

# 2009 MEETING MINUTES

## 2009 Technical Advisory Panel Meeting

### April 27 – May 1, 2009

MCM Elegante Hotel  
2020 Menaul NE  
Albuquerque, NM 87107

## Purpose, Desired Outcomes and Agenda

### Meeting Purpose(s):

- Use a consensus based process to develop recommendations for the Regional Forester regarding which proposals best meet the objectives of the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program (CFRP).
- Use a consensus based process to develop recommendations for the Regional Forester regarding the effect of each proposal on the long-term management.
- Create an environment in which interest groups that have a stake in the management of public forestland in New Mexico can build agreement on how forest restoration should occur on those lands.

### Desired Outcomes:

- A recommendation for the Regional Forester on which project proposals best meet the objectives of the CFRP and should be funded in fiscal year 2009.
- A report on the panel's recommendations regarding the strengths, weaknesses and suggested revisions for each project proposal submitted under the CFRP in 2009.
- Suggestions on how the panel can improve the project evaluation process for their next meeting.
- Suggestions on how to improve the CFRP Request for Proposals for 2010.
- Suggestions on how to improve and expand program outreach activities to prospective grant applicants.

**Time:** April 27- May 1, 2009 beginning at 1 p.m. on Monday, April 27.

**Place:** MCM Elegante Hotel  
2020 Menaul NE  
Albuquerque, NM 87107  
(505) 884-2511

**Chairman and Designated Federal Official:** Walter Dunn

**Facilitator:** Jennifer Pratt Miles

**Meeting Recorders:** Jerry Payne and Alicia San Gil

**Panel Staff:** Alicia San Gil, Carmen Melindez

**Meeting Minutes:** Robert Williams

**Contacts for Further Information:**

Walter Dunn Chairman and Designated Federal Official U.S. Forest Service Southwest Region Cooperative and International Forestry (505) 842-3425 <a href="mailto:wdunn@fs.fed.us">wdunn@fs.fed.us</a>	Alicia San Gil, Contractor U.S. Forest Service Southwest Region Cooperative and International Forestry (505) 842-3289 <a href="mailto:asangil@fs.fed.us">asangil@fs.fed.us</a>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Proposal Review Process

When each individual proposal is being reviewed, the Panel's proposed strengths, weaknesses and recommendations for each proposal will be displayed on a screen in the front of the room.

Approximately 30 minutes has been allocated for the discussion of each project as follows:

Introduction by Panel member assigned to present that project	5 minutes
Discussion of strengths and weaknesses of the proposal	20 minutes
Assign proposal to category (1), (2), (3) or (4)	5 minutes

A category of 1, 2, 3 or 4 will be assigned to each grant proposal to describe how well it addresses each of the evaluation criteria using the following definitions:

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.

The Panel will discuss proposals sequentially by number starting with CFRP 01-09. After discussing the strengths and weaknesses of a proposal, the panel will assign it to category 1, 2, 3 or 4 as defined above.

The panel may recommend partial or complete funding for each individual project. After reviewing all the proposals, the Panel will reexamine specific proposals as necessary in response to issues raised during Public Comment periods. The Panel will then evaluate the number of proposals in category (1) to determine if there is sufficient funding to award grants to all of them.

If the number of proposals in Category 1 exceeds the available funding, or if there is sufficient funding to provide grants to applicants in Category 2, the Panel may use a matrix or some other process to determine which projects to recommend for funding. This process may include additional clarifying criteria to determine which proposals best meet the program objectives. Examples of clarifying criteria used by prior Panels include: 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?; and 5) Would the project add significant capacity for forest restoration?

The panel will seek to use a consensus based decision-making process to develop its recommendations and will submit a list of recommended projects to the Regional Forester that does not exceed the total amount of available funding.

## AGENDA

### Monday, April 27, 2009

<b>When</b>	<b>What</b>	<b>Who</b>
1:00 - 1:15 PM	Welcome and Introductions	Walter Dunn, Chairman
1:15 - 1:30 PM	Meeting Logistics	Facilitator
1:30 - 1:45 PM	Review of Purposes, Desired Outcomes, and Agenda	Facilitator
1:45 - 2:00 PM	What It Means To Be A Federal Advisory Committee	Walter Dunn
2:00 - 2:30 PM	Review/Revise Panel Bylaws	Facilitator & Panel
2:30 - 2:45 PM	Presentation: CFRP Accomplishments	Walter Dunn
2:45 – 3:00 PM	<i>BREAK</i>	
3:00 – 4:00 PM	Discussion: 2009 CFRP TAP Sub-Committee Report	Sub Committee Members
4:00 – 5:00 PM	Review Proposal Evaluation Process	Facilitator & Panel
5:00 – 5:15 PM	Public Comment Period	Members of the Public who submitted written comment
5:15 – 5:30 PM	Review of Day's Work and Agenda for Tuesday, Day Two	Facilitator
5:30 PM	<i>Adjourn</i>	

**Tuesday, April 28**

<b>When</b>	<b>What</b>	<b>Who</b>
8:30 – 8:45 AM	Review Agenda for the Day	Facilitator
8:45 – 10:30 AM	Review proposals: CFRP 01-09, 02-09 and 03-09	All Panel Members
<i>10:30 – 10:45 AM</i>	<i>BREAK</i>	
10:45 – 11:15M	Review proposal: CFRP 04-09	All Panel Members
11:15 - 11:30 AM	Public Comment Period	Members of the Public who submitted written comment
<i>11:30 – 1:00 PM</i>	<i>LUNCH</i>	
1:00 – 3:30 PM	Review proposals: CFRP 05-09, 06-09, 07-09, 08-09, and 09-09.	All Panel Members
<i>3:30 – 3:45 PM</i>	<i>BREAK</i>	
3:45 – 5:45 PM	Review proposals CFRP 10-09, 11-09, and 12-09.	All Panel Members
5:45 – 6:00 PM	Public Comment Period	Members of the Public who submitted written comment
6:00 - 6:30 PM	Review of the Day's work and Agenda for Wednesday, Day 3	Facilitator
<i>6:30 PM</i>	<i>Adjourn</i>	

Purpose, Desired Outcomes and Agenda

**Wednesday, April 29**

<b>When</b>	<b>What</b>	<b>Who</b>
8:30 - 8:45 AM	Review Agenda for the Day	Facilitator
8:45 – 10:45 AM	Review proposals: CFRP 13-09, 14-09, 15-09, and 16-09	All Panel Members
<i>10:45 – 11:00 AM</i>	<i>BREAK</i>	
11:00 – 11:30 AM	Review Proposals: CFRP 17-09	All Panel Members
11:30 – 11:45 AM	Public Comment Period	Members of the Public who submitted written comment
<i>11:45 – 1:15 PM</i>	<i>LUNCH</i>	
1:15 – 3:45 PM	Review proposals: CFRP 18-90, 19-09, 20-09, 21-09, and 22-09.	All Panel Members
<i>3:45 – 4:00 PM</i>	<i>BREAK</i>	
4:00 – 6:00 PM	Review proposals: CFRP 23-09, 24-09, and 25-09.	All Panel Members
6:00 – 6:15 PM	Public Comment Period	Members of the Public who submitted written comment
6:15 - 6:30 PM	Review of the Day's work and Agenda for Thursday, Day 4	Facilitator
<i>6:30 PM</i>	<i>Adjourn</i>	

**Thursday, April 30**

<b>When</b>	<b>What</b>	<b>Who</b>
8:30 - 8:45 AM	Review Agenda for the Day	Facilitator
8:45 – 10:45 AM	Review proposals: CFRP 26-09, 27-09, 28-09, and 29-09.	All Panel Members
10:45 – 11:00 AM	BREAK	
11:00 – 11:30 AM	Review Proposals: CFRP 30-09.	All Panel Members
11:30 – 11:45 AM	Public Comment Period	Members of the Public who submitted written comment
11:45 – 1:15 PM	LUNCH	
1:15 – 3:45 PM	Review Proposals: CFRP 31-09, 32-09, 33-09, 34-09, and 35-09.	All Panel Members
3:45 – 4:00 PM	BREAK	
4:00 – 6:00 PM	Review Proposals: CFRP 36-09, 37-09, 38-09, and 39-09.	All Panel Members
6:00 – 6:15 PM	Public Comment Period	Members of the Public who submitted written comment
6:15 – 6:30 PM	Review of Agenda for Friday, Day 5	Facilitator
6:30 PM	Adjourn	

Purpose, Desired Outcomes and Agenda

**Friday, May 1**

<b>When</b>	<b>What</b>	<b>Who</b>
8:30 - 8:45 AM	Review Agenda for the Day	Facilitator
8:45 – 9:00 AM	Public Comment	
9:00 - 11:00 AM	Review Proposals in categories 1, 2, 3 and 4 for consistency in decision-making, and address public comments Develop list of recommendations within available funding.	Panel Members
11:00 - 11:15 AM	BREAK	
11:15 – 12:00 PM	Review of Proposal Evaluation Process To Identify Areas For Improvement. Review 2009 Request for Proposals to Identify areas for improvement	All Panel Members
12:00 – 12:30 PM	2010 Annual CFRP Workshop	Walter and all Panel Members
12:30 - 12:45 PM	Public Comment Period	Members of the Public who submitted written comment
12:45 - 1:00	Closing Remarks	Walter Dunn, and Panel Members
1:00 PM	Adjourn	

## Proposals Reviewed

Proposal Presentation # 01-09 .....	27
Proposal Presentation # 02-09 .....	31
Proposal Presentation # 03-09 .....	34
Proposal Presentation # 04-09 .....	36
Proposal Presentation # 05-09 .....	39
Proposal Presentation # 06-09 .....	43
Proposal Presentation # 07-09 .....	46
Proposal Presentation # 08-09 .....	48
Proposal Presentation # 09-09 .....	95
Proposal Presentation # 10-09 .....	51
Proposal Presentation # 12-09 .....	53
Proposal Presentation:# 11-09 .....	56
Proposal Presentation # 13-09 .....	58
Proposal Presentation # 14-09 .....	62
Proposal Presentation # 15-09 .....	66
Proposal Presentation # 16-09 .....	68
Proposal Presentation # 17-09 .....	72
Proposal Presentation # 18-09 .....	74
Proposal Presentation # 19-09 .....	76
Proposal Presentation # 20-09 .....	77
Proposal Presentation # 21-09 .....	79
Proposal Presentation # 22-09 .....	82
Proposal Presentation # 23-09 .....	86
Proposal Presentation # 24-09 .....	88
Proposal Presentation # 25-09 .....	90
Proposal Presentation # 26-09 .....	97
Proposal Presentation # 27-09 .....	101
Proposal Presentation # 28-09 .....	105
Proposal Presentation # 29-09 .....	107
Proposal Presentation # 30-09 .....	111
Proposal Presentation # 31-09 .....	108
Proposal Presentation # 32-09 .....	114
Proposal Presentation # 33-09 .....	116
Proposal Presentation # 34-09 .....	118
Proposal Presentation # 35-09 .....	120
Proposal Presentation # 36-09 .....	122
Proposal Presentation # 37-09 .....	125
Proposal Presentation # 38-09 .....	129
Proposal Presentation # 39-09 .....	132

# Minutes

**Monday, April 27, 2009**

**Panel:**

Arturo Archuleta (not present)  
Robert Berrens  
Dave Borland  
Anne Bradley  
Walter Dunn – Chairman  
David Huffman  
Carmen Melendez  
Esteban Muldavin  
Jim Norwick  
Brent Racher  
Tammy Randall-Parker  
Matthew Silva  
Ann Watson

**USFS Staff:**

Carmen Melendez – CFRP Staff  
Jerry Payne – Recorder  
Alicia San Gil – Recorder

**Meridian Institute Staff:**

Jennifer Pratt Miles – Facilitator  
Robert Williams – Meeting Minutes

**Members of the Public in Attendance:**

Jaramillo & Sons Forest Products  
Griegos Logging, LLC.  
Salomon Ramirez, USFS  
Jack Chatfield, CRRRP  
David Warnack, USFS, Gila National Forest  
Sterling Grogan, Biophilia Foundation  
Naomi Engelman, NMFIA

**Meeting Called to Order**

1:10 p.m. Walter Dunn calls the meeting to order

**Welcome and Introductions**

1:10 p.m. Walter Dunn, the Designated Federal Official for the Technical Advisory Panel (Panel), calls the meeting to order, and makes brief opening remarks. Mr. Dunn notes that proposals build on previous year's projects and that the quality of proposals continues to improve. He also notes that the panelists deserve some of the credit for the continuing maturation of the proposals due to their considerable effort and thorough review.

Dunn: Notes the 39 proposal for this year is not the largest number but it is both the tallest stack of paper and the highest quality. He reminds participants to sign in and initiates a round of introductions.

NAME	ORGANIZATION	INTEREST GROUP
Arturo Archuleta	Mexicano Land Education & Conservation Trust	Local Communities
Robert Berrens	University of New Mexico	Independent Scientist
David Borland	USDI, Bureau of Land Management	Federal Agency
Anne Bradley	The Nature Conservancy	Conservation
Walter Dunn	CFRP Program Manager, Cooperative and International Forestry, Southwestern Regional Office, U.S. Forest Service	Chairman and Designated Federal Official
David Huffman	Northern Arizona University	Independent Scientist
Esteban Muldavin	University of New Mexico	Independent Scientist
Jim Norwick	New Mexico State Land Office	State Land Management Agency
Brent Racher	Restoration Solutions	Commodity
Tammy Randall-Parker	US Forest Service	Federal Agency
Matthew Silva	Rancher	Commodity Interests
Ann Watson	Santo Domingo Tribe	Tribal or Pueblo

1:18           Dunn: Describes how the participants have responded well to the constantly morphing and evolving requests of the panel. The sophistication of the set of proposals is astonishing. He remarks how in 2001 he included an invitation for cross-jurisdictional planning wondering what would happen. He has been surprised by the sophistication of the responses. He reminds panelists how the work one of Bob Berrens' graduate students found the probability of funding could decline with an increase in complexity, such as cross-jurisdictional funding, but that complexity was requested. He compliments the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program (CFRP) Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) members for their hard effort reviewing the proposals and preparing. He provides appreciation for the work and notes that evidence of their work is manifested by the recent passage of the Forest Landscape Restoration Act (FLRA) which creates a national version of the New Mexico program.

**Meeting Logistics**

1:22 p.m.       Pratt Miles: Provides an overview of the logistics for the meeting, including time and the facilities.

Jerry Payne: Invites the panel members to his house for dinner and provides a quick overview of some of the logistics.

1:23 p.m.       Panel members Dave Huffman and Brent Racher arrive.

Pratt Miles: Reminds all participants to provide the conflict of interest forms. Walter reminds participants to get the eye of the meeting recorder to make sure the time they leave the room and return is recorded in the minutes.

Conflicts of interest were recorded as follows.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Conflict Of Interest</b>
Arturo Archuleta	Mexicano Land Education & Conservation Trust	01-09, 06-09, 08-09
Robert Berrens	University of New Mexico	None
David Borland	USDI, Bureau of Land Management	25-09
Anne Bradley	The Nature Conservancy	07-09
Walter Dunn	CFRP Program Manager, Cooperative and International Forestry, Southwestern Regional Office, U.S. Forest Service	NA
David Huffman	Northern Arizona University	None
Esteban Muldavin	University of New Mexico	33-09
Jim Norwick	New Mexico State Land Office	None
Brent Racher	Restoration Solutions	03-09, 07-09
Tammy Randall-Parker	U.S. Forest Service	None
Matthew Silva	Rancher	None
Ann Watson	Santo Domingo Tribe	37-09

No questions about logistics.

### **Review of Purposes, Desired Outcomes and Agenda**

- 1:24 p.m. Pratt Miles: reviews the purposes and desired outcomes of the meeting.
- 1:28 p.m. Pratt Miles: Day one is about providing background and clarifying the bylaws. The following three days are focused on the evaluation process. The last day provides an opportunity to review the recommendations, ensure consistency and make suggestions for improving the process in the next year.
- 1:30 p.m. No questions about the agenda or purpose.

