



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

**Southwestern
Region**

May 2007



Project Funding Recommendations and Proposed Evaluation Comments

2008 Technical Advisory Panel Collaborative Forest Restoration Program

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because of all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410, or call (800) 79503272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Printed on recycled paper – May 2008

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Proposal Review Process.....	3
Funding Recommendations	5
Proposal Review: Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations	9
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 01-08	9
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 02-08	10
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 03-08	11
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 04-08	13
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 05-08	14
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 06-08	15
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 07-08	17
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 08-08	18
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 09-08	19
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 10-08	20
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 11-08 Rev. 1	22
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 12-08	23
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 13-08	25
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 14-08	26
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 15-08	28
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 16-08	29
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 17-08	30
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 18-08	32
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 19-08	33
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 20-08 Rev. 2	34
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 21-08	35
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 22-08	37
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 23-08 Rev 1	38
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 24-08	39
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 25-08	41
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 26-08	42
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 27-08	43
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 28-08	44
PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 29-08	46
Recommendations	49
Recommendations for the FY 2009 CFRP Request for Proposals.....	49
Recommendations for Improving the CFRP Technical Advisory Panel Process.....	49
2008 CFRP TAP Subcommittee.....	50
Appendix A: Collaborative Forest Restoration Program Bylaws	51
Section I: Purpose:	51
Section II: Authority:	51
Section III: Membership Selection and Appointment:.....	51
Section IV: Meeting Procedures:	52
Section V: Role of Panel Members:	53
Section VI: Process for Developing Recommendations	54

Section VI: Expenses and Reimbursement 54

APPENDIX B: Collaborative Forest Restoration Program Charter 55

Appendix C. Technical Advisory Panel Members 59

**Appendix D: Proposal Review, Common Proposal Strengths, Weaknesses and
Recommendations 61**

 Strengths: 61

 Weaknesses: 61

 Recommendations:..... 62

Executive Summary

The Collaborative Forest Restoration Program (CFRP) Technical Advisory Panel met in Albuquerque, New Mexico, April 21-25, 2008, to provide the USDA Forest Service Southwestern Regional Forester with recommendations regarding which project proposals submitted for funding under the CFRP best met the objectives of the program. The Secretary of Agriculture established the Panel as a Federal Advisory Committee on September 4, 2007 (DR 1042-138) pursuant to the Community Forest Restoration Act of 2000 (Title VI, Pub. L. No. 106-393).

The Panel reviewed and renewed their bylaws and responsibilities under the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The Panel then reviewed 29 proposals requesting \$8,606,263 in Federal funding to determine which ones best met the objectives of the CFRP. Using a consensus approach, the Panel recommended 14 of the 29 proposals for funding, totaling \$3,814,214 to correspond with the program funds available for grants in 2008.

If a Panel Member or any member of their immediate family, or organization employing them, would directly or financially benefit from a CFRP grant proposal being evaluated, or if a Panel Member was directly involved in the development of the proposal, that Panel member left the meeting room during the discussion of that proposal and recused themselves from the Panel's decision to avoid a conflict of interest.

This report includes the Panel's findings regarding recommended funding, strengths and weaknesses for each proposal, and recommendations for improving the proposal review process, Request for Proposals, and CFRP Workshop. Meeting notes including the meeting agenda can be obtained on the CFRP website (www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/cfrp) or by contacting Walter Dunn, USDA Forest Service, 333 Broadway Blvd. SE, Albuquerque, NM 87102, telephone (506) 842-3425. This report will also be available on the CFRP website (www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/cfrp).

Walter Dunn
Walter Dunn, Designated Federal Official
CFRP Program Manager, USDA Forest Service, Southwestern Region

05/20/2008
Date

Proposal Review Process

The categories of decision were:

1. The proposal is an excellent match with the purposes and objectives of the Act and the panel recommends funding as written. The proposal may have minor administrative weaknesses.
2. The proposal is an excellent match with the purposes and objectives of the Act. The proposal has some substantive weaknesses, but it is eligible for funding.
3. The proposal is a good fit to the purposes and the objectives of the Act, but the weaknesses identified in the work plan, budget, and/or monitoring plan must be addressed before the project can be recommended for funding.
4. The proposal does not clearly address the objectives of the Act and/or successful implementation is doubtful.

The Panel used the following criteria to evaluate project proposals and assign a category of decision:

1. Does the proposed project meet the eligibility requirements of the program in Section III and follow the format described in Section V of the Request for Proposals?
2. Will the proposed project reduce the threat of large, high intensity wildfires and the negative effects of excessive competition between trees by restoring ecosystem functions (including healthy watersheds), structures, and species composition, including the reduction of non-native species populations on Federal, Tribal, State, County, and Municipal forest lands?
3. Will the proposed project re-establish fire regimes approximating those that shaped forest ecosystems prior to fire suppression?
4. Will the proposed project replant trees in deforested areas, if they exist, in the proposed project area?
5. How will the proposed project improve the use of, or add value to, small diameter trees? What kinds of markets are available to support the project? Where is the resource base? How much material will the project need to fulfill the project needs?
6. Will the proposed project include a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders as well as appropriate Federal, Tribal, State, County, and Municipal government representatives in the design and implementation of the project?
7. Does the proposal include a plan for a multiparty assessment that will:
 1. Identify both the existing ecological condition of the proposed project area and the desired future condition; and
 2. Monitor and report on the positive or negative impact and effectiveness of the project including improvements in local management skills and on the ground results?
8. Does the project proposal incorporate current scientific forest restoration information?
9. How will the proposed project preserve old and large trees?
10. Will the proposed project create local employment or training opportunities within the context of accomplishing restoration objectives? Are these opportunities consistent with the purposes of the program? Are summer youth job programs, such as the Youth Conservation Corps, included where appropriate?
11. Have the proponents demonstrated the capability to successfully implement the proposed project?
 3. Does the proponent have a viable business plan (if applicable)?

4. How has the proponent performed on past grant awards? (If a proponent has been awarded a CFRP grant in the past, the Panel will review all performance and/or multiparty monitoring reports from their previous grant(s). The proponent does not need to include copies of these reports in their application.)
12. Does the proposal facilitate larger landscape-scale effort(s) (i.e., a landscape assessment or Community Wildfire Protection Plan)?
13. What would be the effect of the proposed project on long-term forest management?
14. Is the proposed activity in a priority area for hazardous fuel reduction?
15. Is the cost of the project reasonable and within the range of the fair market value for similar work?

The Panel developed a list of strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for each proposal. In addition to noting unique characteristics of the proposals, the panel also drew from a list of common proposal strengths, weaknesses and recommendations (Appendix D).

The Panel recommended that all proposals in Category 1 be funded. Because there was sufficient funding to provide partial funding to one additional applicant in Category 2, the Panel used a matrix to determine which additional projects to recommend for funding. This process included reviewing all Category 2 proposals using five additional clarifying criteria to determine which proposals best met the program objectives. These criteria included:

1. Is the project part of a longer term and/or landscape level comprehensive collaborative forest restoration effort?
2. Does the project demonstrate an innovative approach that adds value to the CFRP?
3. Would the project be sustainable?
4. Is there a high degree of collaboration?
5. Would the project add significant capacity for forest restoration?

The Panel ranked those Category 2 proposals that best met all five of these criteria in order of priority; the proposal ranked as the highest priority was recommended to receive any remaining available CFRP grant funds.

Funding Recommendations

Table 1. Program Proposals: Technical Advisory Panel Funding Recommendations, Approved by the USDA Forest Service Southwestern Regional Forester

Proposal #	Project Title	Lead Organization	Fed. Req	Match	Recommended Funding	Regional Forester Approved Funding
CFRP 01-08	People, a Plan and P-J: Adaptive Landscape Management in the Fire, Insect and Disease Prone Piñon Juniper Woodlands of Santo Domingo Pueblo	Santo Domingo Tribe	\$360,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$0	\$0
CFRP 02-08	Improving New Mexican Contractor's In-State Competitiveness by Reducing Administrative Barriers	New Mexico Forest Industry Association	\$358,057.00	\$90,250.00	\$358,057	\$358,057
CFRP 03-08	Pueblo of Jemez's Sustainable Forest Stewardship Strategy	Pueblo of Jemez	\$119,775.00	\$29,137.00	\$0	\$0
CFRP 04-08	Barbero Grazing Allotment Collaboration and Restoration Project	NorthEastern Contractors Limited Liability Company	\$352,992.00	\$88,262.00	\$0	\$0
CFRP 05-08	Upper Pecos Watershed Riparian Forest Restoration Program	Upper Pecos Watershed Association	\$164,813.09	\$41,203.27	\$0	\$0
CFRP 06-08	Restoration through Utilization and Educational Outreach Video	Northridge Forest Projects	\$360,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$0	\$0
CFRP 07-08	Youth Restoring the Forest: RMYC's La Jara Canyon CFRP Proposal	Rocky Mountain Youth Corps	\$360,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP 08-08	Ensenada Forest Health Restoration Project II	Chacon & Sons	\$360,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP 09-08	Black Lake Forest Restoration and Workforce Sustainability Project	HR Vigil Small Products	\$329,524.00	\$82,480.00	\$97,713.27	\$98,000
CFRP 10-08	Forest Restoration Project in Taos Canyon - North Shady Brook Project	Taos Canyon Neighborhood Association	\$250,493.00	\$66,600.00	\$0	\$0

