left of the line is a small 'x' icon, and to the right is the word 'clear' in red text.

Identity 2. Chief Executive Officer (or equivalent)

Title	President
First Name	Tony
Last Name	Peters
Job title	President
Date	23/07/2023

Signature. Chief Executive Officer (or equivalent)

A Petals

clear

Q96. Pressing next will complete the survey and submit the report, please ensure you have provided all the necessary information before finalising the survey.

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Location Data

Location: [\(-33.8715, 151.2006\)](#)

Source: GeoIP Estimation