### **What It Means to be a Federal Advisory Committee**

- 1:31 p.m. Dunn: Reminds panel members that as participants of the TAP they were a Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) panel and their names and affiliations are public record. One of the CFRP proponents (grant applicant) requested a list of the panel members. Mr. Dunn had to review the FACA for guidance. Since names and affiliations were listed on the website the proponent was advised of that fact and told to direct any questions to Mr. Dunn to be distributed to the FACA panel members. Since the FACA process is an open panel process any document reviewed and discussed by the panel must be available for the public to

photocopy. Personal notes are not public. The meeting notes and the formal agreement captured in the final report are public.

No questions about the public aspects of the FACA.

Dunn: Reminds panelists that appointments are for 2 years so technically this is the last time this group will meet. Panelists are encouraged to reapply but can not serve on the FACA panel for more than six years.

1:34 p.m. Dunn: Reminds panelists the charter is renewed every 2 years. This committee can only be discontinued by an act of Congress, since it was established by an act of Congress, or a lack of funding.

No questions about membership or charter.

### **Review/Revise Panel Bylaws**

1:35 p.m. Pratt Miles: Reviews panel bylaws and requests suggestions for language concerning how the panel will consider new information about proposals surfaced during discussion.

1:38 p.m. Dunn: Reminds panel that this year the staff did a preliminary review of obvious administrative weaknesses but, due to statutory direction, did not exclude any proposals that did not include complete information since this is the role of the panel. It will be the panelists' role to determine if each submitted proposal is eligible for funding or not. Due to this reason is it expected proponents may try to include more information during the panel discussion and clarification on the issue is important.

Panel discussion.

1:55 p.m. Group discusses examples of grant application omission to determine how they will be addressed:

- No budget = a budget submitted after the due date for proposals will not be considered by the Panel because this is a requirement of the RFP
- No letters to tribes = this is a requirement of the RFP, so letters submitted after the due date will not be considered by the Panel
- Mention that NEPA has been completed but no other substantiation = NEPA documentation is required for projects proposing vegetation treatment, so submissions after the due date will not be considered by the Panel
- Corrections to budget = can be considered, depending on the circumstances
- Non-federal match exceeds 20% and proponent wants to submit a correction to make it meet that = correction will be considered if it is a minor administrative issue
- No letter from a project partner substantiating the non-federal match but the partner shows up at the public comment period indicating it was their fault not the fault of the proponent = ?

Racher: Proposals being written are already addressing these omissions and this is part of the process for preparing these projects.

Pratt Miles: Does anyone disagree?

Muldavin: This means we should reject?

Racher: Yes, the ability to put together a proposal is an integral part of putting together a successful project.

Pratt Miles: The following, if submitted during public comment, would not be considered by the Panel in their evaluation: budget, exceeded 10 pages or had not commitment letter. The following could be considered by the Panel if submitted during public comment, correction to overmatch or letters of support.

Dunn: Reminds panel that this is about fairness, fairness to all proponents who put together a complete proposal and fairness to proponents who put together a very good proposal and forgot something insignificant. It is about not making the panel throw the baby out with the bathwater.

2:13 p.m. Bradley: Suggests accepting new language with the possibility of revising it in the future.

2:14 p.m. Panel agrees to accept new information if it is requested in clarification from the proponent by the panel. Unsolicited information will not be considered.

2:15 p.m. Final agreed-upon language for bylaws, 3c) under Open Meetings: "... The panel will not consider new information that was required by the RFP. The panel will consider information provided in response to a request for clarification or if it is a factual correction."

2:16 p.m. No additional changes to meetings or bylaws.

### **Presentation: CFRP Accomplishments**

2:17 p.m. Dunn: Gives presentation that was provided at the CFRP Annual Workshop and requests that panelists think about the question, "Is this really the best way to present the program?" The FRLA is increasing the number of questions being received about the program and therefore increasing the importance of his presentation and message.

Panel discussion.

Panel compliments Mr. Dunn on the presentation and makes minor suggestions including:

- Emphasizing cross-jurisdictional nature of programs
- Importance of Core Ecological Indicators
- Continuing the emphasis on students
- Inclusion of State staff in line officer training
- How work on private land is influencing CFRP projects and visa-versa (crowding in dollars)
- Reporting leveraged dollars
- Look to see if litigation is being reduced so we can substantiate the anecdotal evidence of "being on the same trail together"

3:09 p.m. Pratt Miles: Adjourns the panel to break.

**3:02 – 3:21 BREAK**

## Discussion: 2009 CFRP TAP Sub-Committee Report

- 3:21 p.m. Dunn and Pratt Miles: Review work of the CFRP TAP Sub-Committee that met August 5-6. All panel members have copies of the report. The template for multi-party assessment reporting is highlighted. Previously the assessment did not have a format due to the variability of the different projects. The subcommittee developed a format for multi-party monitoring assessment that includes: location; description of the project and its objectives; description of the collaborative process and the multi-party monitoring process used; description of the monitoring methodology and calculations used for data analysis and interpretation; and description of the project results.
- Forest coordinators are now using this template and an email from Ignacio Peralta (USFS) is displayed demonstrating how the use of a monitoring format is an improvement over the past.
- 3:32 p.m. Pratt Miles: Clarifies there were three major outcomes: the template; a recommended core set of ecological indicator; and a set of projects recommended for long term monitoring.
- 3:33 p.m. Dunn: Addresses the timing of how the recommendations from the sub-committee were included in the program before the full committee had the ability to comment so comments or suggestions were requested. Reminds panel members that Dave Borland and Anne Bradley participated in the sub-committee.
- Muldavin: Did the subcommittee feel there was further business left to tackle?
- Bradley: Addresses the fact that there will be changes on the landscape but it will not be impossible to ensure that the changes were all due to CFRP projects or that wildfire risk was reduced by a specific amount
- Borland: Emphasizes the importance of monitoring disturbance elements currently and reference conditions.
- Muldavin: Are there next steps for the Institute (NMFWRI)?
- Dunn: There is a contract with the Institute for technical assistance to CFRP to develop multi-party monitoring. No other known entity is the keeper of this data across jurisdictions and is an appropriate role for the Institute.
- Muldavin: Is the Institute responsible for the assessment of the 15 year results?
- Dunn: A 15-year report is not part of the mandate, the monitoring is required.
- Muldavin: Looks for more than stand structure and fuels, disturbance, erosion, other things that need to be measured when doing thinnings. Suggests thinking of this as an ongoing tool and activity of the panel, Institute and participants.
- Dunn: This is the reason for a core, minimum set of indicators to begin monitoring that were not overburdening to the participants.
- Muldavin: But this was determined by the Institute. But as independent advisors on the panel how did they influence the discussion.
- Bradley: It was a robust discussion and is ongoing.
- Racher: We need to remember that we have a number of community members that are not highly trained scientists who can take overly sophisticated

measurements. This is about gathering important baseline data and improving that over time.

Muldavin: I am trying to understand how this can be an ongoing process with all three entities.

Dunn: The job of the panel is to evaluate the projects. Because the panel has such expertise it has been employed to comment on issues such as this. At times, as administrator of the project, I have to make a call for purposes of efficiency. I have committed at this point that we have to move this forward and changes create inefficiencies. The idea here is to create this as a base but there is flexibility for doing more and adding more. It is difficult to find a zone of agreement between all entities collecting data and the data collection platforms they are using.

Berrens: Collectively we don't understand the cost of restoration very well. Restoration economics language is being developed. The only way we will begin to understand the cost is if we get a lot of baseline data on how participants are spending the monies. It would be helpful to think through a baseline of monitoring data on how they actually spent the money. It has to be more than the number of acres treated, but a breakout on how it is spent, fuel, T&E, etc. so ecological outcomes can be linked to funds expended.

Dunn: The multi-party assessment report template is one opportunity and there is a lot of flexibility. The other is the development a core of socio-economic indicators moving forward and this could be a start of this.

Randall-Parker: Is there a section that is appropriate for citizen science based indicators or economic indicators but another more technical set of indicators that can be tracked by the Institute?

San Gil: Regarding monitoring of actual expenditures, the grant agreements has the budgets submitted and any modifications more than 10% have to be officially modified.

Racher: Some of the information is proprietary and there would be resistance to show this.

Muldavin: There is a distinction between the long term monitoring project (more rigorous) and additional citizen based monitoring. But there is a need to measure more abiotic landscapes in many ways.

4:00 p.m. Dunn: The Institute is going to be paid to go out and measure the core indicators that were agreed upon.

Borland: All data can all be utilized by a common software program and on a variety of different platforms.

Pratt Miles: Any glaring gaps should be suggested now for inclusion.

4:03 p.m. Dunn: The formal mechanism for that is the next meeting of the sub-committee but that is not for over a year so if there is a different process that someone has in mind it should be suggested. Regarding Bob Berrens' suggestions, pg. 8, #2 was an attempt to include some of this information.

Melendez: We need to do a good job up front of getting this information so we can do a cost analysis so that we do not have to go back to the participants. Under federal financial assistance we should not have to go back. If it is a lump sum contract you cannot really get the details that you want, also you have contingencies.

Dunn: Remember that the requests are not part of the administration of the grant but are part of the multi-party monitoring report.

Melendez: The grantee can provide supporting information.

Bradley: What Bob Berrens is asking for is important, but when you think about these types of grants the majority of people doing the work will have difficulty providing the information and it will take some time to get it. Some of the grantees actually receive lump sum estimates themselves.

Racjer: We have come a long way with the multi-party monitoring since the outset. One of the developing trends is the increasing range of the people applying for these projects and we do not want to make this too difficult or abstract for them.

Boreland: If you look at proposal 23 it was proposed last year and some of the economic costs were included. This brings up the point, what is the range of economic costs beyond cost per acre? It has something to do with the products in addition to the treatments. The Signal Peak report is an example and quite involved. You need this information to determine if the costs are within the range of what is appropriate.

Randall-Parker: Reinforces Brent Racher's identification of the development of a new trend of the blossoming of a new industry, a third party multi-party monitoring industry.

Pratt Miles: Provides summarization: 1) Regarding the ecological indicators, it is possible to look at expanding the set to make it more comprehensive by a) identifying another level of ecological indicators that would be monitored by the Institute but not by grantees and b) panel members were encouraged to send recommendations for additional indicators to Walter for discussion by the sub-committee. Regarding the template, there is flexibility to suggest additional socio-economic indicators. This is not required by the Act but the Walter has heard that it would be useful to measure socio-economic indicators on an ongoing basis.

4:21 p.m. Muldavin: Suggests adding a signature page to the multi-party monitoring and assessment reports, to ensure partners have had an opportunity to review the report and support its conclusions. (Agreed – documented)

San Gil: Emphasizes Carmen Melendez's point to try and require more detailed budgeting information up front.

4:25 p.m. Berrens: Notices there is a payment for environmental services benefit that needs to be evaluated. Is this about developing a business that can be self-sufficient or is this about getting good projects on the ground that have an environmental services benefit?

- 4:28 p.m. Pratt miles: Notes there are 19 CFRP Projects recommended for long term monitoring by the sub-committee (pg.10).  
No comments.

### **Review Proposal Evaluation Process**

- 4:29 p.m. Pratt Miles: Notes an attempt to allot more time for discussion of projects in the agenda. Suggestion of other changes is encouraged.
- 4:30 p.m. Pratt Miles: Provides an overview of the proposal evaluation guidelines and suggests that each panel member presenting the project overview should include a recommendation if the proposal is eligible for funding or not. The guidelines are as follows.

#### **Proposal Review Process**

When each individual proposal is being reviewed, the Panel's proposed strengths, weaknesses and recommendations for each proposal will be displayed on a screen in the front of the room. Approximately 30 minutes has been allocated for the discussion of each project as follows:

Introduction by Panel member assigned to present that project	5 minutes
Discussion of strengths and weaknesses of the proposal	20 minutes
Assign proposal to category (1), (2), (3) or (4)	5 minutes

A category of 1, 2, 3 or 4 will be assigned to each grant proposal to describe how well it addresses each of the evaluation criteria using the following definitions:

- (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.

The Panel will discuss proposals sequentially by number starting with CFRP 01-09. After discussing the strengths and weaknesses of a proposal, the panel will assign it to category 1, 2, 3 or 4 as defined above.

The panel may recommend partial or complete funding for each individual project. After reviewing all the proposals, the Panel will reexamine specific proposals as necessary in response to issues raised during Public Comment periods. The Panel will then evaluate the number of proposals in category (1) to determine if there is sufficient funding to award grants to all of them.

- 4:35 p.m. Pratt Miles: Stresses that with time limitations understood, the committee will take the time necessary to review each of the proposals. Suggests that one process strategy the committee might employ is, since the first proposals take longer to review, if there is a proposal the group feels stuck on it can be set aside returned to later.

Pratt Miles: Also addresses the 2008 request for ideas for how to address impasses. One possibility is creating a 5<sup>th</sup> category, “Does not meet program requirements.” Also encourages the panel to discuss each of the categories in more detail at the outset so there is more clarity.

- 4:42 p.m. Panel discuss, questions and comments.
- 4:42 p.m. Racher: Without a pre-screen we do need a 5<sup>th</sup> category?  
Panel agrees to language: “The project does not meet the eligibility requirements stated in the RFP.”
- 4:45 p.m. Muldavin: Do we need to review projects in this category so they have substantive comments?
- 4:48 p.m. Panel agrees to review projects in category #5.
- 4:54 p.m. Upon further discussion the panel agrees to include #5 within #3 instead with the inclusion of “...but in some other way does not meet the eligibility criteria...”
- 4:55 p.m. Pratt Miles: Asks the committee to discuss the difference between major and minor weaknesses.  
Berrens: Suggests the distinction comes out in the consensus process and has been difficult to describe explicitly on an ongoing basis.  
Pratt Miles: Brings the committee’s attention to the ranking criteria for the purpose of clarification in order to determine if the same criteria should be used.
- 5:01 p.m. Panel agrees to use same process. If there is sufficient funding for all projects in category 1 then they are all funded.
- 5:02 p.m. Muldavin: Expresses concern over the system and wants to take some time to think about a potential alternative.  
Suggestion: All panel members to keep notes on the proposal evaluation matrix during the week and not just on Friday.
- 5:05 p.m. Racher: Reminds the group that the way the committee looks at the criteria can change during the week.  
Pratt Miles: Offers summary, the group will do a consistency review and use the matrix criteria during the first second tier of analysis, after all proposals have been reviewed and assigned a category based on the consensus of the Panel.  
Bradley: Are we going to report out the matrix criteria as we are doing the presentation?  
Dunn: It was requested that the evaluation criteria be added to the evaluation guidelines (included on pg. 2) therefore they should be included on the screen with the strengths and weaknesses.
- 5:10 p.m. Dunn: Clarifies that the sustainability question on the matrix means that when the grant money ends that the project has a strong likelihood of continuation beyond the term of the grant. Therefore the word sustainability may be removed here.  
Bradley: The scale and scope of comparable programs may not make this fair.  
Pratt Miles: Suggests “may not be continuing because it met its objectives” as an alternative.

Randall-Parker: We may find out that these projects may not be sustainable and we added a request for multi-jurisdictional projects.

Berrens: Are there a set of non declining assets?

Racher: Notes the question of sustainability is important. From an industry perspective we are asking if we are funding things that are out there with durable effects on the landscape versus a shot in the pan with benefits for a discrete amount of time and then requiring more funding.

Pratt Miles: Is this about generating benefits that will continue?

5:20 p.m. Berrens: We are making investments in assets that will provide net benefits in an ongoing way.

Agreed upon language: “Will the project generate benefits after the grant period?”

Muldavin: Unclear about the difference between column f (benefits) and column h (capacity).

5:24 p.m. Clarified: benefits can be ecological, economic, social, a piece of machinery, increased knowledge. Discussion continues to address the difference between “benefits” and “capacity” and the difficulty understanding the difference between these.