Table 1. Program Proposals: Technical Advisory Panel Funding Recommendations, Approved by the USDA Forest Service Southwestern Regional Forester						
Proposal #	Project Title	Lead Organization	Fed. Req	Match	Recommended Funding	Regional Forester Approved Funding
CFRP 11-08 Rev. 1	The La Jara Taos Pines Ranch Firewise Community Forest Health Restoration/Education/Monitoring CFRP	Urban Interface Solutions	\$360,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$0	\$0
CFRP 12-08	El Greco Forest Restoration in the Truchas Mountain Area of the Carson National Forest which is also an Economically Depressed Area in the Federally Recognized and Designated Enterprise Zone	El Greco Forest Restoration	\$360,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$0	\$0
CFRP 13-08	Forest Thinning for Fire Prevention and Education of Youth in Questa	Village of Questa	\$360,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$0	\$0
CFRP 14-08	Forest Thinning for Fire Prevention and Education for Youth in the Questa / Lama Area	Lama Junction Sawmill	\$320,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$0	\$0
CFRP 15-08	The Project to Complete Pot Creek Forest Restoration	New Earth Stewards, LLC	\$352,166.00	\$101,660.00	\$0	\$0
CFRP 16-08	Creating Landscape-Scale Opportunities on the Carson National Forest	Amigos del Bosque	\$120,000.00	\$30,000.00	\$0	\$0
CFRP 17-08	Shiprock Hazardous Fuel Reduction and Restoration	Dine Agriculture Inc.	\$358,904.00	\$89,808.00	\$358,904	\$358,904
CFRP 18-08	Ramah Navajo Forest Management and Forestry Energy Development Program	Ramah Band of Navajos - Natural Resources	\$360,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP 19-08	Lucero Fire Restoration Project	Pueblo of Isleta	\$360,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$0	\$0
CFRP 20-08 Rev 2	Alamo Community Capacity Building through Collaborative Forest Restoration	Alamo Navajo School Board, Inc.	\$360,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$360,000	\$360,000

Table 1. Program Proposals: Technical Advisory Panel Funding Recommendations, Approved by the USDA Forest Service Southwestern Regional Forester						
Proposal #	Project Title	Lead Organization	Fed. Req	Match	Recommended Funding	Regional Forester Approved Funding
CFRP 21-08	Post-Fire Restoration in the Middle Rio Grande Bosque: A Landscape Approach towards Revitalization of an Ecosystem	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District	\$360,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP 22-08	Ojo Peak Crown Fire Restoration Planning Project: Developing a Plan for Restoring Post-Crown Fire Watershed Integrity	The Four Corners Institute	\$87,094.73	\$21,932.00	\$87,094.73	\$87,094.73
CFRP 23-08 Rev 1	New Mexico Community Land Grant Planning & Preparation for Community Forest Restoration Pilot Project	Mexicano Land Education & Conservation Trust	\$120,000.00	\$30,505.00	\$120,000.00	\$120,000.00
CFRP 24-08	Eastern Gila Forest and Community Restoration Project	Gila National Forest Permittees Association	\$360,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$360,000.00	\$360,000.00
CFRP 25-08	Burro Mountain Homestead Restoration Project	Gila Tree Thinners	\$360,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$360,000.00	\$360,000.00
CFRP 26-08	SDT Firewood Production Through the Purchase of a Firewood Processor	RC Forest Products	\$119,845.00	\$29,961.25	\$119,845.00	\$119,845.00
CFRP 27-08	Acquiring and Processing Piñon Pine into Value-Added Products	Santa Clara Woodworks	\$152,600.00	\$38,540.00	\$152,600.00	\$152,600.00
CFRP 28-08	Forest Restoration Thinning on the Signal Peak North Project	Gila Woodnet	\$360,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$0	\$0
CFRP 29-08	McMillan Native Vegetation Restoration Project	Carlsbad Soil and Water Conservation District	\$360,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$0	\$0
TOTAL:			\$8,606,263.82	\$2,180,338.52	\$3,814,214	\$3,814,500

Proposal Review: Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 01-08
ORGANIZATION: Pueblo of Santo Domingo
FOREST: Santa Fe
COMMUNITY: Santo Domingo
CONTACT: Jeff Morton (505.465.0055 x112)
PROJECT TITLE: People, a Plan and P-J: Adaptive Landscape Management in the Fire, Insect and Disease Prone Piñon-Juniper Woodlands of Santo Domingo Pueblo
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000
CATEGORY: 2
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal includes strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
5. The project includes a good youth component.
6. The project reduces fire risk in community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List.
7. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
8. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
9. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
10. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
11. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
12. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
13. The project has a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
14. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
15. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
16. The project will create new jobs.
17. The proposal includes the support of the National Park Service, which is unique to the set of 2008 proposals.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The collaborator / contractor letters do not verify match (e.g., GIS Mapping).
2. The budget does not include clear unit costs (e.g., chainsaw maintenance).
3. The costs of the project (costs per acre) appear higher than fair market value for similar work.
4. The size of the plots (4 acres/plot) may not provide sufficient amount of information to make the adaptive decisions that the treatment design seeks to address.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. A letter from the Forest that would administer the grant should be included.
2. From the beginning of the development of a restoration project, general estimates of volume of byproduct to be generated should be made for the purpose of co-developing the utilization strategy.
3. The proponent should clarify the specific steps to be taken to develop the Woodland Management Plan and the costs associated with that task.
4. The proponent should include consideration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Fire Management Plan in the proposal.
5. The proposal should include more specificity on the density of the stands relative to the piñon die-off; the proponent should consider identifying the habitat types or plant associations for the treatment sites.
6. The proponent should clarify how existing science/findings from studies of similar prescriptions in similar ecosystems were incorporated in the project design (i.e., Brian Jacob's research).
7. The proponent should follow the recommendations provided by Hawks Aloft as a result of their surveys (e.g., timing restrictions).

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

N/A

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 02-08

ORGANIZATION:

New Mexico Forest Industry Association

FOREST:

Santa Fe

COMMUNITY:

Statewide

CONTACT:

Naomi Engelman (505.412.9028)

PROJECT TITLE:

Improving New Mexican Contractors In-State Competitiveness by Reducing Administrative Barriers

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$358,057

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$90,250

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$448,307

CATEGORY:

1

RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$358,057

STRENGTHS:

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal includes strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
6. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
7. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
8. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
9. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.

10. The proposal supports building the technical capacity of local operators to submit competitive bids.
11. The proposal includes the goal of getting contractors to a functional level of capacity as a means for making the project self-sufficient when the grant expires.
12. The proposal will continue and expand the Forest Worker Safety Certification Program to reduce workers compensation rates and improve labor safety.
13. The proposal will increase the number of qualified and experienced individuals with the skills necessary to accomplish forest restoration.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The youth component lacks detail in how it will accomplish the monitoring.
2. Some collaborator / contractor letters do not verify match.
3. The monitoring plan is vague (e.g., sample measurement for #3 does not accurately capture the change from the existing to the desired condition).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proponent should develop and implement a detailed monitoring form to track individual successes and/or accomplishments of those trained.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

N/A

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 03-08
ORGANIZATION:	Pueblo of Jemez
FOREST:	Santa Fe
COMMUNITY:	Pueblo of Jemez
CONTACT:	John Galvan (505.834.7696)
PROJECT TITLE:	Pueblo of Jemez's Sustainable Forest Stewardship Strategy
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$119,775
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$29,137
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$148,912
CATEGORY:	3
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

STRENGTHS:

2. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
4. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
5. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
6. The project includes a good youth component.
7. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
8. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
9. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
10. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
11. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.

12. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
13. The proposal includes good budget detail and / or work plan.
14. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
15. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
16. The project will create new jobs.
17. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
18. The proposal is forward thinking and offers an opportunity to make the operation sustainable in the future.
19. The Jemez Pueblo has been a key partner in landscape level restoration among multiple jurisdictions, including the FS, Valles Caldera National Preserve, and Jemez River Watershed Organization.
20. The proposal incorporates a unique use of gap funding to extend NEPA on tribal lands facilitating the capitalization of the private entrepreneur represents strong collaboration between two partners.
21. They have contracted with Barela Timber Management to do treatment on tribal lands and they are attempting to build capacity for treatment in the future.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with **conservation** groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
2. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided.
3. The proposal does not include provisions for preserving old and large trees.
4. There is no discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan.
5. To understand the proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
6. The proposal does not state that safety of operators / operations will be assured.
7. The proposal lacks a description or estimate of volume of restoration byproducts.
8. The treatment and/or utilization plans are vague.
9. The monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan.
10. NEPA is not complete.
11. The proposal does not reference to a completed Community Wildfire Protection Plan.
12. The proposal lacks enough detail to determine if the NEPA is for a commercial timber operation or if it is for restoration.
13. The reference to uninterrupted timber harvest does not meet CFRP objectives for restoration.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.
2. From the beginning of the development of a restoration project, general estimates of volume of byproduct to be generated should be made for the purpose of co-developing the utilization strategy.
3. We strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised proposal next year with the recommendations and weaknesses addressed.
4. The proposal could be strengthened by a broader base of partners in collaboration in NEPA and project design.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

N/A

PROJECT NUMBER: **CFRP 04-08**
ORGANIZATION: Northeastern Contractors Limited Liability Company
FOREST: Santa Fe
COMMUNITY: Pecos
CONTACT: Sean Medrano (505.426.7585)
PROJECT TITLE: Barbero Grazing Allotment Collaboration and Restoration Project
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$352,992
MATCHING FUNDS: \$88,262
TOTAL BUDGET: \$441,254
CATEGORY: 2
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0

STRENGTHS:

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal includes strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
6. The project includes a good youth component.
7. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
8. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
9. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
10. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
11. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
12. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
13. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
14. The proposal is clear and well organized.
15. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
16. The project will create new jobs.
17. The proposal leverages the use of an EQIP grant.
18. The proposal includes involvement by the livestock grazing permittees; permittees have committed to treating an additional 2,500 acres.

WEAKNESSES:

1. Some collaborator / contractor letters do not verify match/role in proposal.
2. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided (it is unclear where the 700 acres are).
3. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
4. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.
5. The monitoring plan does not seem to match the time frames in the work plan.
6. The narrative does not effectively support the budget (e.g., year 2 budget includes treatment costs, but work plan does not call for treatments in year 2).
7. The work plan does not describe the project activities sequentially.

8. The proposal does not include detailed discussion of livestock grazing practices and their impact on the treatment area.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Proponent should more clearly describe the relationship of the EQIP grant to the restoration objectives of this proposal.
2. The proposal should include monitoring the effects of grazing.
3. The proposal offers the opportunity to address the interaction of grazing with the reestablishment of the natural fire regime.
4. The proponent should secure written commitments from Barbero Grazing, Pecos Independent Schools, San Miguel County, Village of Pecos, Quivera Coalition and Adelante RC&D with regard to the educational/outreach component of the work plan.
5. The proponent should more clearly describe the current conditions of the treatment area.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. SF 424: Match exceeds 20%
2. Equipment that is already owned by the proponent should not appear in the “equipment” line; instead, these items should be under the “other” line.