Clarified: Column h) is “capacity to conduct forest restoration”

5:28 p.m. Berrens: Points out this discussion mirrors the economic debates over sustainability through the literature, and the changes being made make a helpful distinction.

The panel discusses the “quality” of collaboration and agrees they can make the necessary distinctions and left that column the same.

5:33 p.m. Pratt Miles: Suggests strategies for resolving conflicts that arise during the TAP’s evaluation of proposals.

1. Clarity process for making decisions
2. Understanding different points of view around the room
  - a. Evaluation checklist
  - b. Panel overview
  - c. Stating views or issues as clearly and specifically as possible (e.g., giving examples from the proposals such as having 15 letters of support)
3. Understanding reasons for different points of view (e.g., answering the why question)
4. Consider points of others as seriously as one’s own
5. Try to offer a proposal for how to address an issue

5:41 p.m. Dunn: Reminds panelists to use language the proponetns can follow easily and include “the why,” justification and rationale. This is especially important to provide the rationale for unsuccessful applicants.

Randall-Parker: Reminds the panel that sometimes when the weakness does not get discussion that is because every panel member agreed it was a weakness. The weaknesses that get discussed are the ones are more marginal.

5:49 p.m. Panel Clarification: The project presenters should add high points when possible to the overview but the majority will surface through the discussion.

### **Public Comment Period**

5:50 p.m. Pratt Miles: Opens the public comment period. The following two letters are read into the record.

#### **Public Comment #1**

April 27, 2009

Mr. Walter Dunn  
Chairman and Designated Federal Official  
USDA Forest Service Southwest Region  
Cooperative and International Forestry

Dear Mr. Dunn,

I offer this letter to the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program (CFRP) Technical Advisory Panel as it prepares to review 2009 proposals. As you and the panel know, we are the recipients of a 2008 CFRP grant entitled: *Improving New Mexican contractors' in-state competitiveness by reducing administrative barriers*. Two primary programs are being funded under this grant – (1) Administrative Technical Assistance and (2) the Forest Worker Safety Certification (FWSC) training program to reduce workers compensation insurance premiums. This letter is intended to clarify any potential questions that may arise as a result of 2009 grant applicants' inclusion of FWSC funding support in their proposals.

Thanks to funding from CFRP and other sources, NMFIA was able to take over administrative responsibility for the FWSC training program on July 1, 2008. Since that time we have administered seven full certification and five re-certification training courses to approximately 200 forest workers. Current oversight for this program is provided by the FWSC Advisory Group which includes representatives from USDA Forest Service, NM State Forestry, NM Division of Insurance, NM Workers Compensation Administration, Mountain States Insurance Group, New Mexico Mutual, Forest Guild, NMFIA, NM Forest & Watershed Restoration Institute, and industry representatives.

A mutual goal of CFRP, NMFIA, and the Advisory Group is to ensure that the FWSC program is self-sustaining. Toward that end, when NMFIA took over, it was decided to make the program available to forest workers on a cost share basis. At that time, it was determined that a 50/50 split would be appropriate to continue to assist workers with the cost (previously the training had been provided free of charge); but at the same time, get them started on being responsible for their own training costs. Therefore, 2009 CFRP proposals which include funding support for FWSC training are most likely budgeting for their out-of-pocket 50% to certify workers (the other 50% is coming from our CFRP funding). Using cost-share funds, the out-of-pocket, per person, course cost is

\$80 for full certification and \$64 for re-certification. However, for each of the proponents that this was discussed with, it was also made clear that NMFIA CFRP funding started in 2008 and therefore is not in sync with their funding request.

P.O. Box 32191 Santa Fe, NM 87594  
Phone/Fax 505-986-9722  
info@nmfia.net www.nmfia.net

In addition, at the most recent Advisory Group meeting, held on April 20, 2009, it was decided that going forward, NMFIA will continue to subsidize FWSC trainings through Jun 30, 2010 at 50/50 for general forest workers and 25/75 (NMFIA pays 25%) for Youth Conservation Corps (YCC's). The reduction in support for YCC's is because they are specifically designed to have turnover every year; and, as a result, cost share funds are being disproportionately consumed by them. Starting July 1, 2010 the only subsidization that will be provided to forest workers will be 50/50 for re-certification. The intention behind this decision is three fold – to assist the FWSC program in becoming self-sustaining, to have workers/employers take responsibility for the true cost of doing business; and to incentivize workers/employers that remain in the industry and continue their training and professional development. Any impact these decisions may have on NMFIA's CFRP budget will be addressed directly with our CFRP Coordinator via a request for budget modification.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide this information to the CFRP Technical Advisory Panel. If anyone has any concerns or further questions, please let me know. I will be available intermittently in person during this year's review session, and via cell phone when not present in person.

Sincerely,  
Naomi Engelman  
Executive Director

**Public Comment #2 (via email)**

From: [jeanpublic@yahoo.com](mailto:jeanpublic@yahoo.com)  
Date: 3/14/2009

I meet on computer software. High school students meet with other high school students via computer software. Why are forest service personnel unable to do that and save taxpayers the money for their hotel meals and travel vacations? This is nothing but a vacation at taxpayer expense. I think the whole project should be shut down and investigate ways to have these meetings via computer. When will the FS move into the twenty first century? In another hundred years? It is time to do that right now. The taxpayers are sick of providing vacations on their backs.

Jean Public  
15 Elm Street  
Florham Park, NJ 07932

**Review of Day's Work and Agenda for Tuesday, Day Two**

5:55 p.m. Pratt Miles: Reviews agenda for day two and adjourns panel.

5:57 p.m. **Panel adjourns for the day.**

**Tuesday, April 28, 2007**

**Panel:**

Arturo Archuleta  
Robert Berrens  
Dave Borland  
Anne Bradley  
Walter Dunn – Chairman  
David Huffman  
Carmen Melendez  
Esteban Muldavin  
Jim Norwick  
Brent Racher  
Tammy Randall-Parker  
Matthew Silva  
Ann Watson

**USFS Staff:**

Carmen Melendez – CFRP  
Jerry Payne – CFRP  
Alicia San Gil – CFRP

**Meridian Institute Staff:**

Jennifer Pratt Miles – Facilitator  
Robert Williams – Meeting Minutes

**Members of the Public in Attendance:**

Rudy J. Jaramillo, Jaramillo & Sons Forest Products  
Daniel Antonio Herrera, Manzano Land Grant  
Michael Rivera, PSA  
Dierdre Tarr, Claunch-Pinto SWCD  
Orlando Lopez, Monzano Land Forest  
Ignacio Peralta, USFS, Carson National Forest  
Jack Chatfield, CRRRP  
David Warnack, USFS, Gila National Forests  
Danny KuyKendall, KuyKendall & Sons  
Molly Jaramillo, Jaramillo & Sons Forest Products  
Eytan Krasilovsky  
G. Matthew Allea  
Naomi Engelman, NMFIA  
Juan Sanchez, Chilili Land Grant  
Rachael Wood, Forestry Consultant  
Mariana Padilla, Parametrix  
Connie Zipperer, USFS, Lincoln National Forest  
Reuben Montes, USFS, Santa Fe National Forest

8:38 a.m. Jennifer Pratt Miles convenes the Panel, reviews the agenda, and asks members of the public to sign in. Panel members and members of the public introduce themselves.

Jennifer Pratt Miles and the Panel review the ranking categories that Panelists use to review proposals.

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**.

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**.

The proposal is a good fit to the purposes and the objectives of the Act, but the proposal does not meet eligibility criteria or **weaknesses identified in the work plan, budget, and/or monitoring plan must be addressed before the project can be recommended for funding**.

The proposal does not clearly address the objectives of the Act and/or successful implementation is doubtful.

8:41 a.m. Pratt Miles: Reviews the process used to review the proposals. Each proposal is introduced by a Panel Member. The Panel decides by consensus, and ultimately all Panel members agree to support the proposals that are recommended for funding. Pratt Miles asks Panel members to be specific regarding proposal strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations in addition to using the boilerplate language. This will enable CFRP staff to provide relevant information if an applicant has questions about the evaluation and/or how to improve their proposal.

On Friday, after reviewing all the proposals, the Panel will reexamine specific proposals as necessary in response to issues raised during Public Comment periods. The Panel will then evaluate the number of proposals in category (1) to determine if there is sufficient funding to award grants to all of them.

If the number of proposals in Category 1 exceeds the available funding, or if there is sufficient funding to provide grants to applicants in Category 2, the Panel will use a matrix to determine which projects to recommend for funding. The matrix will include additional clarifying criteria to determine which proposals best meet the program objectives. Examples of clarifying matrix criteria used by prior Panels includes: 1) Is the project part of a longer term 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?; and 5) Would the project add significant capacity for forest restoration.

8:47 a.m. No questions about the process

8:47 a.m. Pratt Miles reviews changes for this year. The staff will not complete a pre-screening determination of eligibility but will identify administrative weaknesses. The panel will accept new information or clarification that is requested by the panel and can address factual errors brought to the attention of the panel.

Dunn: Provides an example, such as the technicalities of a legal match. Dunn also indicates that the coordinator can make clarifications through the chairman who will then enter it the clarifications into the record for panel clarification

Pratt Miles: Clarifies that anything required in the RFP that was not submitted in the proposal will not be considered by the panel in their deliberations.

Minutes, Tuesday, April 28, 2009

- Racher: Asks for new agreed-upon matrix language to be posted for review.
- 8:54 a.m. Pratt Miles: Displays new matrix language for this year.
- 8:54 a.m. No further questions asked.
- 8:54 a.m. Pratt Miles: Requests overview of proposal #01-09 from Jim Norwick.
- 8:54 a.m. Arturo Archuleta **recuses** himself for the deliberation
- 8:54 a.m. Jim Norwick provides overview and summary of proposal #01-09.



- 9:17 a.m.       Dunn: Weaknesses #13, #15, #18 are what this proposal is attempting to do and can create a precedent for other land grants to do through NEPA. Doing NEPA on non-federal lands is a very new thing. The ability to have a clearly defined process on non-USFS land is a strength. For that reason weakness #13 is suggested for removal.
- Regarding weaknesses #15 and #18, if you look at the socio-economic monitoring plan this is a planning grant, this is what they are trying to do, therefore it cannot be a weakness. Partners should be added, however.
- Norwick: Did not see anything regarding who will collect the data and a responsible party should be identified.
- Dunn: That is a specific weakness that should be included in #15 and #18.
- Norwick: The proposal lacks a statement of how the proponent will collaborate with industry and markets. Was not looking for specific basal area removed, etc.
- Pratt Miles: Suggests panel members provide specific language to replace the boilerplate language.
- 9:26 a.m.       Racher: Suggests adding weakness #12 with the following language. “To understand the proposals effectiveness more language is needed on the site specific existing conditions.” But the project is proposing to collect some of this information and since this is a multi-jurisdictional project space was limited for them to expand on this weakness, making it a minor weakness. Also notes weakness #21 referencing the budget. There are some very large lump sums without cost per acre or cost per unit or well defined breakdown.
- Dunn: Notes that as we are calibrating our process, in a number of the proposals the unit is one contract due to contracting mechanism.
- 9:32 a.m.       Racher: Under the detailed staff , the other staff is not well defined. That staff and their friends make up all the match for this. Other staff and personnel/friends is not well defined and makes up 100% of the proposal’s match. This budget exceeds the one year total and does not have a breakout of a year one and a year two. This is a detail for weakness #27. Also suggests adding a strength, the fact that this does has a detailed monitoring plan and how will it will be measured (#21).
- 9:35 a.m.       Dunn: Notes weakness number #3 and #4 should not be included because this is a planning process and part of the objective of the grant itself.
- Randall-Parker: Disagrees because they were able to come up with a monitoring plan, therefore they could better identify some products that would come off the project. For strength #4, the proposal should include some description of anticipated byproducts.
- Pratt Miles: Notes this is potential new boilerplate language for considered usage in the future.
- Watson: This is not new to anybody what this is all about. If it is a planning document they should have some idea of what they are going to do.
- Dunn: Requests clarification from Ian Fox.

Fox: The match is the staff of another group (Mexicano Land Education and Trust Conservancy/Parametrix) and the budget narrative includes their names and their clarifications. This is in response to weakness #21. Item A talks about total hours broken down by hour as personnel for the project. This responds to the "other staff" listing in the program.

Norwick: That clarification addresses the "other staff" issue.

9:42 a.m. Dunn: Requests Ian Fox to address socio-economic monitoring plan, weakness #6.

Fox: Regarding weakness #6, this is just the template that is suggested and they are looking to demonstrate what they will collect and as they move forward they will assign the responsible parties. The work plan on pg. 7 also includes the duties.

Barrens: Remarks that pg. 8 notes that information will be collected during the planning page without clarification of who will address it.

Dunn: Notes the weakness should then say, it is not clear in the monitoring plan template (pg. 9) who will collect the monitoring data.

Muldavin: Notes the proposal is complex because it is multi-jurisdictional and has two spatially disconnected locations. It is not clear if there will be one report or two reports. This relates to the one-two year project discussion. Asks as if there should be two reports.

Racher: Yes, it indicates there will be two NEPA projects.

9:49 a.m. Dunn: Suggests adding a recommendation clarifying that two separate NEPA documents will be produced.

Muldavin: Questions why this would not be 2 separate CFRP projects. Understands clarification that multi-jurisdictional and landscape scale this is multi-jurisdictional and they can be two different things.

Melendez: Is the NEPA done on the USFS land or is that a USFS contribution?

Fox: The proposal will address all lands simultaneously with the land grant as the lead, but the project will have to be approved by the USFS.

9:54 a.m. Berrens: Regarding the unit cost of the NEPA, it was difficult to understand that cultural and biological resources are included. Is that the case, with the Environmental Assessment?

9:57 a.m. Racher: Notes that pg. 6, second paragraph directly addresses the question.

Pratt Miles: Requests language for weakness #3.

Dunn: Proposes modifying strength #1, the proposal will be an innovative approach to developing a precedent for cross-jurisdictional restoration treatments on land grant and forest service ownership.

Bradley: For a planning document weakness #3 is a high bar. It is reasonable to request some basic information but because this is in a riparian area and fire treatment. She therefore requests moving #3 but retaining weakness #4.

10:01 a.m. Silva: Recommends moving it because there is no current strong, identified market right now so it would be difficult to identify.

Panel agrees to remove weakness #3.

Dunn: Reminds the panel it is not the number of weakness but the ease with which they can be addressed.

Payne and Bradley: Reinforces that the number of budget related weaknesses are relatively minor and while irritating, can be addressed. For this reason a recommendation of 1 is suggested.

Randall-Parker: Originally had this as a #3 because the grant did not flow. Due to discussion it has moved to a #2, but cannot see a #1.

Dunn: We have worked hard to get these land grant proposals and we want to lay this track to attract more of these and the more we get the better they will be and the setting of the precedent is important.

Watson: It does set an important precedent but could be better written and planned.

Berrens: Requests a little more discussion. Their budget is not broken out by year, so it is asked how the panel is reading the specific language when a specific budget is not included (i.e. the yearly breakdown) it will not be considered for funding. Are we moving forward with some grey areas?

The group agrees this is a grey area.

Bradley: Suggests that since the 424 was correct and many details were included the project should be considered for funding, but considered as a #2.

Pratt Miles: Clarifies that if a proposal includes a 424 and does not have a specific detailed budget the group will consider it for funding.

San Gil: Notes the staff would determine that this follows the format.

Racher: The example given in the appendices exceeds the one-year allowable amount for a CFRP grant.

10:17 a.m. Pratt Miles: The funding issue will be considered in another discussion. The group agrees to a recommendation of #2.

10:19 a.m. Pratt Miles reviews the agenda and group process.

Racher: Asks how the panel should address the matrix criteria determination question.

The group agrees to make individual notations on the matrix following each discussion to better inform the Friday consistency review

**10:23 – 10:37 BREAK**

10:23 a.m. Atruro Archuleta **returns**

10:37 a.m. Pratt Miles: Calls the panel back to order and asks Dave Borland to provide an overview of proposal #02-09.