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 05-08

ORGANIZATION:	Upper Pecos Watershed Association
FOREST:	Santa Fe
COMMUNITY:	Upper Pecos Watershed
CONTACT:	Douglass Jeffords (505.757.3600)
PROJECT TITLE:	Upper Pecos Watershed Riparian Forest Restoration Program
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$164,813.09
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$41,203.27
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$206,016.36
CATEGORY:	3
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
3. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
4. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
5. The project reduces fire risk in community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
6. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
7. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
8. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
9. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
10. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
11. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
12. The proposal includes good budget detail and / or work plan.
13. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
14. Project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.

15. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
16. The proposal includes strong focus on creating better fire buffers near high-use riparian recreation areas (with potential for human-induced fire events).
17. The proposal makes good use of the “Firewise Model” to design & implement community outreach program.
18. The proposal critically connects mitigation and outreach to communities at risk with larger planning efforts in riparian areas.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with tribal groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
2. The youth component lacks detail.
3. The proposal did not include documentation of consultation with tribes.
4. The collaborator / contractor letters do not verify their contribution to the project, specifically NMDGF, youth education, community leader with regards to Firewise, local waste utility companies, or the Advisory Committee.
5. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided.
6. The costs of the project are not within a reasonable range for similar type work, the cost of NEPA planning on ten sites seems very expensive.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with tribes in project design, implementation and monitoring.
2. Documentation of letters sent to potentially affected tribes should be included.
3. It would be helpful to include more description of the UPWA itself (e.g., how big, how broad, who composes, etc.) somewhere in the narrative; e.g., it would be helpful to see a direct statement of who the project coordinator is (rather than simply inferred).
4. We strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised proposal next year with the recommendations and weaknesses addressed.
5. The proposal should include a description or estimate of volume of restoration byproducts that may be problematic in a campground.
6. Utilization or sale of restoration residue may help pay for treatment in the implementation phase.
7. The proposal could be strengthened if the collaborating partners would identify sites for NEPA and planning.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

N/A

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 06-08

ORGANIZATION:

Northridge Forest Projects

FOREST:

Santa Fe

COMMUNITY:

Mora

CONTACT:

Michael Benjamin (575.387.5385)

PROJECT TITLE:

Restoration through Utilization and Educational Outreach Video

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$90,000

TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000
CATEGORY: 2
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
3. NEPA is complete.
4. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
5. The project includes a good youth component.
6. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
7. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
8. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
9. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
10. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
11. The proposal includes good budget detail and / or work plan.
12. The project will create new jobs.
13. Video education and outreach component is new and innovative to CFRP.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with NGO conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
2. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided.
3. The proposal does not include provisions for preserving old and large trees.
4. There is no discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan.
5. To understand the proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
6. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.
7. The treatment plan is vague.
8. The monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan.
9. The proposal lacks a detailed work plan.
10. Supplies are included in the budget line for equipment (or vice versa).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.
2. From the beginning of the development of a restoration project, general estimates of volume of byproduct to be generated should be made for the purpose of co-developing the utilization strategy.
3. The proponent should include the Forest Service's Public Affairs staff in the development of the video in order to ensure that federal government production requirements are met.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

N/A

PROJECT NUMBER: **CFRP 07-08**
ORGANIZATION: Rocky Mountain Youth Corps
FOREST: Carson
COMMUNITY: Taos County
CONTACT: Carl Colonius (575.751.1420 x22)
PROJECT TITLE: Youth Restoring the Forest: RMYC's La Jara Canyon CFRP Proposal
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000
CATEGORY: 1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$360,000

STRENGTHS:

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal included strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The project will reduce fire risk in community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
9. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
10. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
11. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
12. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
13. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
14. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort (Taos County CFRP Coalition, Taos County CWPP).
15. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
16. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area – the industry is paying for the material.
17. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
18. The project has a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
19. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
20. The proposal includes good budget detail and / or work plan.
21. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
22. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
23. The project will create new jobs.
24. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The exact size of the treatment area is unclear (e.g., it varies throughout the proposal).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal should ensure that any surveys either 1) meet US Office of Management and Budget guidelines, or 2) do not use Federal dollars.
2. The proponent must adjust the budget so that the costs of the wood permits are not being paid for with Federal dollars.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. SF 424: Used old form

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 08-08
ORGANIZATION:	Chacon & Sons
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Ensenada Forest Health Restoration Project II
COMMUNITY:	Rio Arriba County
CONTACT:	Alfonso Chacon (505.583.2178)
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
CATEGORY:	1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$360,000

STRENGTHS:

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal included strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project will reduce fire risk in a priority watershed.
8. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
10. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
11. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
12. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
13. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
14. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
15. This proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
16. Has a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
17. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
18. Good budget detail and / or work plan.
19. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
20. Includes collaborator interest forms.
21. The project will create new jobs.
22. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.

23. The proposal includes a plan to test a crosswalk for monitoring measures (e.g., FS Stand Exam protocols & CFRP multiparty monitoring protocols).

WEAKNESSES:

1. To understand the proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities (specifically, in the aspen regeneration areas).
2. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The disposition of merchantable material needs to be agreed upon with the Forest Service prior to a grant award.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

N/A

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 09-08
ORGANIZATION:	HR Vigil Small Products
FOREST:	Carson
COMMUNITY:	Black Lake
CONTACT:	Herman Vigil (505.387.5694)
PROJECT TITLE:	Black Lake Forest Restoration Project II
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$329,524
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$82,480
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$412,400
CATEGORY:	2
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$98,000

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal included strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The project will reduce fire risk in community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
9. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
10. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
11. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts through mechanization of the work.
12. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
13. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
14. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.

15. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
16. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
17. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
18. This proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
19. The proposal has a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
20. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
21. The proposal includes good budget detail and / or work plan.
22. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
23. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
24. The proposal builds upon previous CFRP projects.

WEAKNESSES:

1. Proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
2. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.
3. The treatment and/or utilization plans are vague.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.
2. A letter from the Forest that would administer the grant should be included.
3. From the beginning of the development of a restoration project, general estimates of volume of byproduct to be generated should be made for the purpose of co-developing the utilization strategy.
4. The purchase of equipment and supplies should occur after NEPA is completed.
5. The proponent should clarify whether demand for small diameter wood is outstripping supply beyond the need for firewood in the monitoring plan.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

N/A

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 10-08

ORGANIZATION:

Taos Canyon Neighborhood Association

FOREST:

Carson

COMMUNITY:

Taos

CONTACT:

John Otis (575.770.4840)

PROJECT TITLE:

Forest Restoration Project in Taos Canyon – North Shady Brook Project

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$250,493

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$66,600

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$317,093

CATEGORY:

3

RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0

STRENGTHS:

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal included strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The project will reduce fire risk in community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
9. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
10. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
11. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
12. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
13. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
14. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
15. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
16. The proposal includes good budget detail and / or work plan.
17. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
18. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
19. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
20. The project will maintain existing jobs.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The youth component lacks detail.
2. The project will not add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
3. The proposal lacks detailed explanation of herbicide application / safety efforts.
4. The proposal does not state that safety of operators / operations will be assured.
5. The treatment and/or utilization plans are vague.
6. The monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan.
7. The proposal lacks detailed work plan (the work plan says that the project manager will complete all activities; not clear how this will be possible).
8. The budget does not include clear unit costs (i.e., project manager is funded in both the Federal and non-Federal match portions of the budget - it appears that the project manager is being paid for 15 months/year; the indirect charges are vague).
9. The detailed budget does not follow RFP budget format.
10. The non-federal match does not appear to be adequate in the budget justification (e.g., the project manager is over-paid by 3 months a year, making the match insufficient).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The collaborators should consider developing a “Firewise” program in the community.
2. The proponent should clarify in writing who will be doing the activities in the work plan.
3. In the prescription development with the Forest Service’s silviculturalist, the proponent should maximize the planning tools available to the Forest Service to fully explore treatment options.
4. The proponent should collect pre-treatment monitoring data, using the same variables that will be collected post-treatment.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. SF 424- Match exceeds 20%
2. The multiparty monitoring consultant should appear under the “contractor” line instead of the “other” line in the budget.

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 11-08 Rev. 1

ORGANIZATION:

Urban Interface Solutions

FOREST:

Carson

COMMUNITY:

Taos

CONTACT:

Rachel Mondragon (575.751.3536)

PROJECT TITLE:

The La Jara Taos Pines Ranch Firewise Community Forest Health Restoration/Education/Monitoring CFRP

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$90,000

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$450,000

CATEGORY:

2

RECOMMENDED FUNDING:

\$0

STRENGTHS:

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The project includes strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The project will reduce fire risk in community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
9. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
10. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
11. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
12. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
13. This proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
14. The proposal has a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
15. The proposal includes good budget detail and / or work plan.
16. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
17. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
18. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms, including multiple intents to purchase forest products.
19. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
20. The project uses Firewise as an outreach tool.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The collaborator / contractor letters do not verify match.
2. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the match commitment.
3. The treatment plan is vague.
4. The monitoring plan does not monitor the utilization component of the work plan.
5. The details regarding the disposition of the merchantable material are unclear.
6. The proposal does not describe how program income will be utilized.
7. Fuel treatment costs that are being paid to contractors should be included in the “contractor” line of the budget, not under the “personnel” line.
8. It is unclear why the budget includes the cost of purchasing equipment if the thinning is being contracted out.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proponent should include the Forest Service’s Public Affairs staff in the development of the video in order to ensure that federal government production requirements are met.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