**Proposal Presentation #02-09**

**Proposal #** 02-09                      Canadian river Soil and Water Conservation District  
**Proposal Presenter:**                      Dave Borland

<b>Strengths</b>	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 21, 22, 29 Many new treatment methods will be taught. Students will be involved
<b>Weaknesses</b>	1, 3, 4, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, 28 One map is a good general map but the other is not clear. They do not have an estimate of volume of removal. The page numbers have changed and are confusing. Did not collaborate with bird interests. The units in the budget are not clear. Note administrative weaknesses
<b>Recommendations</b>	Eligible for funding 3
<b>Ranking Category</b>	2

- 10:55 a.m.        Norwick: Is consultation with Tribes included?  
                          Racher: References Appendix K, and mentions it is in the EIS.  
                          Melendez: Questions recipient of the contract going to a group or NRCS, and who is responsible for administering.  
                          Dunn: Asks Ian Fox for clarification.  
                          Fox: It is addressed under pg. 4, Section F of the budget who is the private contractor doing the work. It is addressed through non-federal match.
- 11:04 a.m.        Berrens: What is the reason for the difference in cost in the third year?
- 11:09 a.m.        Racher: The prior weaknesses were not addressed because of substantial changes to the project (i.e., the collaboration changed the approach). This goes to the quality of the collaboration. For example, there is a letter from the Wilderness Alliance as a supporter who was a past intervener. Recommend removing weakness #29 and the addition of a strength related to collaboration.  
                          Dunn: The narrative does not clearly explain that this is a new rather than revised proposal.  
                          Watson: If this is a revision it should be similar not a whole new project.
- 11:14 a.m.        Archuleta: Notes this was submitted as a new document but then was determined as a revision. Clarification on the process was requested.  
                          Dunn: The Chairman and the Forest Coordinators make the determinations after all proposals are received.
- 11:15 a.m.        Pratt Miles: Since it was submitted as new should it be considered as new?

- Muldavin: Once the USFS stamps it as revised or new that is the determination that should be used.
- Pratt Miles: It is captured both as a strength and weakness.
- Bradley: given where this project is located there is no need for identified coordination with NMFIA, NMFWRI and NM State forestry and CWPP.
- 11:21 a.m. Borland: These were included because it is unclear if there is a fire protection plan for the region and there should be coordination with the entities responsible for creation of this plan. These should be included as recommendations rather than weaknesses.
- Berrens: There is no letter from some of the partners (commitment) which should be included. The language should be, "There is no letter from the NMSU Range Improvement Task Force addressing the monitoring component."
- Muldavin: Is this covered by the NM Department of Agriculture?
- 11:25 a.m. Berrens: Indicates there is no letter from the task force indicating that they will conduct the monitoring as the proposal states.
- Dunn: This is a minor weakness because this partner is going to provide the plant material
- Muldavin: On the task force issue, there was no discussion of grazing and it was to happen on the grasslands. Following clarification that it was not included from grazing, the point was determined mute.
- Huffman: Recommends that if there is an area that is not going to be treated that it be utilized as a control. He also clarifies that he is not recommending leaving an area untreated just as a control, but if the area is not being treated it will not be a control.
- Racher: Are we now asking for participants to establish controls?
- 11:32 a.m. Huffman: A control with a pre and post treatment is quite helpful.
- Dunn: It is good to include as a recommendation.
- 11:33 a.m. Racher: Proposes strengths #3, #4, #10, #11, #12, #13, #16, and #22. Regarding #3 and #4, the strong letters of support address the reaching across the table. This is a good example of collaboration after NEPA (NW Wilderness Alliance, and Wild Turkey Federation). Regarding #10, in the proposal they address the risk of high intensity of wildfire (through the appendices).
- 11:38 a.m. Bradley: How is #12 a strength?
- 11:38 a.m. Racher: These programs across the state have lost their funding because they were not reaching across the table and joint problem solving. Maintaining that capacity is important. This will maintain the Canadian River Riparian Restoration Project and the industries associated with that.
- 11:44 a.m. Dunn: Suggests the following recommendation, the proposal would be strengthened by including partners concerned with non-game bird species.
- Bradley: Concurr.

- 11:46 a.m. Panel discusses the treatment and control language and determines it was ambiguous.  
Dunn: Requests clarification from Ian Fox on the bird issue.  
Fox: Annually the Wilderness Alliance does week-long bird surveys.
- 11:48 a.m. The panel agrees to remove the non-game bird and avian related recommendations as covered by this survey process.  
Pratt Miles: Asks if the proposal includes the Core Ecological Indicators.  
Muldavin: Notes the strength is that the monitoring goes beyond.  
Group agrees to add the following boilerplate weakness language: "The proposal does not include (monitoring of) the core CFRP ecological indicators." The group also includes the following boilerplate language, "The proposal monitoring goes beyond the core CFRP ecological indicators."
- 11:53 a.m. Huffman: Questions why all proposals need to include the Core Ecological Indicators which are basically about fire, but not all projects are about fire. An alternative strength could be included in the future. This is a candidate for Friday discussion with the Institute.  
Borland: Proposes a ranking #3  
Racher: Notes the importance of collaboration in ways that we have not seen and for this reason this one should be between a #1 and a #2. If some more of the recommendation details were included this could be a #1.  
Bradley: This is part of a bigger more ambitious project, but there were a number of components that needed to be more clear, so it would not be possible to support #1, recommends a #2.  
Berrens: Due to the strong collaboration component this should be considered a #2.  
Pratt Miles: Confirms that the panel recommends a #2.

### **Public Comment Period**

11:59 a.m. Jennifer Pratt Miles notes there was no written comment submitted.

### **12:01 – 12:13 BREAK**

- 12:13 p.m. Pratt Miles calls the panel to order, reminds panel members to note matrix considerations for proposal #02-09 and asks Tammy Randall-Parker to review proposal #03-09.
- 12:13 p.m. Brent Racher **recuses** himself.
- 12:14 p.m. Randall-Parker begins proposal presentation.

**Proposal Presentation #03-09**

**Proposal #** 03-09                      Forest Guild Bluewater II  
**Proposal Presenter:**                      Tammy Randall-Parker

<b>Strengths</b>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 , 24, 26, 28, 29 Large scale. Continuing of working relationship with the Wood Industry Network (WIN). Good use of biomass and utilization. Good collaboration.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	1 The youth component lacks detail. Approximate volume biomass was vague (though it was a big component of their monitoring).
<b>Recommendations</b>	Eligible for funding. 1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

- 12:25 p.m.        Dunn: Suggests adding the following strength, the log of communication is an effective means of describing consultation with tribes.
- 12:26 p.m.        Barrens: Notes a strength, the proposed project attempts to develop a GIS based system that links restoration treatments with restoration costs.
- 12:27 p.m.        Bradley: Adds the following strength, the proposal increases capacity of Ramah Navajo Chapter Forestry program, a previous CFRP recipient.
- 12:27 p.m.        Silva, notes a strong letter of support from the District Ranger.
- 12:28 p.m.        Watson: Suggests removing weakness #17.  
  
Huffman: Suggests a strength, the project includes an adaptive approach to restoration an annual evaluation of monitoring data which is used to collaboratively refine prescriptions.  
  
Melendez: Makes recommendation for showing justification of rates for the coordinator including fringe benefits.
- 12:33 p.m.        Dunn: Requests clarification from Fox.
- 12:33p.m.        Fox: Executive summary, paragraph 1 states how much will be removed from the project area based on cruises done in similar stands.  
  
Group discusses the desire to identify markets and the difficulty in describing markets.
- 12:40 p.m.        Randall-Parker: suggests the following recommendation, the proposal would be improved by providing the potential for markets, firewood, pellets, wood chips, etc.  
  
Pratt Miles: Requests a proposed ranking.
- 12:41 p.m.        Randall-Parker: Gives a recommendation of #1.

- 12:41 p.m. Pratt Miles: Confirms the group recommendation of #1.
- 12:41 p.m. Brent Racher **returns**
- 12:41 p.m. Pratt Miles adjourns panel for lunch.
- 12:41 – 2:01 LUNCH**
- 2:01 p.m. Pratt Miles calls the panel to order and asks Ann Watson to provide an overview for proposal #04-09.

**Proposal Presentation #04-09**

**Proposal #** 04-09

Increased Forest Restoration and Utilization in the Cibola

**Proposal Presenter:**

Ann Watson

<b>Strengths</b>	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 28, 29 Strong letters of support and a NEPA ready proposal. Addresses all areas of the proposal (except one: replanting) and they seem well positioned for success.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	7, 8, 12, 19, 23 The maps were not clear and there was no budget for attending the Annual Workshop. The workplan only goes through 2010 which does not match the budget. There is not letter to the Tribes.
<b>Recommendations</b>	Eligible for funding. 1-2
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

- 2:11 p.m. Silva: Notes the administrative weaknesses in lines 19, 20 and 21 but is not sure of the importance of the issue. Notes the District Ranger notes consideration for this proposal where the previous one indicates serious consideration.
- 2:12 p.m. Jim Norwick enters the room.
- Fox: This is semantic issue and there is strong support and there is no difference in priority between this and the previous proposal.
- Dunn: Notes that the USFS has specifically been requested to move away from making rank determinations.
- 2:15 p.m. Rancher: Wants to add strength #19 because supply to pellet manufacturing is included.
- 2:16 p.m. Huffman: Adds strength #31 that the project is utilizing an adaptive monitoring approach.
- 2:17 p.m. Randall-Parker: Adds strength #14 because fire threat reduction is a big component and is tied to the Bluewater Watershed EIS and the mechanical treatments are intended to set ups up for using fire on the landscape.
- 2:18 p.m. Watson: Adds that the development of a wood utilization feasibility study to assess the cost of treatment across the landscape is a strength. Additionally, the development of merchantability criteria for biomass products to better determine sales, service and stewardship contract costs is another strength.
- 2:20 p.m. Racher: Notes that the budget includes a significant amount of detail laid out in a useful and accessible manner. This does not include back end costs, but does include it on the front end, and therefore recommends the addition of #23 in terms of good budget detail (not workplan).

- 2:21 p.m. Muldavin: Suggests two weaknesses. The first is #19 because the first two treatment areas are already below the targets identified on the monitoring plan. The group is specifying lowering the stems per acre. There is a mis-match. He also suggests adding weakness #12 because more information is needed to understand why low density stands are being treated.
- 2:25 p.m. Borland: Asks for clarification on pg. 6.
- Fox: It was Biological Assessment that they were searching for and not all the silvicultural information was carried forward so these stands are actually more dense than they appear. Not all size classes got typed into the proposal.
- Bradley: Asks clarification regarding the map.
- Fox: This is because it was from an inaccurate attribute table.
- Muldavin: Weakness #12 still stands.
- 2:28 p.m. Silva: Notes that on the budget information it appears the equipment costs may be over \$5,000 because of depreciation and questions if this is acceptable. The detailed budget says nothing above \$5,000 but it is under
- Dunn: Asks for clarification.
- Proponent: The final equipment cost would include miscellaneous small items. The \$205,000 is all operating costs since no machinery would be purchased.
- 2:31 p.m. Dunn: Since direction is not clear it should not be made a weakness. A recommendation could be that operating costs on equipment line 424 section b should be moved to other (h).
- 2:32 p.m. Melendez: In some places instead of units it has dollar costs. Recommends correcting the budget to show actual units and move personnel equipment costs to some place other than inclusion in equipment. Administrative benefits should be moved to fringe benefits and training should be clarified in terms of number, people, and how it is related to the project.
- Proponent: The dollar cost should be included as hours instead of dollars.
- 2:38 p.m. Payne: Reviewing weakness #12, questions **if** low density stands are being treated not **why**.
- Muldavin: Wants to know why.
- Huffman: Notes that on pg. 6 they are interested in reducing fire on savannah lands but on pg. 9 the existing conditions are ponderosa and PJ. This savannah type is very different from forest and the switching terminology creates confusion.
- Borland: Recommends creating separate tables for the monitoring plan table on pg. 9 by forest type, one of PJ and one for ponderosa with the same information for each.
- Muldavin: Recommends adding treatments and habitat types/vegetation types.
- Borland: Recommends replacing forest type with vegetation type.
- 2:45 p.m. Payne: Requests clarification.

- Proponent: In our effort to collaborate with the Tribe they are interested in PJ and so that is why this is included. The confusion between stems per acre and basal area is a mistake. The property selected was selected by the silviculturalist.
- 2:50 p.m. Bradley: These projects get more synergy as they involve more but the purpose is not just for a check-off but substantive involvement. Given the purpose of the monitoring collaboration the Cottonwood Gulch group does not meet the need but should not be considered a weakness.
- 2:52 p.m. Watson is caught between a 1 and 2 for a recommendation category but gives it a 2 because of the confusion in the budget and the group discussion.
- Borland: Notes this is part of a larger restoration project and in order for it to be ongoing and this project needs to be a catalyst to help make it happen and would therefore recommend a #1, in addition to adding to strength #16.
- 2:54 p.m. Bradley: Proposes modifying the strength #16 to include the project is part of a landscape level comprehensive forest restoration effort.
- 2:56 p.m. Berrens: Adds, that it significantly generates industry capacity. The issue with this is the large scale which is important and recommends a #1.
- 2:57 p.m. Pratt Miles: Confirms that everyone can support a recommendation of #1.
- 2:58 p.m. Pratt Miles: Asks Bob Berrens to provide the overview of proposal #05-09.

**Proposal Presentation #05-09**

**Proposal # 05-09**                      Bosque Community Planting Using Small Diameter Woody Biomass at the Pueblo of Santa Ana  
**Proposal Presenter:**                Bob Berrens

<b>Strengths</b>	3, 7, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 29 Includes an experimental design component. Uses invasive plant species slash piles and chip them into mulch and use to increase probability of survival of native species plantings.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 26, 32, 34 No letter from UNM or the high school. Did not identify collaboration with Bosque Environmental Monitoring Program. The BIA letter does not explicitly support the dollar match. The BIA letter states NEPA is the responsibility of the Agency vs. the Pueblo's fire management plan.
<b>Recommendations</b>	Meets eligibility requirements. 1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

- 3:11 p.m.            Dunn: Notes there is a NEPA decision so the administrative weakness should be removed.
- 3:13 p.m.            Randall-Parker: Adds to weakness #2, there does not appear to be strong collaboration and there was no letter from the administering forests and few other groups.
- 3:16 p.m.            Racher: Requests clarification from scientists on panels regarding mushrooms from Oregon and is wondering if there is a new species being introduced into the ecosystem.  
  
                           San Gil: Notes the proponent is reaching out to other Tribes which is an important tribal collaboration component.  
  
                           Muldavin: Notes the species is not identified and the risk is unknown. He requests clarification.  
  
                           Proponent: Clarifies that they are native oyster mushrooms that were important for historic and cultural reasons and they are not able to be purchased in New Mexico.
- 3:20 p.m.            Racher: Regarding the budget weakness, on the cost we are paying for mileage per vehicle and gas costs so this appears to be double counting. Does the legal opinion for the BIA legal match contract also include the BOR 638?  
  
                           Proponent: Itin the law that the BIA and BOR 638 funds are both legal for this usage.
- 3: 24 p.m.            Berrens: The unclear budget issues are still unclear (due to the mulch) but are minor weaknesses.