N/A

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 12-08
ORGANIZATION:	El Greco Forest Restoration
FOREST:	Carson
COMMUNITY:	Rio Arriba County
CONTACT:	Max Cordova (505.689.2474)
PROJECT TITLE:	El Greco Forest Restoration in the Truchas Mountain Area of the Carson National Forest which is also an Economically Depressed Area in the Federally Recognized and Designated Enterprise Zone
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
CATEGORY:	3
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The project includes strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. The project includes a good youth component.
6. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
7. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
8. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
9. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
10. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
11. The project will create new jobs.
12. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
2. The youth component lacks detail.
3. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal (State Forestry.)
4. The letters of support do not clearly describe the roles and commitments of the partners as described in Table 1.
5. The proposal does not clearly indicate that the majority of material processed with CFRP purchased equipment will come from public lands.
6. To understand the proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
7. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.
8. The treatment and/or utilization plans are vague.
9. The monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan.
10. Equipment that is included in the budget should be displayed as supplies.
11. The NEPA is complete, but the Forest Service letter of endorsement indicates a section 18 review is needed, which may take up to two years.
12. The proposal includes federal funds to purchase a federal permit.
13. Workers compensation rates may be very low.
14. The proposal does not budget for safety training.
15. The fuel estimates in the budget may be low.
16. The proposal does not describe how program income will be utilized.
17. The budget detail for the technical support is unclear; each contractor should have been broken out.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.
2. Before a grant is awarded more specific milestones need to be identified.
3. The proponent should clarify that any federal permits are purchased with non-federal funds.
4. The purchase of equipment and supplies should occur after NEPA is completed.
5. We strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised proposal next year with the recommendations and weaknesses addressed.
6. The proposal would be strengthened by consideration of inflation in future years.
7. The proposal could have been strengthened by the collaboration with the "Truchas" Land Grant Board of Trustees (elected officials).
8. The work plan needs to include Picuris Pueblo role in proposal.
9. In Table 3, the proposal should include existing ecological conditions and desired future condition.
10. The proponent should look for opportunities to engage collaborators in the treatment layout.
11. The proponent should ensure that wages are within prevailing wages for the area.

COMMENTS:

1. The proposal is unclear if there was collaboration in the design of the treatments to be used in this project.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

N/A

PROJECT NUMBER: **CFRP 13-08**
ORGANIZATION: Village of Questa
FOREST: Carson
COMMUNITY: Questa / Lama
CONTACT: Brent Jaramillo (505.586.0694)
PROJECT TITLE: Forest Thinning for Fire Prevention and Education of Youth in Questa
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000
CATEGORY: 3
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0

STRENGTHS:

1. The project included strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
4. NEPA is complete.
5. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
6. The project includes a good youth component.
7. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
8. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
9. The project is part of a multi-jurisdictional restoration effort (including the Village of Questa).
10. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
11. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
12. The proposal includes good budget detail and / or work plan.
13. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
14. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
2. The youth component lacks detail (particularly in the budget; no letter from Singing River Field Center committing to the program or contract).
3. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal (e.g., Singing River Field Center, C.A. Cisneros Youth and Family Center, Boys n Girls Club of Northern NM).
4. The proposal does not include provisions for preserving old and large trees.
5. The project will not add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
6. The proposal lacks a description or estimate of volume of restoration byproducts.

7. The monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan.
8. The narrative does not effectively support the work plan and budget.
9. The proposal lacks detailed budget and work plan.

10. The milestones are too general.
11. The budget does not appear to adequately support the work plan.
12. The budget does not include clear unit costs.
13. The expenses under “other” are not defined (the proponent clarified that these costs are for the educational component, which will be expended under a contract).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation and commodity groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.
2. The proposal would be strengthened by explaining how the expenses for the educational component will be spent.
3. The proponent should ensure that the safety of the thinning subcontractor operators/operations will be assured.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. SF 424 – Uses old form
2. SF 424- Missing CFDA #
3. SF 424- Missing Duns #

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 14-08
ORGANIZATION:	Lama Junction Sawmill
FOREST:	Carson
COMMUNITY:	Questa / Lama
CONTACT:	Jannette Cordova (575.586.1845)
PROJECT TITLE:	Forest Thinning for Fire Prevention and Education for Youth in the Questa / Lama Area
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$320,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$410,000
CATEGORY:	3
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
2. NEPA is complete.
3. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
4. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
5. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
6. This proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
7. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
8. The letters of support demonstrate community support (from community members and the retail sector) for the mill.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The project title does not adequately describe what will be accomplished.
2. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
3. The youth component lacks detail.

4. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal.
5. The collaborator / contractor letters do not verify match (e.g., George's Woodworks, Doc Wilson Camp, Chevron Plus etc.).
6. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided.
7. The proposal does not include provisions for preserving old and large trees.
8. The proposal does not clearly indicate that the majority of material processed with CFRP purchased equipment will come from public lands.
9. To understand the proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
10. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.

11. The proposal does not state that safety of operators / operations will be assured.
12. The proposal lacks a description or estimate of volume of restoration byproducts.
13. The treatment and/or utilization plans are vague.
14. The monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan.
15. The narrative does not effectively support the work plan and budget.
16. The proposal lacks detailed budget and work plan.
17. The milestones are too general.
18. The budget does not appear to adequately support the work plan.
19. The budget does not include clear unit costs.
20. The detailed budget does not follow RFP budget format.
21. The proposal does not include key personnel qualifications.
22. The proposal does not describe how program income will be utilized.
23. The proposal lacks clarity on the role of the partners (e.g., Chevron Mining is listed as providing cash or in-kind services but the letter does not support this).
24. The budget does not include adequate match (does not add up to 20% of total project cost).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation & youth groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.
2. From the beginning of the development of a restoration project, general estimates of volume of byproduct to be generated should be made for the purpose of co-developing the utilization strategy.
3. We strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised proposal next year with the recommendations and weaknesses addressed.
4. The proposal would be strengthened by the inclusion of a business plan that clearly described product types, volume estimates, and that strengthen the utilization of products.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. SF 424 – Old form
2. SF 424 – Missing CFDA

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 15-08
ORGANIZATION: New Earth Stewards
FOREST: Carson
COMMUNITY: Pot Creek
CONTACT: Michael Knutti (575.751.1536)
PROJECT TITLE: The Project to Complete Pot Creek Forest Restoration
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$352,166
MATCHING FUNDS: \$101,660
TOTAL BUDGET: \$441,326
CATEGORY: 2
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal included strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
3. NEPA is complete.
4. The project will reduce fire risk in community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
5. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
6. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
7. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
8. The proposal is innovative in that it combines forest restoration treatments with the arts and youth outreach.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The youth component lacks detail.
2. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal (Urban Interface Solutions).
3. The project will not add significant capacity to restoration efforts (however, the sale of grant-purchased equipment is a unique approach to increasing the scale of the grant activities).
4. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.
5. The proposal lacks a description or estimate of volume of restoration byproducts.
6. The treatment and/or utilization plans are vague.
7. The monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan.
8. The narrative does not effectively support the work plan and budget.
9. Even with the sale of the equipment, the budget will fall short of covering the full costs of treating the full 150 acres.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Prior to grant award the proponent should ensure that the sale of equipment complies with OMB Circular A-110
2. The proposal would be strengthened by including more specific information concerning existing and desired future conditions and variables measured in the monitoring plan.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. SF 424A – Section B is incorrect

PROJECT NUMBER: **CFRP 16-08**
ORGANIZATION: Amigos del Bosque
FOREST: Carson
COMMUNITY: Espanola
CONTACT: Gilbert Vigil (505.239.7760)
PROJECT TITLE: Creating Landscape-Scale Opportunities on the Carson National Forest
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$120,000
MATCHING FUNDS: \$30,000
TOTAL BUDGET: \$150,000
CATEGORY: 3
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0

STRENGTHS:

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal included strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The project will reduce fire risk in community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
9. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
10. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
11. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
12. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
13. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
14. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.

15. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
16. The proposal includes good budget detail and / or work plan.
17. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
18. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.

19. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
20. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
21. The project will create new jobs.
22. The proposal has strong focus on identifying transportation costs and has good collaboration to track realistic costs.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with the Forest Service in design, implementation, and monitoring.
2. The collaborator / contractor letters do not verify match.

3. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided.
4. The proposal does not include provisions for preserving old and large trees.
5. To understand the proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
6. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.

7. The proposal does not state that safety of operators / operations will be assured.
8. The proposal lacks a description or estimate of volume of restoration byproducts.
9. The treatment and/or utilization plans are vague.

10. The milestones are too general.
11. Piñon-juniper restoration objectives are not addressed in the proposal.
12. NEPA is not complete.
13. The NEPA contractors are not identified.
14. It is unclear who would use the services for transportation since there is no letter of commitment from other projects.
15. There are no numeric estimates of acres that could be NEPA cleared or number of projects that could be completed.
16. There are no maps or information for priority locations to do the NEPA work.
17. It is not clear that the current Forest Service program of work includes time for specialists to assist in the implementation of the proposed project.
18. The proposal lacks information on current gaps in markets, transportation, and industry capacity.
19. The connection between the transportation aspect of the proposal and the NEPA clearance/identification of the proposal is unclear.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. From the beginning of the development of a restoration project, general estimates of volume of byproduct to be generated should be made for the purpose of co-developing the utilization strategy.
2. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with the NM Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute.
3. The proposal could be strengthened by addressing the New Mexico Forest Restoration Principles and the PJ Framework in the NEPA process.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

N/A

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 17-08
ORGANIZATION:	Dine Agriculture
FOREST:	Carson
COMMUNITY:	Shiprock
CONTACT:	Dave Burbank (505.368.1028)
PROJECT TITLE:	Shiprock Hazardous Fuel Reduction and Restoration
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$358,904
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$89,808
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$448,712

CATEGORY: 1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$358,904

STRENGTHS:

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal includes strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
10. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
11. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
12. The project has a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.

13. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
14. The proposal includes good budget detail and / or work plan.
15. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
16. The applicant did an excellent job of addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations
17. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
18. The project will create new jobs.
19. The project includes an innovative approach to outreach using the river walk as an interpretive tool.
20. The addition of Fort Lewis College as a collaborator is a strength particularly because of their emphasis on natural resource management on tribal lands.
21. The restoration of native vegetation is a strength of this proposal.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Native old and large trees should be preserved.
2. The proponents should do a pre-project bird survey collaborating with Hawks Aloft in methodology.
3. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g. to protect nesting bird habitat).
4. The proposal would be strengthened by a discussion on the role of fire in the riparian communities.
5. The proponents should strive to treat the center portion of the water treatment site over time.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

N/A

PROJECT NUMBER: **CFRP 18-08**
ORGANIZATION: Ramah Band of Navajos
FOREST: Cibola
COMMUNITY: Ramah
CONTACT: Mike Henio (505.775.7128)
PROJECT TITLE: Ramah Navajo Forest Management and Forestry Energy
 Development Program
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$360,000
CATEGORY: 1

STRENGTHS:

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The project included strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The project will reduce fire risk in community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
9. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
10. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
11. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
12. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
13. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
14. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
15. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
16. The project has the potential to supply materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
17. The proposal has a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
18. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
19. The proposal includes good work plan detail.
20. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
21. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
22. The project has the potential to create new jobs.
23. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments and is an excellent example of becoming self-sufficient and successful in bidding on and completing restoration projects and government contracts.

24. The use of the Forest Advisory Committee in this project has the potential to strengthen our understanding of on the ground piñon-juniper restoration throughout NM.

WEAKNESSES:

25. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring (to some extent, this is mitigated by the inclusion of the Forest Advisory Committee).
26. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided.
27. The utilization plans are vague (for value-added processing beyond firewood).
28. The budget does not include clear unit costs (specifically regarding the mileage).
29. The proposal creates a special advisory committee on piñon-juniper treatments as part of monitoring and evaluation plans, but they are lacking a letter of support/commitment from one of the proposed committee members (Craig Allen).
30. It is unclear who the “consulting forester” is; this position accrues a total of \$38,000 across the life of the project, and we don’t know the units for this cost.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. From the beginning of the development of a restoration project, general estimates of volume of byproduct to be generated should be made for the purpose of co-developing the utilization strategy.
2. Surveys should be conducted for grey vireo and treatment plans adjusted appropriately.
3. The proposal offers the opportunity to address the interaction of grazing with the reestablishment of the natural fire regime.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. SF 424A – Section B is incorrect

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 19-08

ORGANIZATION:

Pueblo of Isleta

FOREST:

Cibola

COMMUNITY:

Pueblo of Isleta

CONTACT:

John Sorrell (505.724.9233)

PROJECT TITLE:

Lucero Fire Restoration Project

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$90,000

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$450,000

CATEGORY:

2

RECOMMENDED FUNDING:

\$0

STRENGTHS:

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The project included strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. NEPA is complete.
4. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
5. The project includes a good youth component.
6. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
7. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
8. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.

Proposal Review: Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations

9. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
10. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.

11. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
12. The proposal includes good budget detail and / or work plan.
13. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
14. The project will create new jobs.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
2. The youth component lacks detail.
3. The collaborator / contractor letters do not verify match and/or roles in project (e.g., USFWS, NM Natural Heritage Program, US Army Corps of Engineers).
4. The proposal did not include documentation of consultation with tribes.
5. The proposal does not include provisions for preserving all native vegetation.
6. There is no discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan.
7. Proposal lacks detailed explanation of herbicide application / safety efforts.
8. The proponent lacked external collaboration.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with external and conservation groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.
2. A letter from the Forest that would administer the grant should be included.
3. The proposal would be strengthened by consulting other tribes and CFRP recipients that have an interest in this type of work or who are involved with similar projects.
4. Native vegetation should be clearly marked and protected prior to treatment.
5. The proposal should include a discussion of the ignition sources of the recurring fires on the treatment sites.
6. The proponent should strongly consider including a bird survey plan using Hawks Aloft's methodology.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. SF 424 – Old form

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 20-08 Rev. 2

ORGANIZATION:

Alamo Navajo School Board, Inc

FOREST:

Cibola

COMMUNITY:

Alamo Navajo Reservation

CONTACT:

Lynda Middleton (505.854.2543 x1301)

PROJECT TITLE:

Alamo Community Capacity Building through Collaborative Forest Restoration

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$90,000

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$450,000

CATEGORY:

1

RECOMMENDED FUNDING:

\$360,000

STRENGTHS:

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The project included strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
10. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
11. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
12. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
13. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
14. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort (specifically on adjacent lands administered by BLM).
15. The proposal has a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
16. The proposal includes good budget detail and / or work plan.
17. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
18. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.

19. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
20. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
21. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
22. The project will create new jobs.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The work plan table (page 8) is inconsistent with the letter from the District Ranger (specifically regarding the amount of acres that will be made available for treatment).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proponent should ensure that wages for the crew are within the prevailing range of wages for the area.
2. The proponent should discuss the resources needed to sustain the program beyond the life of the grant.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

N/A

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 21-08

ORGANIZATION:

Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District

FOREST:

Cibola

COMMUNITY:

Belen

CONTACT:

Yasmeen Najmi (505.247.0234)

PROJECT TITLE: Post-Fire Restoration in the Middle Rio Grande Bosque:
A Landscape Approach towards Revitalization of an
Ecosystem
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000
CATEGORY: 1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$360,000

STRENGTHS:

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The project included strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
4. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
5. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
6. The project includes a good youth component with excellent detail.
7. Reduces fire risk in community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
8. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
10. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
11. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
12. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
13. The proposal has a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
14. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
15. The proposal includes good budget detail and / or work plan.
16. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.

17. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities in a location where cross-jurisdictional work is typically very challenging.
18. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
19. Inclusion of seasonal work restrictions is commendable.
20. The inclusion of soil moisture management is commendable.
21. The inclusion of an ecologically based rapid assessment methodology, testing, and sharing with other potential CFRP projects is an important strength of this proposal.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proposal lacks detailed explanation of herbicide application / safety efforts.
2. The proposal does not state that safety of operators / operations will be assured (particularly as it relates to training and herbicides).
3. The utilization plans are vague.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with the federal land management agencies (Forest Service, BLM) in project design, implementation and monitoring.
2. The proponent should work with State Forestry to further develop the utilization plan.

3. The proponent should specify which native species will be used in the restoration and describe the amounts of those species that will be used.
4. The proponent should ensure that any non-native species left as cover on the treatment site be treated so that they do not serve as a seed source.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

N/A

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 22-08
ORGANIZATION:	Four Corners Institute
FOREST:	Cibola
COMMUNITY:	Mountainair
CONTACT:	Melissa Savage (505.983.8515)
PROJECT TITLE:	Ojo Peak Crown Fire Restoration Planning Project: Developing a Plan for Restoring Post-Crown Fire Watershed Integrity
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$87,094.73
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$21,932
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$109,026.73
CATEGORY:	1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$87,094.73

STRENGTHS:

1. Includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. Strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
6. The project includes a good youth component.
7. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
8. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
9. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
10. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.

11. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
12. The proposal has good budget detail and / or work plan.
13. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
14. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
15. The goal to restore ecosystem function is laudable.
16. The proposal is innovative in its integrated watershed scale and interdisciplinary approach to post-fire restoration and is supported by a strong team of collaborators.
17. The applicants have built into the proposal outreach to a land grant organization to strengthen their planning and restoration efforts.

WEAKNESSES:

1. To understand the proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
2. The Forest Service letter of endorsement does not clearly confirm the degree of collaboration that took place during the proposal development (during the proposal review, the Forest Service CFRP Coordinator clarified that a high degree of collaboration with the FS did in fact take place during the proposal development).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Before grant award, more specific milestones need to be identified.
2. The proponent should ensure that personnel and contractual costs are displayed under the correct line items (for example, Melissa Savage’s costs for completing the monitoring report should be under “personnel”, as is explained in the letter of commitment from the Four Corner’s Institute).
3. The proponent should use certified weed-free materials or on-site materials for mulch.
4. The proposal would be strengthened, as a part of the planning process, by a description or estimate of volume of byproducts that could potentially pay for the burned area restoration.
5. Given the projects intent to expand the current body of knowledge regarding post-fire restoration, the project proposal would be strengthened by the incorporation of references to the current body of scientific information that exists on this topic.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

N/A

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 23-08 Rev 1
ORGANIZATION:	Mexicano Land Education & Conservation Trust
FOREST:	Cibola
COMMUNITY:	Carnue and Chilili Land Grants
CONTACT:	Candido Archuleta (505.328.4104)
PROJECT TITLE:	New Mexico Community Land Grant Planning & Preparation for Community Forest Restoration Pilot Project
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$120,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$30,505
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$150,505
CATEGORY:	1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$120,000

STRENGTHS:

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The project included strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.

8. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
9. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
10. The proposal includes good budget detail and / or work plan.
11. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
12. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.

13. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
14. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
15. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments (Santa Clara Pueblo).
16. The applicants have built into the proposal outreach to other land grants to strengthen their planning and restoration efforts.
17. The proposal includes a plan to develop a monitoring and evaluation plan for future implementation activities.
18. The proposal is an innovative collaboration among land grants and Santa Clara Pueblo, with the potential of developing cross-jurisdictional treatments of land grant, Pueblo and Forest Service lands.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The youth component lacks detail.
2. The Forest Service's Sandia and Mountainair Ranger Districts were not identified as partners in the proposal (the proposal should also include letters of support).
3. The proposal does not include provisions for preserving old and large trees.
4. There is no discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan.
5. The monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan.
6. The proposal does not include a discussion of potential restoration byproducts.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proponent should consult with the NMFWRI and NM State Forestry during the NEPA process.
2. The proponent should ensure that the NM Forest Restoration Principles are used.
3. The proposal would be strengthened by the inclusion of a description of the current and desired future conditions and hazards as identified in the Community Fire Plans.
4. The project should include more formal collaboration with the Forest Service that will facilitate cross-jurisdictional planning, leading to a larger landscape level approach.
5. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop activity and timing plans (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. SF 424 – Match exceeds 20%

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 24-08
ORGANIZATION:	Gila National Forest Permittees Association
FOREST:	Gila
COMMUNITY:	Winston
CONTACT:	Laura Schneberger (575.772.5753)
PROJECT TITLE:	Eastern Gila Forest and Community Restoration Project
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000

TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000
CATEGORY: 1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$360,000

STRENGTHS:

1. The project included strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support, particularly the NM Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
4. NEPA is complete.
5. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
6. The project includes a good youth component, inclusion of the NMSU range club.
7. The project will reduce fire risk in community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
8. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
10. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
11. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
12. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
13. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
14. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
15. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
16. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
17. This proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
18. The proposal has a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
19. The proposal includes good budget detail.
1. The project will create new jobs.
20. The project has the potential to assist many future CFRP projects through the feasibility analysis, economic case studies, and publication of entrepreneur desk guides.
21. The project is unique and innovative in that it adds value added wood products that would be utilized through a coop in a rural community in Southern New Mexico.
22. The inclusion of an economist is a strength of this proposal.
23. The proposal provides a good value to the CFRP by adding capacity, performing treatments, and enhancing economic understanding of small diameter timber utilization.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with other land management agencies (BLM) in design, implementation, and monitoring.
2. The proposal does not describe the role of the NMSU range club in monitoring.
3. Letters of support from some of the partners listed in Section C, page 3, were not included in the proposal (NRCS and Wahoo Ranch).
4. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.