- 3:24 p.m. Racher: Recommends adding #16 as a weakness.
- 3:25 p.m. Muldavin: Revisits the monitoring component and notes the strength is that the monitoring is beyond what the Core Ecological Indicators reply (#30) for part of the plan but it does not include all 5 of the core indicators because some do not apply in this situation.
- 3:28 p.m. Huffman: Notes that on pg. 32 that there is hazardous fuel monitoring but that it is done through another grant. Notes that it is not really a hazardous fuel reduction and since that is not the primary purpose here
- Pratt Miles: Notes that Strength #30 required all 5 indicators and going beyond, therefore strength #30 should not be included.
- Huffman: Suggests adding a strength that the monitoring plan includes additional detail
- Dunn: Notes there is nothing requiring a letter from the administering forest so that should be removed. Also notes that projects requiring vegetative treatments must include the five core ecological indicators.
- Muldavin: Notes all five cannot be measured in this case.
- Racher: Notes that over time they can be measured and we are talking about a 15 year monitoring program so they should be included.
- Pratt Miles: Indicates this is a good conversation for Friday about the inclusion of all five indicators (where in the proposal and if they are relevant). Recommends language that was included regarding the monitoring.
- 3:37 p.m. Dunn confirms there is no weakness regarding the lack of a letter from the administering forest.
- 3:41 p.m. Melendez: Notes this is one of the best budget justifications
- Berrens: Asks clarification from the proponent if the CFRP funds will be done by fuels reduction.
- Proponent: The fuels reduction will be done under BIA funds as part of the match not under CFRP funds. BIA is not comfortable disclosing the entire project but not so the amount that is discoverable is included.
- Dunn: Given the authority of 638 the funds become the property of the Tribe and they can use them as they wish.
- Berrens: Is not disputing the use of the funds, just the clarity of the letter.
- Dunn: But the law indicates that they become the property of the Tribes.
- Berrens: Indicates willingness to drop #33 as a weakness.
- Group discusses the complexity of the indirect cost component.
- 3:48 p.m. Berrens: Indicates the cost is correct and gives a recommendation of a #1 because of the experimental design, but the BEMP, UNM, and High School collaboration letter missing is a problem.
- Muldavin: It should be a #1 because of its experimental design and the lack of collaboration letter is likely not a big deal because the collaboration will likely exist.

- 3:52 p.m. Randall-Parker: There was a lot of confusion on this grant and the length of time it took to discuss and the content of the discussion means that it should be a #2.
- Dunn: Sometimes the length of discussion is about the panel clarifying new information or innovations, and the panel should remember that moving forward in discussion.
- 3:55 p.m. Bradley: Notes that the panel did not ding the project for lack of sustenance or a significant problem since much of the discussion was the panel's own learning. What is the substantive problem with the proposal?
- The group discusses the weaknesses identified and recognizes that many of the issues were minor and did not discover sufficient weaknesses to mark it down from a #1 to a #2.
- 3:59 p.m. Dunn: Notes he has visited the projects frequently and they are high performers on their grants to the extent that there are few other examples and do a lot of hosting and have been a model CFRP performer.
- 4:00 p.m. Watson: This is an innovative idea and the proponents are solid performers.
- 4:01 p.m. Racher: The mulch match issue is substantive.
- 4:02 p.m. Dunn and Berrens: This proponent can show significant non-federal match therefore this is not a significant issue.
- 4:04 p.m. Randall-Parker: Requests to hear from other panel members.
- 4:04 p.m. Huffman: Believes a restoration economy can be based on what is being proposed and this project is innovative and much needed and therefore recommends a #1.
- 4:06 p.m. Pratt Miles: Asks if this project is an "excellent fit" for CFRP due to the innovative aspects.
- 4:07 p.m. Berrens: Wants to give it a #1 because of the experimental design
- 4:08 p.m. Norwick: There is too much complexity that creates confusion but has a question if it is a good fit for the act.
- 4:08 p.m. Dunn: One third of restoration projects funded since the start of CFRP are bosque restoration projects to help restore watershed projects. This is a watershed restoration project and therefore fits with the act.
- 4:10 p.m. Archuleta: This is one of the projects that you have to step back and take a look at as part of a larger project. One of the limitations of CFRP is the funding amount, but in the context of the project put together with the other related projects this is very relevant.
- 4:11 p.m. Silva: I am not familiar with this country and will defer to others on this project.
- 4:11 p.m. Borland: I would like to say this is a research project we are funding. It does not have appropriate NEPA, it does not address the safety of the workers and should be a #2.
- 4:12 p.m. Muldavin: Monitoring in an experimental design is a strong design and not just a research project because it is applied to what they want to do on the ground in Santa Ana in a large way. It has an experimental design so they can understand if their treatments are successful.

- 4:13 p.m. Dunn: Refers back to aspects of the Act and demonstrates the relevant aspects, such as removal of non-native species; it develops and demonstrating how this clearly addresses CFRP goals.
- 4:16 p.m. Archuleta: I do not see this as not having sufficient NEPA.
- 4:16 p.m. Borland: The NEPA identified is a programmatic fire plan which is not sufficient.
- 4:17 p.m. Dunn: This is not a determination for this panel, this is an administrative decision of the land manager. With reference to weakness #34, the USFS adopts the decision of another federal land management agency in a letter to the file.
- 4:19 p.m. Pratt Miles: Confirms this is an excellent match. Asks if there are significant weaknesses that would make this not support a #1.
- 4:20 p.m. Dunn: Due to the ambiguity recommendation (#12) and weakness #34 should be removed.
- 4:20 p.m. Randall-Parker: I would like to make sure this proposal is within the Act because it sets a precedent. When saying there are many watershed proposals and removal of tamarisk to remove that fire danger.
- 4:21 p.m. Dunn: This project qualifies by the first qualification element of the Act.
- 4:21 p.m. Randall-Parker: If I wanted to explore native seed, that could be funded?
- 4:22 p.m. Dunn: Yes, that has already been funded.
- 4:22 p.m. Pratt Miles: Suggest referring to pg. 2-3 for the importance.
- 4:23 p.m. Bradley: This is a project that relies on larger level activities that is reduced to make it fit the CFRP requirements and that is the reason for a lot of the confusion. Due to its innovation and needed treatment it is still a #1.
- 4:23 p.m. Pratt Miles: Confirms the group recommendation of #1 with the addition of a recommendation for the incorporation of a work plan for worker safety in the proposal.
- 4:23 – 4:40 BREAK**
- 4:40 p.m. Pratt Miles calls the panel to order and address the agenda issue questioning how many proposals the group can get through. The group agrees to try to get through proposal #10-09 and #12-09 if possible by 7:30 p.m.
- 4:44 p.m. Pratt Miles asks Esteban Muldavin to provide an overview of proposal #06-09.
- 4:44 p.m. Arturo Archuleta **recuses** himself.

**Proposal Presentation #06-09**

**Proposal #** 06-09

Ojo Peak Post-Wildfire Remediation and Monitoring Project

**Proposal Presenter:**

Esteban Muldavin

<b>Strengths</b>	2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 28, 29, 30 Includes a socio-economic monitoring component.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	4, 20, 24 No letter of support from the Four Corners Institute plus NMFIA, La Merced, Crane Collaboration, Los Lunas. (all primary partners). Narrative indicates match not captured in the letter from CPSWCD. (Off by \$10,000 in the non-federal match.)
<b>Recommendations</b>	2
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

- 4:56 p.m. Racher: Regarding #5, I believe we indicated that the proponent does not have to indicate the match in their letter therefore recommend removing weakness#5.
- 4:47 p.m. Melendez: Regarding the budget justification and the 424, it should show combined Federal and non-federal, in Section B column 1 and Section E
- 4:58 p.m. Racher: In the proposal and the budget it is not clear who is hiring the workers listed as personnel, therefore recommends that the workplan and budget justification clarify that the proponent will hire the contractors. Also indicates adding strength #28 because this is part of restoration to fire resilience.
- 5:01 p.m. Dunn: Regarding weakness #24, it appears the unit costs are clearly described.  
Muldavin: That was specifically tied to the SWCA covering the monitoring and that was not broken out.  
Dunn: Can we say the monitoring costs for SWCA are not clearly broken down (i.e., 1 unit = 13,500)? I also do not really remember seeing this in previous budgets that were submitted but we are starting to see this more now, the fact that sub-contractors often give lump sum bids as cost per acre.
- 5:04 p.m. Watson: Confirms this is the case. Estimates often come as just cost per acre.  
Payne: If we have a monitoring plan and we have a contractor that is doing the work we have an idea of what if going to be done.  
Melendez: For a consultant you have to have details, for a contract you can have a lump sum bid.  
Berrens: I would like to keep weakness #24 because it does not include unit costs. The non-federal match is off by \$10,000 and it less than 20%. This is a significant issue that should be listed under weaknesses.

- Borland: The plant materials and training costs are not broken out and should be included as a minor weakness under \$24.
- 5:10 p.m. Dunn: If you reference Appendix E in the RFP, they are providing appropriate justification for monitoring costs for SWCA.
- Melendez: But in the budget justification it is not there; so it should be moved back to weakness.
- Dunn: But their budget looks just like the budget in the RFP Appendix E. We cannot require them to do something different than what is in the RFP. (To be further discussed on Friday.)
- 5:17 Muldavin: There are two partner 3's in the budget (Zeedack and NMFIA/ECRM) and the second is not in the budget justification.
- Racher: We have a limited number of conservation groups in the state and all cannot engage in all projects. We should remove this weakness
- 5:20 p.m. Bradley: TNC was involved in the prior project and the NEPA which is why we provided support, but we cannot remain actively engaged in the project. We will not benefit but we are supportive.
- Muldavin: TNC was satisfied with the NEPA process.
- Bradley: Yes.
- Racher: Can I have a clarification regarding the 20% match issue?
- Proponent: We had far more than 20% but in our haste but to get it down to 20% we deleted 3 lines that we did not intend to delete.
- 5:24 p.m. Muldavin: I do consider this an innovative project, given the 20% is not a weakness the only issue would be the letters, but since all of them were involved in the process before I would recommend a #1.
- Randall-Parker: What is innovative?
- 5:25 p.m. Muldavin: Materials used on site for erosion control and testing with good monitoring. The other part is that the youth will be involved in planting seeds they collected and will be monitoring, so it is an integrated restoration project within a hydrologically well-structured project.
- Norwick: I had almost the identical strengths and weaknesses and ranked it a #1.
- Racher: This is a carry-on from the innovation from the previous year so I would make it a #1.
- 5:26 p.m. Huffman: Post wildfire areas are a big piece of the picture so I would make it a #1. I would recommend: "consider" increasing more plots because they have an n=3 and with a t-test they need to double the sample size because n=3 is the minimum number you can see to have any statistical significance.
- 5:29 p.m. Pratt Miles: Reminds the panel that it needs to fit a need and be an excellent match and only have minor weaknesses.
- 5:30 p.m. Bradley: This proposal meets those criteria and the criteria that are in our matrix.
- 5:31 p.m. Pratt Miles: Confirms the group agrees the recommendation was a #1 and asks Dave Huffman to provide an overview of proposal #06-10.

- 5:31 p.m. Arturo Archuleta **returns**.
- 5:30 p.m. Ann Bradley and Brent Racher **recuse** themselves.

**Proposal Presentation #07-09**

**Proposal # 07-07**                      Red Canyon Forest Restoration Project  
**Proposal Presenter:**                Dave Huffman

<b>Strengths</b>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 18, 19, 21, 24, 28, 29 Large list of collaborators. There is training in monitoring included.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	12 Would like to see more details about the prescription, though it will be developed collaboratively.
<b>Recommendations</b>	1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

5:39 p.m.            Dunn: Requests more specificity on weakness #1.

Huffman: That should **not** be included as a weakness.

Berrens: The taxpayers get a lot for their money because it comes in at about \$100-138/acre and get 300 acres of treatment and 500 acres of treatment. Adds the strength that the project offers a lot of value for the money (NEPA costs).

Huffman: The proposal includes the Core Ecological Indicators and includes the sampling design which is not always included, and this data will be comparable with USFS protocol.

Archuleta: This project starts to help develop consistent socio-economic monitoring protocols used by other projects.

Randall-Parker: The letters of support were strong and had the potential to create new jobs (strength #29).

Dunn: Regarding weakness #12, is more information needed about the specific treatments?

Huffman: Yes, but they are being developed collaboratively so it is hard to make this question. Asks a clarifying question, what part in the decision memo is addressed in the proposal.

Fox: The ponderosa pine type under the Thunderbird assessment, in the decision memo and EA, gave a range of 30-70 basal area and we are going to apply Goshawk guidelines but since there is confusion about these guidelines we are going to work with the community to better meet their needs.

Huffman: It is still vague and should be considered a minor weakness.

Borland: Will the USFS be available to help with this.

Fox: Yes, it is specified.

Randall-Parker: There is a new Masters thesis available from NAU regarding the application of the Goshawk guidelines written by Matt Tuten, it should be recommended to refer to that work.

- 5:53 p.m. Huffman: Recommends a #1 but would like more discussion on the effort match.
- 5:53 p.m. The group spends time looking through the letters to verify if there is match available.
- 5:57 p.m. Dunn: Requests clarification of the match.  
Fox: There are plenty of Water Board funds available.  
Dunn: Since the match comes from the applicant then it is an easy thing to address.
- 6:00 p.m. Pratt Miles: Confirms the panel recommendation is a #1.
- 6:01p.m. Pratt Miles adjourns the panel to a short break.
- 6:10 p.m. Pratt Miles requests that Jim Norwick provide an overview of proposal #08-09.
- 6:10 p.m. Brent Racher **returns**.
- 6:10 p.m. Anne Bradley **returns**.
- 6:10 p.m. Arturo Archuleta **recuses** himself.

**Proposal Presentation #08-09**

**Proposal # 08-09** Merced del Pueblo de Chilili Wildfire Fuels Reduction  
 Collaborative Forest Restoration Project  
**Proposal Presenter:** Jim Norwick

<b>Strengths</b>	Presentation: 1, 6, 9, 10, 12, ,13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 23, 24, 27, 29
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Presentation: 1, 3 4, 5, 8, 10, 12, 15,18, 19, 21, 22, 26, 30, 31
<b>Recommendations</b>	2-3
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

- 6:19 p.m. Dunn: Requests an update on the NEPA.  
 Fox: All NEPA is complete and all documentation and SHIPO consultation is complete and in the room.  
 Panel: Deletes weakness #31.
- 6:20 p.m. Dunn: Proposes deleting weakness #3 due to information on pg. 4 paragraph 4.  
 Panel: Deletes weakness #3.
- 6:23 p.m. Dunn: Proposes deleting weakness #30 due to the first paragraph of the executive summary since it is a ponderosa pine treatment.  
 Panel: Deletes weakness #30.
- 6:25 p.m. Racher: Suggests deleting weakness #5 and #26 because the proponent is providing the equipment.
- 6:26 p.m. Payne: If equipment is purchased in advance then it is not eligible.
- 6:27 p.m. Norwick: The proposal indicates the equipment “will” be purchased.  
 Panel deletes weakness #5 and #26
- 6:27 p.m. Dunn: Recommends removing weakness #13 due to the information in the last paragraph of the narrative.  
 Panel: Deletes weakness #13.  
 Berrens: Suggests adding a recommendation that the final budget break out the fiscal and administrative component in the socio-economic monitoring plan.
- 6:30 p.m. Racher: Suggests removing weakness #21. Wants to add strength #26 because there is work happening on different lands but we are seeing significant cross-jurisdictional collaboration.  
 Dunn: Suggests adding, to strength #26, the project includes innovative tribal land grant cross-jurisdictional activities.  
 Watson: The project includes training therefore suggests removing weakness #16.