5. The proposal does not state that safety of operators / operations will be assured.
6. The proposal does not include a resume from the project coordinator.
7. There is no detail on the sustainability of the coop's business plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for cross jurisdictional restoration potential.
2. The project is a good opportunity to expand collaboration to include non-traditional partners.
3. The proposal could be strengthened by a more thorough description of the ecosystem or vegetation types in which restoration activities will take place.
4. The economic case studies should detail the role of the coop.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. SF 424 - Missing CFDA #
2. SF 424A – Errors in Section B

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 25-08

ORGANIZATION: Gila Tree Thinners
FOREST: Gila
COMMUNITY: Silver City
CONTACT: Glenn Griffin (575.388.4130)
PROJECT TITLE: Burro Mountain Homestead Restoration Project
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000
CATEGORY: 1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$360,000

STRENGTHS:

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners, including an ATV group (Gila Rough Riders).
2. The project included strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a well developed youth component with a track record of proven success.
8. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
10. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
11. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
12. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
13. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
14. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.

15. This proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
16. The proposal has a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
17. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
18. The proposal includes good budget detail and / or work plan.
19. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
20. The project will create new jobs.
21. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
22. Potential markets are described in detail.
23. The project includes a detailed assessment of the challenges of creating a sustainable business.
24. A strength of the proposal is an ongoing relationship with the small business development center,
25. The proposal offers a good discussion and chance to monitor the re-sprouting issue regarding removed trees, particularly Alligator juniper.
26. The project will allow for year round employment.

WEAKNESSES:

1. There is an inadequate discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan.
2. The proposal does not discuss or reference the best available science with respect to persistent PJ woodland.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal should include provisions to ensure old and large trees are preserved.
2. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).
3. The proponents should ensure that the interactions among other CFRP grantees are clear and that funding does not overlap.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. The margin and font is off on the project narrative.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 26-08
ORGANIZATION:	RC Forest Products
FOREST:	Gila
COMMUNITY:	Reserve
CONTACT:	Ruben Carreon (575.533.6511)
PROJECT TITLE:	SDT Firewood Production through the Purchase of a Firewood Processor
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$119,845
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$29,961.25
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$149,806.25
CATEGORY:	1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$119,845

STRENGTHS:

1. The project included strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
3. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
4. The project includes a good youth component.
5. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
6. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
7. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
8. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
9. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
10. The project will maintain and expand existing job opportunities.
11. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
12. This project supports the growth of two businesses.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with state/municipal/county groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
2. Letters of support from a key partner (JL Enterprises) was not included in the proposal.
3. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided.
4. The monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with state/municipal groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.
2. The monitoring plan could be strengthened by measuring production before and after new equipment is used.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

N/A

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 27-08

ORGANIZATION:

Santa Clara Woodworks

FOREST:

Gila

COMMUNITY:

Santa Clara

CONTACT:

Gordon West (575.537.3689)

PROJECT TITLE:

Acquiring and Processing Piñon Pine into Value Added Products

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$152,600

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$38,540

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$191,140

CATEGORY:

1

RECOMMENDED FUNDING:

\$152,600

STRENGTHS:

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal included strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.

4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
6. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
7. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts (processing).
8. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
9. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
10. This proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.

11. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
12. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
13. The project will create new jobs.
14. The project integrates other CFRP recipients into project.
15. The grant request utilizes only a small amount of CFRP dollars in comparison to allowable amount.
16. A strength of the proposal is an ongoing relationship with the small business development center.
17. A strength of the proposal is the attempt to investigate green product certification and utilization of woodland products.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The youth component lacks detail (letter mentions monitoring).
2. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal (specifically, willingness to pay, price, etc.).

3. The proposal does not state that safety of operators / operations will be assured.
4. The monitoring plan is not multiparty.
5. The proposal and budget do not address anticipated program income (from the flooring production).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proponents should ensure that the interactions among other CFRP grantees are clear and that funding does not overlap.
2. The proponent should ensure that any estimated program income is accounted for in the budget.
3. The proponent should consult with Colorado Forest Restoration Institute (CFRI) / Colorado Wood / NMFWRRI regarding similar efforts to produce piñon flooring.
4. The proposal could be strengthened by a discussion of outcomes of the applicant's previous grant-funded ventures.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

N/A

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 28-08

ORGANIZATION:

Gila Woodnet

FOREST: Gila
COMMUNITY: Silver City
CONTACT: Dana Bates (575.537.3250)
PROJECT TITLE: Forest Restoration Thinning on the Signal Peak North Project
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000
CATEGORY: 2
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0

STRENGTHS:

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The project included strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The project will reduce fire risk in community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
9. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
10. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
11. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
12. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
13. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
14. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
15. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
16. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
17. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
18. This proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.

19. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
20. The proposal includes good budget detail and / or work plan.
21. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
22. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP)
23. The project will create new jobs.
24. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
25. The discussion of whole cloth and restoration economies is a strength of this proposal.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The collaborator / contractor letters do not verify match (specifically, the letter from Chiricahua Apache Nation does not commit to participating in the project).
2. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided.
3. There is no discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan.

4. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.
5. The proposal lacks a description or estimate of volume of restoration byproducts.
6. The monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan.
7. The distinction between project and previously funded CFRP grants is unclear.
8. The proposal and budget do not address anticipated program income.
9. The budget includes a direct cost item (annual workshop attendance) in the “indirect cost” line of the budget.
10. The costs of the project are very high and do not seem to be within the range of the fair market value.
11. The proposal is unclear on how the estimated economic impact of \$2M on page 4 is calculated.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proponent should ensure that any estimated program income is accounted for in the budget.
2. The proponents should ensure that the interactions among other CFRP grantees are clear and that funding does not overlap.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

N/A

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 29-08
ORGANIZATION:	Carlsbad Soil and Water Conservation District
FOREST:	Lincoln
COMMUNITY:	Carlsbad
CONTACT:	Nathan Jurva (575.628.1532)
PROJECT TITLE:	McMillan Native Vegetation Restoration Project
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
CATEGORY:	3
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

STRENGTHS:

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The project included strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
10. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.

11. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
12. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
13. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
14. This proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
15. The project has a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.

16. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
17. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
18. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
19. The project will create new jobs.
20. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments (specifically, lessons learned from the NM Recycling Coalition)
21. If successful, this proposal may add to the “tool-box” for salt-cedar eradication.

WEAKNESSES:

1. To understand the proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities, specifically trees/acre and sizes.
2. The proposal does not state that safety of operators / operations will be assured.
3. The proponents do not discuss what the desired future condition should be (e.g., what will the seed mix be).
4. The proposal does not discuss available science for salt-cedar eradication (e.g., how does this treatment compare to other salt cedar eradication projects, such as that at the Bosque del Apache?).
5. In its current location, this project may not meet the restoration objectives of the CFRP (vs. reclamation).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proponent should separate out the costs per acre according to activity (e.g., extraction, mulching, seed cost, etc.).
2. The proponent is strongly encouraged to collect pre-treatment monitoring data.
3. We strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised proposal with a more comprehensive restoration plan that incorporates the river and riparian attributes that reflect historical conditions.

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. SF 424 – Used old form.

Table 2. 2008 CFRP Proposal Evaluation Matrix

Proposal #	Lead Organization	Part of a longer term comprehensive CFR	Innovative approach that adds value to CFRP	Sustainable: Will effort continue?	Quality of the collaboration	Adds significant capacity to restoration	Total
CFRP 01-08	Pueblo of Santo Domingo	X	X		X	X	4
CFRP 04-08	North Eastern Contractors LLC	X		X		X	3
CFRP 06-08	Northridge Forest Projects	X	X	X		X	4
CFRP 09-08	HR Vigil Small Products	X		X	X	X	4
CFRP 11-08	Urban Interface Solutions	X			X	X	3
CFRP 15-08	New Earth Stewards, LLC		X		X		2
CFRP 19-08	Pueblo of Isleta	X					1
CFRP 28-08	Gila Woodnet	X	X		X		3

Recommendations

Recommendations for the FY 2009 CFRP Request for Proposals

- Require all proposals to include a letter from the Forest that will be responsible for administering the grant (due to increasing admin responsibilities of the Forest Service in regards to NEPA, etc.).
- If CFRP 02-08 is funded, include note in the 2009 CFRP RFP that applicants do not need to budget for safety training (CFRP 02-08 includes free training for CFRP grantees).
- Require all proposals to include a budget narrative.
- Ask all applicants to consult with adjacent, active land grant communities (Arturo Archuleta can help develop the consultation list for this).
- Require the NEPA Decision Document for all land jurisdictions (including FS), for those proposals that include on the ground activities.
- Include stronger language / requirements asking proponents to more thoroughly describe the existing conditions and desired future conditions (for those projects that are NEPA ready).