- 6:33 p.m. Panel: Removes weakness #16.  
Norwick: Suggests removing weakness #5 and #15 because it is covered on pg. 5.  
Panel: Removes weakness #5 and 15.  
Bradley: The work plan is straight forward.  
Silva: The proposal does not indicate to which sawmill the material will go.  
Dunn: recommends removing weakness #1 because of the letter from The Wilderness Guardians.
- 6:35 p.m. Panel: Removes #1.
- 6:36 p.m. Dunn: Which partners do not include letters (weakness #4)?
- 6:38 p.m. Randall-Parker: The proposal does include potential products and potential values for material to be removed (strength).
- 6:39 p.m. Panel: Removes weakness #4.  
Huffman: Suggests removing weakness #10 because it is discussed on pg. 5. Also wants to add strength #11 because of the restoration of clumpy structure.  
Dunn: Recommends removing weakness #18 because of the material on pg. 5, paragraph 2 and 3.
- 6:41p.m. Norwick: Recommends retaining #18 because a saw mill is not specified.  
Proponent: The mill will be the community mill.  
Norwick: But the proposal indicates that some of the material will be sold, of the 10-15” material and the local and regional lumber producers are not identified as sales targets.  
Dunn: Regarding weakness #8, the map appears clear. Can someone indicate why it is unclear?  
Norwick: Are they treating the entire area?  
Fox: The treatment is the whole area.  
Norwick: But what about the firebreak and the clumping aspects.  
Fox: The break is the entire boarder.  
Norwick: It would be nice to have this information included in the proposal but it is ok to remove as a weakness.  
Panel: Removes weakness #8.
- 6:48 p.m. Racher: Proposes removing weakness #19 because it includes the Core Ecological Indicators plan.  
Panel: Removes #19  
Norwick: Recommends a #2. Notes that Tom indicates that success of this project should obviate the need for future CFRP projects and if it is the case then it is a very strong proposal.
- 6:51 p.m. Racher: Is between a 1 and 2 because of the lack of the detailed budget.

Berrens: I liked the project overall but had trouble with the lack of detailed budget as well and was between a 1 and 2.

Borland: I think it is a strong proposal because of the collaboration and the only weakness is due to the lack of detailed budget. The recommendation is for a #1 due to a lack of substantive weaknesses.

6:53 p.m. Bradley: I ended up with a #1 on this, but what did we do with the last project that had a 15 month budget (proposal #01-09). Did we move them to a #2 because of this?

Panel: No, there were several other reasons.

Bradley: I would need to understand whether that would move it down to a #2; but they planned for fire treatments after thinning which is a strength.

Pratt Miles: Confirms the panel recommendation of a #1.

**6:55 p.m. Public Comment Period**

Pratt Miles notes there is no written public comment submitted to USFS staff and reminds the public to hand written comment to staff to be read into the record.

6:58 p.m. Arturo Archuleta **returns**.

6:59 p.m. Pratt Miles confirms proposal #09-09 will be considered on Thursday morning and proposal #11-09 will be reviewed on Wednesday morning.

6:59 p.m. Pratt Miles requests Dave Borland provide a summary of project #10-09.

**Proposal Presentation #10-09**

**Proposal # 10-09** El Rito Forest Health Restoration Project  
**Proposal Presenter:** Dave Borland

<b>Strengths</b>	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29
<b>Weaknesses</b>	10, 12 Would like to see stand exam data since they are talking of thinking from below up to a 12" diameter cap.
<b>Recommendations</b>	1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

7:11 p.m. Muldavin: The proposal indicates this is a moderate departure and if they are removing things up to 12" that should be sufficient to reduce the risk of crown fire. Recommends removing the diameter cap weakness.

(Discussion leads to clarification of the weakness as a recommendation).

Silva: Notes the language between proposal #10-09 and #12-09 is identical.

Bradley: Suggests adding the strength that the fuels reduction is occurring in a municipal watershed, and a recommendation that the applicant get support from specialty products because we do not know to which mill the project will be going and request clarification

Proponent: The material needs to be processed within the unit so either mill is eligible.

Bradley: With this clarification confirms deletion of the previous recommendation.

7:14 p.m. Dunn: Suggest removing weakness #9 due to the information at the bottom of pg. 1.

7:15 p.m. Racher: Notes that under the budget the contractor costs should be moved to personnel or other (recommendation). Under fringe benefits there is 30% of personnel costs which is consumed by workers compensation.

Proponent: The 30% is workers comp, but the other FICAs come out of the chainsaw operators.

Racher: Therefore not a recommendation or weakness.

Randall-Parker: Does not believe #14 should be a strength because there is a community concern about the use of prescribed fire.

7:19 p.m. Racher: Notes the District Ranger's letter notes it is viable so it remains a strength.

Minutes, Tuesday, April 28, 2009

Borland: Recommends #1 due to lack of substantive weaknesses.

7:20 p.m. Pratt Miles confirms a panel recommendation of #1

7:21 p.m. Pratt Miles asks Matthew Silva to review proposal #12-09.

**Proposal Presentation #12-09**

**Proposal # 12-09**                      Quality Environment and Economic Sustainability Project  
**Proposal Presenter:**                Matthew Silva

<b>Strengths</b>	Presentation: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24 Many support letters and strong collaboration.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Presentation: 9
<b>Recommendations</b>	1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

7:25 p.m.            Dunn: Add the strength #28, that it implements a CWPP.

7:26 p.m.            Racher: Looking at pg. 5, paragraph 3, proposes adding strength #15 and removing strength #9. Suggests adding strength #5 that Wild Earth Guardians letter commits to between 2,000 and 4,000 but the project uses the whole match of \$4,000 which creates a non-federal match problem, but that is not a major issue. Also on weakness #23, the budget does not indicate feller-buncher operators in cost, only chainsaw operators and laborers.

Proponent: On pg. 6 the proper clarification is made.

Racher: Supports removing weakness #23.

Silva: Suggests a recommendation of #1

7:30 p.m.            Pratt Miles confirms group recommendation of #1

**Review of Day’s Work and Agenda for Wednesday, Day Three**

Pratt Miles thanks the panel for its diligent work and reviews the agenda for day three.

**7:31 p.m.            Panel adjourns for the day.**

## **Wednesday, April 29, 2007**

### **Panel:**

Arturo Archuleta  
Robert Berrens  
Dave Borland  
Anne Bradley  
Walter Dunn – Chairman  
David Huffman  
Carmen Melendez  
Esteban Muldavin  
Jim Norwick  
Brent Racher  
Tammy Randall-Parker  
Matthew Silva (part of the day)  
Ann Watson

### **USFS Staff:**

Carmen Melendez – CFRP  
Jerry Payne – CFRP  
Alicia San Gil – CFRP

### **Meridian Institute Staff:**

Jennifer Pratt Miles – Facilitator  
Robert Williams – Meeting Minutes

### **Members of the Public in Attendance:**

Gordon West, Gila WoodNet  
Dennis Tryillo, Southwest Wood Products and Thinning  
John Usseny, Northern New Mexico College  
Russ Word, USFS, Gila National Forest  
Gabriel Partido, USFS, Gila National Forest  
Suellen Strale, Chimayo Youth Conservation Corps Inc.  
Luis Tairon  
Mike Bradshaw, Cedar Valley Field Services  
Danny Kuy Kendall, Kuy Kendall & Sons  
Christy Van Buren, Picoris Pueblo  
David Warnack, USFS, Gila National Forest  
Patrick Griego, Griego Logging LLC.  
Rachael Mondragon, Urban Interface Solutions  
Luther Martinez, Picoris Pueblo  
Gilbert Vigil, Amigos Del Bosque  
Suda Ford, Taos Pines Ranch POA  
Sarah Scott, BLM, Farmington Field Office  
Jeff Tatoya, BLM Farmington Field Office

8:34 a.m. Jennifer Pratt Miles convenes the Panel, reviews the agenda, progress from the previous day, the order of the proposals (11-09 first and 09-09 on Thursday) and

asks members of the public to sign in. Panel members and members of the public introduce themselves.

- 8:37 a.m. All present introduce themselves. (Note: Matthew Silva is not present)
- 8:41 a.m. Jennifer Pratt Miles and the Panel then discuss the review process the Panelists use to review proposals.
- 8:46 a.m. Pratt Miles asks Arturo Archuleta to provide the overview of proposal #11-09.

**Proposal Presentation: #11-09**

**Proposal # 11-09** Forest Thinning for Fire Prevention and Education of Youth in Questa

**Proposal Presenter:** Arturo Archuleta

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 3, 6, 8, 10, 11, 18, 19, 21, 23 Final: 3, 6, 8, 10, 11, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 28 Strong letters of support. Includes a youth component. Has an approach that was utilized successfully through CFRP in the past. Has a monitoring plan and good budget detail.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 5, 9, 29 Final: 2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 12, 13, 18, 19, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30 As a revision this proposal did not have a section that addressed weaknesses for next year.
<b>Recommendations</b>	Eligible for funding. 3
<b>Ranking Category</b>	3

8:52 a.m. Dunn: Does not see any collaboration with conservation entities (weakness #2) or a discussion of ecological role of fire (weakness #10) and it does not appear to add significant capacity (weakness #13).

8:52 a.m. Racher: Suggests adding strengths #17 and #28. Suggests adding weaknesses #3, not sufficient detail about youth, #4 no letters from support from all partners, and #12. Regarding #18, on pg. 5 there is a lot of science about why the treatments are being implemented, but not about forest restoration or what will be done on the ground in this proposal. Also, weakness #24, the budget is lacking information on the educational component. Weakness #25, budget costs for personnel should be in contractual or travel. Also adds weakness #27.

8:58 a.m. Watson: Does not notice any socio-economic information (weakness #19).

8:59 a.m. Dunn: Offers a point of clarification from RFP, pg. 6 paragraph 2 requiring summarization of how they addressed the panel’s comments from the previous year.

9:00 a.m. Archuleta: Notes that for consistency this should be considered like the other resubmittal that was marked new.

9:01 a.m. Dunn: Asks for clarification.

9:01 a.m. Peralta: This was a resubmittal.

The group discusses the question of consistency regarding the eligibility requirements. With the Canadian River proposal it was thought it was new and the new Forest Coordinator was not aware of the previous submittal and it was

considered new. (Consider discussing the issue of new vs. resubmittal on Friday.) There are two categories for revisions: 1) the proponents go in a completely different direction vs. 2) when it is a revision. When it is the latter the language in the RFP applies, therefore each application needs to be addressed differently. The panel also can discuss how to address the possibility of proponents from adding everything as a new proposal.

- 9:07 a.m. Archuleta: What about previous panelists that did not have the adequate match?
- 9:08 a.m. Dunn: It is a questions of the ease of the fix.
- 9:10 a.m. Archuleta: Do we continue to review if it is eligible or not?  
Panel: Yes, we continue discussion
- 9:11 a.m. Racher, retracts weakness #4 but adds weakness that the equipment cost associated with the match is excessive, specifically the rate of the chipper. Also adds the following recommendations:  
#1 (instead of the weakness)  
#11  
The proposal should address prior weaknesses and recommendations
- 9:15 a.m. Melendez: Adds recommendations.  
424 Section A column B  
What is the educational component at \$159 per hour as it does not seem reasonable  
Some of the personnel should be listed as contract  
Did not include fringe benefits – they should be broken out
- 9:17 a.m. Archuleta: It looks like the majority of the strengths and weaknesses they had last year were similar and have not been addressed.  
Berrens: The contract amount of \$1,600 per acre seems high absent additional detail.  
Randall-Parker: This only estimates 150-200 cords per acre coming off, which is less than others.  
Archuleta: Recommends category #3.
- 9:21 a.m. Panel confirms category #3.
- 9:21 a.m. Pratt Miles asks Racher to provide an overview of proposal #13-09.

**Proposal Presentation #13-09**

**Proposal #** 13-09

Navajo Dam Hazardous Fuel Reduction and Restoration

**Proposal Presenter:**

Brent Racher

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28 Final: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29 The proposal seeks to exceed the basic requirements for monitoring (i.e., bird surveys). The detailed monitoring plan is excellent use of data analysis.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 16, 25 Final: 25 The safety of operators and operations it is not ensured the chainsaw operators ensured (NMFIA worker safety training).
<b>Recommendations</b>	1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	2

- 9:26 a.m. Racher: Asks clarification if the proponent is listed as contractor.  
Perelta: Correct, listed as contractor.  
Huffman: Does not see socio-economic monitoring (weakness #19).
- 9:28 a.m. Randall-Parker: Questions the fire related strengths (weakness #13).  
Borland: A lot of the fire effort is directed in this area due to Saltcedar and Russian olive.  
Dunn: Removal of non-natives can return historic fire returns.  
Pratt Miles: Notes fire return interval through removal of non-natives for Friday consistency review.  
Randall-Parker: Suggests adding strength #29 because the project will add new jobs.  
Muldavain: Wants to encourage (recommendation) the proponents to work with the BOR in their final design phase to further enhance de-channelization of the river and natural watering to reconnect to the floodplain.
- 9:35 a.m. Bradley: Notes a weakness of just a letter to the Navajo but not the other tribes.  
Proponent: Clarifies that the letter was a sample and all affected tribes received letters.  
Bradley: Withdraws weakness.  
Dunn: Notes the letter from Cedar Valley includes safety training information and the exterminating includes safety training information, so recommends removing weakness #16.

Racher: Does not concur, the safety is associated with herbicide application not chainsaw operation etc.

Dunn: The Cedar Valley letter addresses that.

Racher: Comfortable removing weakness #16.

9:39 a.m. Borland: Suggests adding a recommendation that the proponents work within NMFIA.

Archuleta: Asks if it is included in the RFP for worker safety training to be clearly detailed in the proposal. (Discuss for Friday because this is just included in the boilerplate language. Could be a weakness but not a substantial weakness.)

Racher: Recommends a #1

Huffman: Suggests a recommendation of a #2 due to a lack of socio-economic monitoring plan and suggests adding that as a recommendation.

Watson: Notes they talk about management but not long term monitoring.

9:42 a.m. Melendez: The 424 is incomplete. On Section A, Column B no fringe benefits are shown. The non-federal match is less than 20%. Travel needs a better description of the breakdown. Meetings are included at \$35/hour, for what?

Huffman: They note they talk about current conditions but do not complete socio-economic monitoring of future conditions which are one of the objectives of the proposal.

9:49 a.m. Racher: Requests clarification of the match.

Proponent: This was a calculation error. There is plenty of match, there was plenty of funds from the State (e.g., \$170,000 annually) for Russian olive and Saltcedar in San Juan County. The match will be available to Cedar Valley Services. We also have Youth Corps match which is only included for one year.

Archuleta: Is the contract established?

Proponent: Yes.

Berrens: The socio-economic discussion was very strong. It is difficult that it is not included in the monitoring.

Archuleta: Recommends a full 20% non-federal match must be assured prior to award.

Watson: This missing match component is more substantial.

Norwick: I only see them about \$10,000 short and it was confirmed the match was there, and the economic issues are not a major weakness.

Berrens: What sways me regarding the socio-economic aspect was the letter from the BLM officer. This is truly cross-jurisdictional and a vehicle for the state to work with multiple federal agencies.

Borland; Suggests recommendation, to increase the economic stability of the proposal to reach out to the fishing guides and outfitters in the San Juan region for the match and to increase the outreach for the project.

- 10:00 a.m. Muldavin: How would we look at a project that was an ecological project that did not include the core ecological indicators? It is reasonable to expect a strong socio-economic monitoring plan due to the focus of the project.
- Berrens: That is a compelling argument so for fairness I will switch to a recommendation of a #2.
- Racher: I see this as one of the stronger proposals and it does not have some of the weaknesses of the other projects.
- Archuleta: I think that the CFRP focus has been more on ecological and not socio-economic, but that component is very important and it is important.
- 10:04 a.m. Racher: They are only lacking a description of the desired future socio-economic future conditions.
- Dunn: References the RFP requiring that information.
- 10:06 a.m. Muldavin: These monitoring plan requirements are more of a broad hand waving.
- Pratt Miles: Reminds the panel that the more the tools and criteria are set aside the harder time the panel will have with the reconciliation.
- 10:10 a.m. Bradley: Also split between the #1 and #2 and sees that “must” does apply to the need for the socio-economic monitoring plan and given that language is now at a #2.
- Berrens: I like this one a lot, but due to the need for the socio-economic monitoring plan I see this project as a #2.
- 10:13 a.m. Racher: Looks at the way we have looked at projects such as this in the past and this socio-economic monitoring has always been difficult to include and we have treated other projects in the past more leniently. Requests clarification from proponent.
- Proponent: The exclusion of the monitoring plan was an oversight on his part but there is a lot of work going on in the area and work with New Mexico State university and done by Dr. Ashcroft that they will coordinate with.
- 10:17a.m. Racher: Due to the fact that the requirements are more broad hand waving and there is a strong collaborative nature to the project I think this is a strong project.
- Huffman: I think you can develop a strong multi-jurisdictional project that has strong socio-economic monitoring. If there is language that says “proponents must develop a strong socio-economic plan before the award can be funded” that would be sufficient.
- Berrens: I see both points and sit on the fence
- Borland: The San Juan Institute of Cultural Resources is doing the monitoring and maybe we can strengthen that in the recommendation. Due to the strength of the proposal I do see this project as a #1.
- 10:23 a.m. Bradley: Depending on the substantive nature of the weakness, add Dave Huffman’s recommended language and categorize as a #1.
- Norwick: I am satisfied and could see it as a #1.

Pratt Miles: Tests a recommendation of #1 with the recommendation Huffman provided.

Panel discusses if this is a “substantive weakness” that would make it a #2 and the process fact that if the award is funded the proponent will sit down with the Forest Coordinator to address all issues, so all recommendations are always a must.

Pratt Miles: Confirms a recommendation of a #2.

Racher: Hears concerns from others so respects those views despite a strong project.

10:32 Pratt Miles adjourns the group for a break.

**10:32 – 10:50 BREAK**

10:50 Pratt miles reconvenes the group and asks Jim Norwick to provide a quick overview of project #14-09.



comparisons to other proposals that do not do this are not valid. Wants to add the strength, the expenditures of these public dollars build and expand on to private efforts in the community which are well documented.

11:06 a.m. Dunn: I want to add to this that Matthew Silva would likely strongly support this, as he is not here, and CFRP has not done as much as they could along these lines.

11:08 a.m. Archuleta requests clarification on labor cost

Proponent: It will be hand crews and decking and does not include equipment.

11:09 a.m. Dunn: Wants to add the strength that project dollars from sales from merchantable materials will be used to fund additional treatments.

Borland: Requests clarification on the number of stems per acre but does not have a desired future condition and do not see how that can mitigate the first risk. Asks why more cannot be done.

Proponent: We get this amount from the silviculturalist. Due to equipment costs and the CFRP expenditure cap we do as much as we could on a year to year basis.

Borland: Do you think you will reach the target area with the 12" dbh cap.

Proponent: This is the recommendation of the silviculturalist and it is part of the NEPA documentation.

11:13 a.m. Melendez: Notes the following.

The 424a is incorrect, particularly Section B

Budget narratives do not show sufficient justification to show reasonableness and allowability (e.g., education of students \$40/hour)

11:15 a.m. Pratt Miles: Asks if this lack of documentation is due to the expenditure cap.

11:17 a.m. Racher: Expresses concern about the lack of insurance and work of safety.

The panel discusses the budget detail.

Archuleta: Suggests adding a recommendation about detailing the fringe benefits to address Racher's point about safety.

11:22 a.m. Dunn: It causes problems when you have a strength (#23) and recommendations that are counter.

Group discusses the budget issues.

11:27 a.m. Racher: Asks clarification for how the infrastructure capacity will lead to further treatments.

Proponent: For Urban Interface Solutions, treating this type of land and other projects as well is what we do. We are looking at the first 100 acres of 500 that have been approved for treatment.

11:29 a.m. Randall-Parker: I am concerned about the efficacy of the treatment to reduce wildfire risk.

11:30 a.m. Racher: There is a lot of monitoring involved that can provide substantive justification for changing the NEPA if necessary.

- Archuleta: It is not fair to make a recommendation for a proponent to work to change NEPA when it was a USFS determination.
- 11:32 a.m. Huffman: This addresses a fundamental question. There is more detail than in most other proposals. It would be nice to have a diameter distribution to understand. The crown-bulk density is low with lots of stems per acre so lots of the trees are low. They have up to 1000 stems/acre. It doesn't quite get there and it would be nice to know more.
- 11:34 a.m. Archuleta: There is a strength in the monitoring plan with a pro-active approach.  
Dunn: Requests clarification from the proponent.  
Proponent: The NEPA was done under an FRHA and is the result of what everyone in the community wants to see and there is hardly anything under 12 dbh and it is my understanding that the forest silviculturalist believes this will be effective. Also the monitoring plans moving forward will address this.
- 11:37 a.m. Bradley: This is the accepted NEPA, this is the analysis that was done. We need to move forward and if we do not it is out of our jurisdiction to worry about the cap. We also still have this weakness about the cost. My recommendation is to remove the cost as excessive.
- 11:38 a.m. Berrens: Suggests strength, the project builds on Firewise designation from the community.  
Borland: Notes supporting information in the proposal and with the Forest Restoration Institute being involved they do a good job of monitoring.  
Bradley: Regarding the cost, we have funded many projects to provide equipment capacity for future treatments so I saw this as a capacity building project.  
Norwick: The State costs to do this treatment in this ecotype were at this rate.  
Randall-Parker: Withdraws recommendation.
- 11:43 a.m. Racher: Suggests making weakness #11 a recommendation to ensure that the proposal should clearly indicate the majority of material purchased will be used to for treatments on public land. Also, suggests adding strength #12 to add capacity. Suggests, proponents should demonstrate stronger collaboration with environmental groups (e.g., Carson Forest Watch letter).
- 11:46 a.m. Dunn: Suggests, there is a letter of support from a conservation organization (Carson Forest Watch) but it is not clear their issues are addressed.  
Racher: Because some of this material is to be burned, strength #14 should be added.  
Huffman: Disagrees with adding the strength because the community does not want fire and they have some education to do. Suggests not adding strength #14 but concurs to include it with the modification of "aims."
- 11:50 a.m. Norwick: Does the FONZI help with the migratory birds act issue and the Carson Forest Watch letter?  
Panel: Maybe in the eyes of the USFS but not the specific group.  
Norwick: Given the collaboration and the addressing of prior issues recommends a #1.

11:51 a.m. Pratt Miles: Confirms the panel recommendation of #1.

## Public Comment

### Public Comment #3

11:53 a.m. Eytan Krasilowski, a participant involved in the development of the Core Ecological Indicators Project, read the following statement into the record.

4/29/09

To: CFRP TAP

The core ecological indicators, developed by the CFRP monitoring team in 2008, were originally intended for CFRP projects that are thinning trees. These indicators were thought to be the minimum suite of data that grantees thinning trees would have to collect.

The monitoring handbooks and guides offer additional indicators that would be suitable for non-thinning treatments on the land such as: plant species compensation, birds, butterflies, etc.

Sincerely

Eytan Krasilowski

11:55 a.m. Pratt Miles adjourns the group for lunch

**11:55 – 1:23 LUNCH**

1:23 p.m. Pratt Miles reconvenes the panel, reviews the agenda, and reminds participants about the sign-in and public comment protocols, then asks Dave Borland to provide an overview of project #15-09.

**Proposal Presentation #15-09**

**Proposal # 15-09** Restoration of the Picuris Pueblo Traditional Grassland for Sustainability of the Bison Program and Cultural Preservation of the Community.

**Proposal Presenter:** Dave Borland

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 3, 5, 8, 12, 17, 18, 19 Final: 3, 5, 8, 12, 17, 18, 19 Grazing partnership with the Wind River Ranch Foundation
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 8, 9, 10, 12, 17, 19 Final: 8, 9, 10, 12, 17, 19 No provisions to treat elms.
<b>Recommendations</b>	Question about eligibility due to grassland focus 4
<b>Ranking Category</b>	4

- 1:27 p.m. Borland: Asks if restoring a native grassland meets the requirements of the CFRP, especially considering the lack of evidence that it was a native grassland.
- 1:28 p.m. Watson: There are some trees that are going to be removed but it appears focused on a grassland but it does not appear to fit the CFRP.
- 1:29 p.m. Archuleta: Recalls a potentially similar project last year.  
  
Dunn: The closest project is likely the restoration of a meadow within the context of a forest. There have also been PJ removal project, but grasslands as a priority have not been funded.
- 1:31 p.m. Randall-Parker: Requests more information regarding how the project yesterday with the mushroom plugs was funded.  
  
Dunn: That was for watershed restoration and non-native eradication which are project objectives.  
  
(Project objectives were read and put on the screen.)
- 1:34 p.m. Archuleta: Is the issue the term grasslands?  
  
Dunn: Yes, to meet the objectives it needs a forest ecosystem.  
  
Borland: Continues with the overview.
- 1:38 p.m. Discussion continues.
- 1:38 p.m. Dunn: The eligibility of the match concern is the focus on buffalo management and grazing which are important but do not meet the objectives of the project.  
  
Pratt Miles: Asks if the panel has recommendations on other funding sources.

Muldavin: Potentially the Rocky Mountain Elk, the Wildlife Foundation Society or other wildlife management organizations.

Borland: Contact the NRCS for a cost-share agreement program utilizing bison.

Archuleta: 500-600 trees per acre seems like a forest to me so a recommendation could be to revise the proposal to focus on that aspect.

Borland: Recommends category #4.

1:42 p.m.

Pratt Miles: Confirms category ranking of #4 and asks Tammy Randall-Parker to provide an overview of proposal #16-09.

**Proposal Presentation #16-09**

**Proposal # 16-09**                      Multijurisdictional Public and Youth Education, Forest Restoration, and Water Supply Protection in the City of Raton Municipal Watershed.

**Proposal Presenter:**                Tammy Randall-Parker

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 1, 6, 9, 11, 15, 21, 23, 24 Final: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 ,26, 28, 29 Precise and clear prescriptions.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 13, 15, 17, 18, 22, 28 Final: 2, 13, 22
<b>Recommendations</b>	Eligible for funding. 2
<b>Ranking Category</b>	2

- 1:48                      Matthew Silva enters the room
- 1:49 p.m.              Berrens: The distinction between Colfax County and this proposal is clear, therefore recommend removing weakness #28. This is building on previously funded NEPA work which is a strength.  
  
                               Randall-Parker: Notes there is no mention of the amount of material they would be Hydroaxed.  
  
                               Huffman: There are no socio-economic monitoring goals as part of the project.  
  
                               Muldavin: Was going to add strength #2 but realizes TNC was not involved so stopped.  
  
                               Bradley: Recalls some initial involvement from a TNC colleague at the planning level from Colorado.
- 1:53 p.m.              Racher: Due to the fact they are leaving the small diameter wood on the ground after chipping, that should be a weakness. The small diameter trees are not being used.  
  
                               Muldavin: They do provide an explanation that they did not want additional truck traffic in the park.
- 1:55 p.m.              Randall-Parker: I agree with them.  
  
                               Racher: I do not see this as a problem.  
  
                               Pratt Miles: Suggests including the weakness with a caveat.  
  
                               Payne: If the reason is acceptable then it is not a weakness.

- 1:57 p.m. Norwick: Suggests adding weakness #2 and #3 because there is no evidence of conservation community involvement and lack of detail concerning the youth involvement.  
Muldavin: You need to be careful about raising the bar too much on this.  
Norwick: If this is an existing program, tell us what you are doing.
- 2:01 p.m. Panel moves it to a recommendation.
- 2:03 p.m. Racher: Addressing the Hydroaxing, they state why they chose that weakness but they explain their treatments so I do not think those weaknesses are relevant (#15, #17 and #18).
- 2:04 p.m. Randall-Parker: They are talking about treating a lot of trees and putting a lot of mulch on the ground. Expresses concern about fuel still existing.
- 2:05 p.m. Racher: It is reducing the potential for catastrophic wildfire because it is significantly changing the structure.  
Recommendation: Add, the project does not add value to small diameter.
- 2:08 p.m. Panel removes weakness #18.  
Norwick: Suggests removing #15 because there are no products.  
Payne: They may not be able to do this removal by rule and if you are going to chip the stuff the depth of the removal is the problem. Requests clarification.  
Perelta: Regarding material left, they have been hydromulching and there is a significant amount and the diversity of the group has been very difficult since they are agreeing across state lines among many groups. Regarding prescribed fire, the City of Raton is concerned.  
Randall-Parker: Can they remove trees?  
Perelta: They prefer not to because of fear of ecological danger.
- 2:11 p.m. Bradley: A strength is for project partners to use the success of the Santa Fe Watershed management as a learning opportunity for local government officials concerned about fire in their municipal watershed.  
Pratt Miles: Refocuses group on weaknesses #15, #17, and #18.
- 2:14 p.m. Panel removes all three.  
Racher: Suggests adding strengths #2, #3, #4, #8, #10, #13, #16, #22, #25, #26, #28, #29  
Muldavin: Suggests adding the strength that the ecological monitoring exceeds the baseline monitoring.
- 2:17 p.m. Racher: Though there may be a need for more detail, there is a good youth involvement.
- 2:18 p.m. Dunn: Notes there is no letter from the school and requests clarification.
- 2:19 p.m. Perelta: There is an existing 7<sup>th</sup> grade program.
- 2:21 p.m. Berrens: This project seeks to protect a city watershed which is the drinking water supply for 9,000 people.

- 2:22 p.m. Dunn: The education component is not specified in the letters of support, which is a weakness. Requests clarification.
- 2:23 p.m. Perelta: They have a very well established youth program through the park.  
Muldavin: It is ambiguous why the letter is required in this place because the applicant can be done by the applicant:  
Recommendation: Retain the 7<sup>th</sup> grade water quality program recommendation.
- 2:28 p.m. Randall-Parker: I am concerned that the ecological goals will be met by the proposal, therefore I recommend a #2.  
Muldavin: What are the significant weaknesses that would make this a #2.
- 2:29 p.m. Archuleta: For consistency, since a previous proposal did not contain a socio-economic program and we made it a #2, we should do the same here.  
Huffman: This is a little different because the previous had socio-economic goals but this one did not so the monitoring is not quite as important.  
Recommendation: The proponents must develop a strong socio-economic monitoring program before the project award can be granted.  
Muldavin: This proposal is very straightforward and addresses the weaknesses from the past so I was leaning towards a #1 because of its clarity and purpose. We may nix it because of their utilization plan, but we have given #1's to some projects that do not give these type of details.
- 2:35 p.m. Archuleta: Because of consistency, the other project was a very strong project and got a #2 for this reason so for consistency we need to make it a #2.  
Bradley: Notes the irony is the potential strength that lies in the socio-economic components that are not included.
- 2:37 p.m. Racher: Need to modify the weakness #2 to read that they do not have a letter from TNC or conservation groups.
- 2:38 p.m. Dunn: The prescriptions for the treatments are very clearly described. They have the NEPA completed through a collaborative process and I want to add a strength that the park would be an effective educational forum and provide an excellent opportunity for discussing restoration issues.
- 2:39 p.m. Payne: Given what was just said, without a monitoring plan can we cannot tell if this will happen or be successful, therefore we need a weakness to describe this.  
Weakness: There are no socio-economic goals explicit in the proposal with respect to education and recreational goals.
- 2:41 p.m. Muldavin: What would they need to measure in this case? What kind of metrics do they need?
- 2:43 p.m. Berrens: Recreation visitation and valuation are standard but we have not seen it very much in this program yet. In the same way that you need to make sure the ecological indicators are appropriate for an area, you need to do the same ground truthing with the community regarding the appropriate socio-economic goals.
- 2:45 p.m. Dunn: Sometimes we strongly encourage applicants to re-apply.  
Muldavin: I would like to see that.

Bradley: If we are strongly having them apply but what kind of guidance are we giving them on the small diameter component. Suggests removing the weakness on small diameter utilization.

The group discusses the issue of utilization and the desire for the proponent to address it.

Randall-Parker: Recommends, the proposal would be strengthened by addressing why chipping the material was the chosen prescription.

- 2:52 p.m. Berrens: Adds to the socio-economic recommendation, recreation visits, attitudes, perceptions, counts of educational participants and activities, etc.
- 2:54 p.m. Bradley: Their goal is to try to keep their water supply from burning up.  
The group continues to try to find language to address the utilization issue.
- 2:57 p.m. Watson: Have the proponents looked into the depth of the residual and what the research says about the effect at different depths?
- 2:59 p.m. Bradley: This project is not about adding value to small diameter wood and the concern is about finding a way to deal with it in an ecological manner.
- 3:01 p.m. Berrens: Recommends, the proponent should investigate removal of biomass from onsite or ways to mitigate the negative ecological effects.
- 3:04 p.m. Pratt Miles: Checks the group and finds support for a group recommendation of #2.
- 3:05 p.m. Pratt Miles: Asks Ann Watson to provide an overview of project #17-09.