Recommendations for Improving the CFRP Technical Advisory Panel Process

- Discuss the matrix criteria on the first day of the panel meeting, before the review process begins.
- Add matrix criteria to the evaluation checklist – include the same language from the RFP on this.
- Incorporate evaluation criteria checklist into the review process.
- Consider alternatives to resolving impasses among panel members, particularly when running proposals through the matrix.
- Evaluation criteria checklist – move #1 to #4.
- Add public comment period prior to the consistency review.
- Weaknesses # 15, 18, 19 (and others that may be vague) – add a space for the reviewer to provide more detail, explain the concern.
- Try to lump the boilerplate lists (e.g., boil them down more).
- Explore having on hand estimates (by Forest) of the numbers of acres being made available for treatment contracts (e.g., thinning, WUI work, etc.).
- Change the ranking definitions to the following:
 1. The proposal is an excellent match with the purposes and objectives of the Act and the panel recommends funding. The proposal may have minor weaknesses.
 2. The proposal is an excellent match with the purposes and objectives of the Act. The proposal has some substantive weaknesses, but it is eligible for funding.
 3. The proposal is a good fit to the purposes and the objectives of the Act, but the weaknesses identified in the work plan, budget, and/or monitoring plan must be addressed before the project can be recommended for funding.
 4. The proposal does not clearly address the objectives of the Act and/or successful implementation is doubtful.

2008 CFRP TAP Subcommittee

- The panel recommends that a monitoring protocol be developed that allows for long-term monitoring following the reintroduction of fire.
- The following Panel members volunteered to serve on the 2008 CFRP TAP Subcommittee: Ann Bradley, Este Muldavin & Rick DeIaco.

Appendix A: Collaborative Forest Restoration Program Bylaws

April 21, 2008

Section I: Purpose:

The purpose of the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program Technical Advisory Panel (Panel) is to evaluate proposals for forest restoration grants and provide recommendations on funding. Recommendations will be presented to the Southwest Regional Forester, USDA Forest Service.

Section II: Authority:

The Secretary of Agriculture established the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program Technical Advisory Panel as a Federal Advisory Committee on July 12, 2001 pursuant to Section 606 of the Community Forest Restoration Act of 2000 (Pub. L. No. 106-393) (the Act), which directs the Secretary to convene a technical advisory panel to evaluate proposals that will receive funding through the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program. The Panel is subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), and the Government in the Sunshine Act (GISA).

Section III: Membership Selection and Appointment:

The Regional Forester, acting for the Chief of the Forest Service, will appoint Panel members. The 12-15 member panel, as outlined in Section 606 of the Act, includes: a State Natural Resources official from the State of New Mexico; At least two representatives from Federal land management agencies; at least one tribal or pueblo representative; at least two independent scientists with experience in forest ecosystem restoration; and equal representation from: conservation interests; local communities; and commodity interests.

Members of the Panel shall be appointed for terms of 2 years, but may be reappointed. A vacancy on the Panel will be filled from the list of applicants who responded to the original solicitation for applications. A list of qualified applicants who passed the required background clearance check will be kept on file for this purpose. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his/her predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. A replacement shall fill the vacancy as soon as practicable after the vacancy occurs.

At the end of each 2-year term, the Regional Forester will solicit applications for new membership on the panel. Notices will be sent to tribal, county and local governments, conservation organizations, and appropriate Colleges and Universities. A notice describing the purpose of the Panel and the application procedure will be published in local newspapers and a news release will be sent to television stations, radio stations, and their local translators in New Mexico soliciting nominations for Panel membership. Letters will also be mailed to individuals who have expressed an interest in the program or are involved in the forest restoration issue in New Mexico. Information on the Act and how to submit an application for membership on the

Panel will also be posted on the Forest Service Southwest Regional Internet Website at: www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/community.

The Regional Forester, in selecting Panel members, shall seek to ensure the membership of the Panel is balanced and represents and includes a broad range of diverse views and interests. Additional criteria for selection will include but not be limited to: long-time familiarity with forest management issues in New Mexico; past experience working with the government planning process; knowledge and understanding of the various cultures and communities in New Mexico; ability to actively participate in diverse team settings; demonstrated skill in working toward mutually beneficial solutions to complex issues; respect and credibility in local communities; and commitment to attending panel meetings.

The Regional Forester shall appoint a Designated Federal Official (DFO) under sections 10 (e) and (f) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App., who shall also serve as the Chairman of the Panel.

Section IV: Meeting Procedures:

The panel will provide an environment where interest groups that have a stake in forest management issues can work towards agreement on how forest restoration should occur on public land in New Mexico with the grant proposals as the focus of the discussion.

The panel makes recommendations to the Regional Forester on which grant proposals best meet the objectives of the Act. The Panel will meet as often as is necessary to complete its business. The DFO (or a designated substitute) will convene Panel meetings. A majority of the Panel members must be present to constitute an official meeting of the Panel.

A. Agenda: The DFO/Chairman will approve the proposed agenda for each meeting and distributed it to panel members prior to each meeting. An outline of the agenda will be published with a notice of the meeting in the Federal Register at least 15 days prior to the meeting. CFRP project proposals will be distributed to panel members for review at least six weeks prior to the panel meeting. Any member of the panel may submit additional agenda items to the DFO prior to the meeting if they are related to proposal evaluation. Members of the public may submit items for consideration that are related to proposal evaluation by sending them to the DFO prior to the meeting.

B. Minutes and Records: The DFO will prepare minutes of each meeting and distribute copies to each Panel member. The minutes will include: a record of the persons present (including the names of panel members, names of staff, and the names of members of the public who made written or oral presentations); a description of the matters discussed and conclusions reached; and copies of all reports received, issued or approved by the Panel. All documents, reports, or other materials prepared by, or for, the Panel constitute official government records and must be maintained according the Government Services Administration (GSA) policies and procedures. Minutes of open meetings will be available to the public upon request.

C. Open Meetings: All meetings of the Panel will be open to the public. All materials brought before or presented to the Panel will be available to the public for review or copying at the time of the scheduled meeting.

Members of the public may attend any meeting or portion of a meeting and, at the determination of the Chairman, offer oral comment at such meeting. The Chairman may decide in advance to exclude oral public comment during a meeting, in which case the meeting announcement published in the Federal Register will note that oral comment from the public is excluded and will invite written comment as an alternative.

Section V: Role of Panel Members:

A. Designated Federal Official (DFO): The DFO will establish priorities, identify issues that must be addressed, and assure compliance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act and the Community Forest Restoration Act. The DFO also serves as the government's agent for all matters related to the panel's activities. By Law, the DFO must: (1) approve or call the meeting of the Panel; (2) approve agendas; (3) attend all meetings; (4) adjourn the meetings when such adjournment is in the public interest; and (5) chair meetings when directed by the Regional Forester or his/her designee. The DFO is responsible for determining the level and types of staff and financial support required and providing adequate staff support to the Panel, including the performance of the following functions: (a) Notifying members of the time and place for each meeting; (b) ensuring that adequate facilities are provided for meetings; (c) ensuring detailed minutes are taken at the meeting and maintaining records of all meetings, including subgroup or working group activities, as required by Law; (d) maintaining the roll including subgroup and working group activities; (e) attending to official correspondence; (f) maintaining official Panel records and filing all papers and submissions prepared for or by the Panel, including those items generated by subgroups and working groups; (g) acting as the Panel's agent to collect, validate and pay all vouchers for pre-approved expenditures; and (h) preparing and handling all reports, including the annual report as required under FACA.

B. Chairperson: The Chairperson works with the DFO to establish priorities, identify issues which must be addressed, determine the level and types of staff and financial support required, and serves as the focal point for the Panel's membership. The Chairman works with the meeting facilitator to assure that each member of the Panel has an opportunity to express their views. In addition, the Chairperson is responsible for certifying the accuracy of minutes developed by the Panel to document its meetings. The DFO may also serve as the Chairperson.

C. Panel Member: Appointment to the Panel does not make a Panel member an employee of the federal government. The primary responsibility of each Panel member is to review and score each CFRP project proposal to determine which ones best meet the purposes and objectives of the Act. Panel members shall attend Panel meetings, and participate in related workgroups as determined necessary by the Panel and approved by the DFO. Panel members may contact project proponents to clarify specific aspects of a proposal and seek input from other sources familiar with the technical and social aspects of the intended activity.

If a Panel Member or any member of their immediate family, or organization employing them, will directly or financially benefit from a CFRP grant proposal being evaluated, or if a Panel Member was directly involved in the development of the proposal, that Panel member **shall leave the meeting room during the discussion of that proposal and recuse themselves from the Panel's decision** to avoid a conflict of interest. Panel members may answer questions from grant applicants regarding the eligibility and appropriateness of project proposal ideas and still engage in the discussion and decision on a proposal.

During Panel discussions, each member of the Panel shall take the concerns of other Panel members as seriously as they do their own regarding the contribution individual project proposals make towards forest restoration in New Mexico. Panel members are encouraged to support the recommendations of the Panel in their workplaces and in other groups concerned with forest restoration in New Mexico.

D. Recorder: The recorder shall capture issues raised and consensus recommendations of the Panel for each CFRP project proposal and for items of general discussion. The recorder shall take direction from the Chairman on final wording for consensus recommendations, and work with Panel members to assure that issues are captured accurately in the record of the meeting.

Section VI: Process for Developing Recommendations

By law, the Panel must seek to use a consensus based decision-making process in developing their recommendations. If the Panel does not reach agreement through discussion, they may use a weighted ranking system to identify the highest priority projects. The Regional Forester will make the final decision on which proposals receive funding.

Section VI: Expenses and Reimbursement

Members of the Panel serve without compensation. Reimbursement for travel expenses will be made in accordance with Federal per diem rates for attendance at meetings. Panel members should request authorization from the DFO prior to incurring any expenses associated with collecting input on project proposals including but not limited to photocopies, postage, and telephone calls. All expenses will be subject to approval of the DFO. Advisory Panel Expenses will be covered through the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program.

APPENDIX B: Collaborative Forest Restoration Program Charter

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250

DEPARTMENTAL REGULATION	Number: 1042-138
SUBJECT: Collaborative Forest Restoration Program Technical Advisory Panel Federal Advisory Committee	DATE: August 8, 2005
	OPI: Forest Service

1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

- a. The Collaborative Forest Restoration Program Technical Advisory Panel (Panel) is hereby established pursuant to Section 606, Title VI—Community Forest Restoration Act (Pub. L. No. 106-393) (the Act).
- b. The purpose of the Panel is to evaluate proposals for forest restoration grants and provide recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture (defined in section 604 of the Act as the Secretary of Agriculture acting through the Chief of the Forest Service) regarding which proposals best meet the objectives of the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program. The Chief of the Forest Service shall act through the Regional Forester of the Southwestern Region, USDA Forest Service (the Regional Forester), for the purpose of appointing members of the Panel, receiving Panel recommendations, and approving project funding.
- c. The Panel will operate in accordance with the Act (Title VI, Pub. L. No. 106-393) and the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C App.; Pub. L. No. 92-463).

2 SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS

- a. This regulation will expire 2 years from the date of filing unless renewed by proper authority and appropriate action.
- b. The functions of the Panel cannot be accomplished in less than 2 years. In accordance with Departmental regulations, unless renewed, the Panel will terminate 2 years from the date of filing the charter.
- c. This department regulation replaces DR 1042-138, dated July 25, 2003.

3 OFFICERS AND MEMBERSHIP

- a. The Panel will consist of 12 to 15 members approved by the Regional Forester as follows:
 - 1) A State natural resources official from the State of New Mexico;

- 2) At least two representatives from Federal land management agencies;
 - 3) At least one tribal or pueblo representative;
 - 4) At least two independent scientists with experience in forest ecosystem restoration; and
 - 5) Equal representation from—
 - a. Conservation interests,
 - b. Local communities, and
 - c. Commodity interests.
- b. Each Panel member shall serve as a representative of one of the interest groups described in section 606 (b) of the Act. Appointment to the Panel does not make Panel members Federal government employees.
 - c. A vacancy on the Panel will be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his/her predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. A replacement shall fill the vacancy as soon as practicable after the vacancy occurs.
 - d. Members of the Panel shall be appointed for terms of 2 years, but may be reappointed.
 - e. The Regional Forester, in selecting Panel members, shall seek to ensure the membership of the Panel is balanced and represents and includes a broad range of diverse views and interests.
 - f. The Regional Forester shall appoint a Designated Federal Official (DFO) under sections 10 (e) and (f) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act who may also serve as Chair of the Panel. The DFO (or a designated substitute) shall approve the proposed agenda for each meeting, attend each meeting, ensure that adequate facilities are provided for meetings, ensure detailed minutes are taken at the meeting, ensure the minutes and other Panel records are provided for meetings and other needs, and make such reports about the operation of the Panel as may be required or desirable.
 - g. The Panel may create and operate subcommittees or working groups recommended by its members and approved by the Regional Forester or Designated Federal Officer. If appropriate, these working groups or subcommittees may include representatives of nongovernmental organizations that have an interest in the implementation of the Act.
 - h. Equal opportunity practices, in line with USDA policies, will be followed in all appointments to the Panel. To ensure that the recommendations of the Panel have taken into account the needs of the diverse groups served by the Department, membership should include, to the extent

practicable, individuals with demonstrated ability to represent minorities, women, and persons with disabilities.

4 DUTIES

- a. The Panel shall provide recommendations to the Regional Forester on a schedule to be established by the Chair of the Panel.
- b. The Panel's recommendations shall consider the proposed projects' effects on long-term management and provide recommendations regarding which proposals best meet the following objectives pursuant to section 605 of the Act:
 - (1) Reduce the threat of large, high-intensity wildfires and the negative effects of excessive competition between trees by restoring ecosystem functions, structures, and species composition, including the reduction of nonnative species populations;
 - (2) Reestablish fire regimes approximating those that shaped forest ecosystems prior to fire suppression;
 - (3) Preserve old and large trees;
 - (4) Replant trees in deforested areas if they exist in the proposed project area;
 - (5) Improve the use of, or add value to, small diameter trees;
 - (6) Comply with all Federal and State environmental laws;
 - (7) Include a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders as well as appropriate Federal, State, tribal, county, and municipal government representatives in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the project;
 - (8) Incorporate current scientific forest restoration information;
 - (9) Include a multiparty assessment to identify both the existing ecological condition of the proposed project area and the desired future condition;
 - (10) Contain a plan for reporting, upon project completion, on the positive or negative impact and effectiveness of the project including improvements in local management skills and on- the-ground results;
 - (11) Create local employment or training opportunities within the context of accomplishing restoration objectives including summer youth jobs programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps where appropriate;
 - (12) Not exceed 4 years in length;
 - (13) Not exceed a total annual cost of \$150,000 per project, with the Federal portion not exceeding \$120,000 annually per project nor exceed a total cost of \$450,000 for each project, with the Federal portion of the total cost not exceeding \$360,000 per project;
 - (14) Leverage Federal funding through in-kind or matching contributions; and

- (15) Include an agreement by program grantees to attend an annual workshop with other stakeholders for the purpose of discussing the cooperative forest restoration program and projects implemented under the program.
- c. In developing their recommendations, the Panel shall seek to use a consensus-based decision-making process.
- d. Consistent with applicable laws and Departmental regulations, the Panel may adopt such by-laws or rules of operation, as it deems advisable.
- e. The Forest Service Southwestern Regional Forester shall select the proposals that will receive funding through the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program.

5 ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATIONS COSTS

- a. Members of the Panel serve without compensation. Reimbursement for travel expenses will be made in accordance with Federal per diem rates for attendance at meetings. All expenses will be subject to approval of the DFO.
- b. Estimated annual operating costs of the Committee are \$80,000. Federal staff support is estimated to be 0.7 FTE. Advisory Panel Expenses will be covered through the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program.

6 NUMBER AND FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS

- a. The Panel will meet as often as is necessary to complete its business. A majority of the Panel members must be present to constitute an official meeting of the Panel. The Panel shall not hold any meetings except at the call of, or with the advance approval of, the DFO.
- b. Notice of each meeting shall be provided in the Federal Register and in major New Mexico newspapers at least 15 days before each meeting. Panel members will be notified personally of the date, time, and place of each meeting.
- c. All meetings will be open to the public.

7 REPORTS/SUPPORT

- a. The Panel reports to the Regional Forester of the Southwestern Region, USDA Forest Service.
- b. Clerical and other administrative support for the Panel will be provided by the USDA Forest Service.

-END-

Appendix C. Technical Advisory Panel Members

Table 3. 2006-2007 Technical Advisory Panel Members	
Interest	Name, Organization
State land management	Jim Norwick, New Mexico State Land Office
Federal land Management	Dave Borland, USDI Bureau of Land Management
Fed land management	Tammy Randall-Parker, USDA Forest Service
Tribal	Ann Watson, Santo Domingo Tribe
Independent scientist	Robert Berrens, University of New Mexico
Independent scientist	Esteban Muldavin, University of New Mexico
Independent scientist	David Huffman, Northern Arizona University
Conservation	Thomas Jervis, New Mexico Audubon Society
Conservation	Ann Bradley, The Nature Conservancy
Community	Patrick DeIaco, Village of Ruidoso
Community	Candido Archuleta, North Central NM Economic Development Council
Commodity	Matthew Silva, Silva Ranch
Commodity	Brent Racher, Restoration Solutions, LLC.
Designated Federal Official	Walter Dunn, U.S. Forest Service, Southwestern Region (Chairman)

Appendix D: Proposal Review, Common Proposal Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations

Strengths:

- Includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
- Strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
- The proposal includes strong letters of support.
- The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
- Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
- NEPA is complete.
- Proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
- The project includes a good youth component.
- Reduces fire risk in community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
- This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
- The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
- The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
- The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
- The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
- The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
- Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
- The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
- The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
- The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
- This proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
- Has a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
- This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
- Good budget detail and / or work plan.
- The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
- Applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
- Project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
- Includes collaborator interest forms.
- The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
- The project will create new jobs.
- The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.

Weaknesses:

- The project title does not adequately describe what will be accomplished.
- Proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with _____ groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
- Youth component lacks detail.

- Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal.
- Collaborator / contractor letters do not verify match.
- The proposal did not include documentation of consultation with tribes.
- There was no mention of attending the CFRP annual workshop.
- The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided.
- Proposal does not include provisions for preserving old and large trees.
- There is no discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan.
- Proposal does not clearly indicate that the majority of material processed with CFRP purchased equipment will come from public lands.
- To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
- The project will not add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
- Proposal lacks detailed explanation of herbicide application / safety efforts.
- With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.
- Proposal does not state that safety of operators / operations will be assured.
- Proposal lacks a description or estimate of volume of restoration byproducts.
- The treatment and/or utilization plans are vague.
- Monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan.
- The narrative does not effectively support the work plan and budget.
- The proposal lacks detailed budget and work plan.
- Milestones are too general.
- Budget does not appear to adequately support the work plan.
- Budget does not include clear unit costs.
- Supplies are included in the budget line for equipment (or vice versa).
- The budget is unclear on whether the match is non-federal.
- Detailed budget does not follow RFP budget format.
- Distinction between project and previously funded CFRP grants is unclear.
- Panel's prior weaknesses and recommendations not adequately addressed.
- PJ Restoration objectives are not addressed in the proposal
- NEPA is not complete.

Recommendations:

- Proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with _____ groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.
- The proposal would be strengthened by incorporation of a youth component.
- A letter from the Forest that would administer the grant should be included.
- Documentation of letters sent to potentially affected tribes should be included.
- From the beginning of the development of a restoration project, general estimates of volume of byproduct to be generated should be made for the purpose of co-developing the utilization strategy.
- Before grant award more specific milestones need to be identified.
- Purchase of equipment and supplies should occur after NEPA is completed.
- Clarify the match does not include federal funds.
- Verify that there are not direct costs covered in the indirect budget line item.
- We strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised proposal next year with the recommendations and weaknesses addressed

- Proposal should ensure that any surveys either 1) meet US Office of Management and Budget guidelines, or 2) do not use Federal dollars.