**Proposal Presentation #17-09**

**Proposal # 17-09**

Forest Restoration on Carson National Forest

**Proposal Presenter:**

Ann Watson

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 26, 28, 29 Final: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 26, 28, 29 They have a community wildfire protection plan and extensive expertise.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 5, 10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 27 Final: 5, 10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 27 Need more information on the core ecological indicators Detailed budget does not follow RFP guidelines Had a hard time reading this because of the format.
<b>Recommendations</b>	2
<b>Ranking Category</b>	3

- 3:15 p.m. Berrens: They mention the objective of a fuel break and some educational objectives so two weaknesses are that they are lacking any letters or commitments from private landowner groups. Also, the proposal needs detail on the number of homes and structures in the vicinity/area to be affected, and more community involvement.
- 3:17 p.m. Muldavin: Under the strengths of collaboration there are not sufficient letters of support.
- 3:18 p.m. Dunn: There is a letter from the Village of Angel Fire and an email from the homeowners association.
- 3:18 p.m. Muldavin: But they are not included as collaborators.
- 3:20 p.m. Dunn: In other caes we have not always asked for how many homes or structures and because the Village of Angel Fire is identified, that is sufficient.
- 3:20 p.m. Watson: In the budget the letters do not support what is in the budget and under “other” they have workers comp insurance so that should be under fringe benefits.
- 3:22 p.m. Huffman: They mention the core ecological indicators, so that weakness should be removed, though they do not go beyond it.
- 3:24 p.m. Watson: Recommends between a #1 and a #2 but am leaning toward a #2 because the budget does not appear to support the workplan
- 3:25 p.m. Bradley: I am closer to a #3 because the proposal is rather general and I am always looking for more specifics

- 3:26 p.m. Norwick: Concur.
- 3:26 Pratt Miles: Confirms the panel recommendation of a #3 and asks Bob Berrens to review proposal #18-09.

**Proposal Presentation #18-09**

**Proposal # 18-09** Engaging Young Adults in Sustainable Forest Stewardship and Restoration  
**Proposal Presenter:** Bob Berrens

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24, 26 Final: 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24, 26
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 4, 26 Final: 2, 4, 12, 26 Match: You can't use the outcome of the project as match.
<b>Recommendations</b>	Question about eligibility for funding 1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	2

- 3:36 p.m. Payne: Program income can be returned to the program and used as match.  
 Muldavin: No, because you are not getting any cash back.  
 Berrens: You are taking federal dollars and creating the value and counting it as non-federal match.  
 Melendez: If it is income it can be counted.  
 Payne: Since they are giving it away they cannot count it as non-federal match.  
 San Gil: They need a match up front to make it count as a match.
- 3:39 p.m. Racher: The letters are relatively strong. Adds weakness #2 pertaining to the lack of conservation groups, and there are contractors in the personnel section of the budget
- 3:41 p.m. Randall-Parker: Notes the lack of role of fire (weakness #10) and the lack of information of existing conditions (weakness #12).  
 Muldavin: Suggests adding weakness #18 because the treatment plan is vague because it is difficult to understand what they are going to do onsite.
- 3:44 p.m. Huffman: Notes they distinguished persistent PJ woodland from other types and historical fire regimes, therefore that supports the current strength. They talk about the current role but do not talk about it specifically enough as the prescription.  
 Norwick: They talk about fire on pg. 10, therefore remove weakness #10.
- 3:47 p.m. Bradley: Is there anything about the monitoring plan? Yes, #21.  
 San Gil: Retraction, we were looking at CFR governing locations. It is not about the timing of the non-federal match, but it was the fact that they were not selling it and creating hard dollars. Requests clarification.

- Perelta: They have a \$149,000 YCC fund they can use to make up the match.
- 3:48 p.m. Racher: Adds recommendation for more collaboration.
- 3:49 p.m. Berrens: Recommends a #1 despite the vagueness of the treatment plans, though the match issue was resolved.
- 3:51 p.m. Racher: In the others where there were match issues this one is the largest that has been a problem.
- Bradely: Is it the magnitude or the certainty that it is there?
- Berrens: It is the magnitude, it is the largest we have seen yet.
- 3:52 p.m. Racher: Notes there is also a lack of conservation groups, and recommends a #2 or #3.
- 3:55 p.m. Bradley: Determines there is specificity for the prescription in the NEPA documents.
- Panel removes weakness #18.
- Huffman: Suggests a recommendation for breaking out forest and structural types in the prescription in the table on pg. 10 of the project narrative.
- Archuleta: Suggests a recommendation to confirm with the new match there will be more
- Pratt Miles: Check the panel and confirms a recommendation of #2.
- 4:01 p.m. Pratt Miles: Adjourns the group to a break.
- 4:01 – 4:21 BREAK**
- 4:21 p.m. Pratt Miles: Rconvenes the group and asks Esteban Muldavin to provide an overview of proposal #19-09.

## Proposal Presentation #19-09

**Proposal #** 19-09

Forest Preventative Fuels Treatment on Taos Pueblo Lands

**Proposal Presenter:**

Esteban Muldavin

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 2, 3, 4, 6, 15, 19, 28 Final: 6, 9, 10, 11, 15, 19, 28
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 2, 3, 4, 6, 15 Final: 2, 3, 4, 6, 15, 17, 19, 21
<b>Recommendations</b>	3
<b>Ranking Category</b>	3

- 4:26 p.m. Berrens: Recommends change of “environmental” groups to “conservation” groups.  
Muldavin: Does Amigos del Bosque constitute as a conservation group?  
Payne/Peralta: No.
- 4:27 p.m. Berrens: Regarding weakness #15 they say they are going to explore markets so there is no estimate included. Also adds recommendation to add a socio-economic monitoring component to the proposal or provide greater detail regarding the MOU with the Taos Canyon CFRP Coalition.
- 4:29 p.m. Watson: Regarding weakness #16, they talk about safety so it should be removed.  
Archuleta: Emphasizes the needed detailed budget.
- 4:31 p.m. Pratt Miles confirms ranking of #3 and asks Dave Huffman provide an overview of proposal #20-09.

## Proposal Presentation #20-09

**Proposal # 20-09** Camino Real/Ojo Pilot/Abeyta P.J. Mountain Area of the Carson National Forest  
**Proposal Presenter:** Dave Huffman

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 3, 4, 6, 10, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 29 Final: 3, 4, 6, 10, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 29 No letter from Community Forest Alliance.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 17, 19, 20, 29 Final: 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 17, 19, 20, 29 No response to weaknesses from last year.
<b>Recommendations</b>	3
<b>Ranking Category</b>	3

- 4:32 p.m. Huffman: Requests clarification on the status of the project.
- 4:32 p.m. Perelta: It should be a new project because it is a new treatment area with a different prescription.
- 4:33 p.m. Overview continues.
- 4:40 p.m. Randall-Parker: Asks how many acres will be treated.  
Perelta: The letter from the Ranger is correct.
- 4:41 p.m. Bradley: Notes the lack of letters from the Pueblo is a weakness.  
Silva: The concern last year was that the NEPA was outdated. Requests clarification.
- 4:44 p.m. Perelata: The NEPA for the Pilot is current.  
Silva: Is funding allowable for road work?  
Racher: Yes
- 4:45 p.m. Huffman: There are many things listed as activities, but it does not appear the roads are included in the NEPA.  
Berrens: There is no letter of collaboration with the NM Game and Fish.  
Huffman: But they are not listed as a collaborator.  
Berrens: But the proposal says this "... could be done in collaboration with..."  
Dunn: Suggests clarification to weakness #20.
- 4:51 p.m. Huffman suggests a recommendation of #3 due to weakness #9 and #13 and suggests additional language, the proposal does not add significantly to

restoration efforts in the treatments in that the proposed are sanitation cuts and maintenance, not restoration.

4:54 p.m. Berrens: Recommends that the treatment acres in the proposal narrative should match the Ranger letter.

4:55 p.m. Pratt Miles confirms the recommendation of #3 and asks Tammy Randall-Parker to provide an overview of proposal #21-09.

**Proposal Presentation #21-09**

**Proposal # 21-09** Northern NM College Creating Careers from Forest Restoration  
**Proposal Presenter:** Tammy Randall-Parker

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 Final: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 17 Final: 2, 11, 17
<b>Recommendations</b>	Eligible for funding 1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

4:59 p.m. Berrens: Adds strength that this has a strong education component that allows for student access to forest modeling, restoration tools, landfire database, etc.

Randall-Parker: Regarding weakness #17, it would be helpful to see an estimate of volume of restoration byproducts, the amount of biomass that could be used to support the kiln and an estimate if the college went to a biomass heating system.

5:01 p.m. Rancher: Adds strengths #9, #10 and #11. Each of the projects will “indirectly” reduce fire danger. Also adds weakness #2 for lack of conservation groups, weakness #5, and #11 because the majority of biomass material was not from federal lands, and the monitoring plan was relatively weak. Additionally, in the budget there are summer salaries and a number of interns listed as interns with an hourly wage without fringe benefits and they are not covered by the College liability plan. Wants to make sure workers have liability insurance.

5:07 p.m. Muldavin: Welcome to the world of the University college system.

Berrens: If you have to get a grant you will have to write the insurance in there and the majority of college credit student hours are being taught by people without benefits. This cannot be considered a weakness.

Payne: Did they have the opportunity to include this in the grant.

Berrens: I would write health insurance into a Federal grant I would write. Researchers require 1% fringe and health insurance, and for interns there is no requirement.

5:10 p.m. Silva: Do professional students, (e.g., nurses etc.) have a different system?

5:12 p.m. Dunn: Sometimes we provide weaknesses and the proponent will come back and address it by saying they have no power to change the situation. Is something we would say about another proposal?

Berrens: But in the others the rate is higher? I would say this is common practice in the University environment. But are the students working in the woods?

- 5:15 p.m.       Dunn: Suggests a sentence, this may be beyond the control of the applicant, and requests clarification.
- Applicant: There is general insurance for the college, such as the use of the van etc. is included, and is included in the general overhead. Forest workers safety is completely different.
- 5:17 p.m.       Dunn: It is unclear what the market is for the furniture.
- 5:17 p.m.       Randall-Parker: That is part of the student's role to figure out what it will be.
- Bradley: It is difficult to figure out, but there is specificity on the monitoring plan.
- 5:19 p.m.       Berrens: Wants to modify the will create new jobs strength (#29) to add, with a technical training component. Training in GIS is particularly helpful.
- Randall-Parker: Requests where weakness #5 comes from.
- Proponet: It was a compilation error.
- 5:22 p.m.       Dunn: Weakness #11 is stringent because the proposal just includes an analysis.
- 5:23 p.m.       Muldavain: Do we need a recommendation regarding what conservation groups should be doing regarding this project.
- Racher: In procurement of biomass material we have consistently involved conservation groups in the analysis of the source.
- Bradley: Involvement in the NEPA, landscape analysis, and project development is a particularly relevant place.
- 5:25 p.m.       Dunn: Adds an administrative weakness, the project totals on 424 A and B don't match. Also offers that there are too many unrelated activities and objectives. It is scattered without too many connecting objectives.
- 5:27 p.m.       Archuleta: Requests clarification on weakness #5.
- Racher: It is not the match but commitment that is not confirmed with a letter.
- 5:29 p.m.       Dunn: Regarding strength #26, what is an example of a cross-jurisdictional benefit?
- Borland: The different landscapes that they can affect with the project.
- Dunn: But is it in the proposal?
- Berrens: The creation of the CWPP says they will work with the county, state, and federal entities. This requires a slight shift in what we were originally thinking about.
- 5:31 p.m.       Dunn: What about the diverse array of products?
- Randall-Parker: Remove the 100% alteration
- Borland: Proposes striking the too many unrelated activities.
- Group: Removes.
- 5:34 p.m.       Berrens: Suggests removing weakness #5 because NAU will be teaching the class.

Huffman: Suggests adding the recommendation to verify the Forest ERA participation.

Randall-Parker: Recommends a #1

Berrens: It appears initially to be disjointed but it only works at the university if there is a unifying theme and the theme is Forest Restoration Economies. Congratulates the partners for the work and recommends a #1.

5:36 p.m. Racher: This does not have a specific outcome and it is not clear there will be positive products.

Payne: Should we add the recommendation that the proposal would be strengthened by representation of conservation groups.

5:38 p.m. Bradley: Yes there is potential for disjointedness but this strongly builds capacity which helps me recommend a #1.

Archuleta: It is important to give this an opportunity to see if there is student interest. This is a long-term capacity building project.

5:40 p.m. Dunn: Notes the letter of support from the Ranger district requires the students to develop a network to collaborate together which speaks to a product that would help it to move forward.

5:41 p.m. Pratt Miles confirms a recommendation of #1 and asks Anne Bradley to provide an overview of proposal #22-09.

**Proposal Presentation #22-09**

**Proposal # 22-09**                      McMillan Native Vegetation Restoration  
**Proposal Presenter:**                Anne Bradley

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 22, 24, 25, 29 Final: 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 22, 24, 25, 28, 29
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 2, 4, 19 Final: 2, 4, 8, 19
<b>Recommendations</b>	2
<b>Ranking Category</b>	2

- 5:48 p.m.            Archuleta: This is revision from last year and the topic was restoration vs. reclamation, therefore requests clarification on how that was addressed.  
                          Bradely: Proponents included a definition of restoration.
- 5:50 p.m.            Racher: What this demonstrates is the attempt to restore a functioning ecosystem.
- 5:50 p.m.            Muldavin: Issues include where we would put our resources for restoration. This is more like reclamation because there is a major human feature in the human made lake bottom. This is the extreme consideration of reclamation.
- 5:51 p.m.            Racher: This is not much different than other places along the Rio Grande that are confined by levees.  
                          Muldavin: Why does BOR not go forward with the restoration of this area?  
                          Dunn: Requests clarification from the proponent:  
                          Proponent: This is the NE shore that was a natural deltaic function area and was not inundated historically.  
                          Muldavin: Removes concern with that clarification.  
                          Huffman: Notes the proposal does not include a socio-economic monitoring component.  
                          Berrens: Adds a strengths that this riparian restoration project, as a part of the Pecos River Non-Native Management Plan, has the potential for significant economic impact with respect to the state of New Mexico Water Compact water delivery obligations. This costs the state a lot of money to deliver and this can have significant.
- 5:58 p.m.            Dunn: Requests exceed the \$120,000 for one year (administrative weakness). It appears in the budget that materials are requested every year. Asks for clarification.
- 5:59 Proponent: Yes, it should only appear once.
- 6:00 p.m.            Dunn: Requests further clarification of the purchase issue.

- 6:01 p.m. Proponent: The purchase should be all at once but was split to not exceed the \$120,000 maximum.
- 6:02 p.m. Huffman: Confirms the core ecological indicators are included on pg. 9.  
Norwick: Requests clarification regarding (pg. 2) is the treatment area dead, and what is the ecological treatment area.  
Proponent: The majority of all the treatment area is currently dead.
- 6:03 p.m. Muldavin: Is it optimal to do in the fall or spring?
- 6:04 p.m. Proponent: A significant volume is needed for composting so it is desired to do this in the fall after the full growth and the composting will be complete not just mulching so seed dispersal is not an issue.
- 6:05 p.m. Dunn: Notes a discrepancy between pg. 1 and pg. 9 regarding detailed training and project longevity. Requests clarification.  
Proponent: Cannot promise long term sustainability of the project, but can promise to train and employ 5 in the project.  
Dunn: What prevents this from reseeding as non-native immediately?
- 6:07 p.m. Watson: This is a real concern and all you can do is keep monitoring and retreat and get native vegetation established so it can outcompete though that is difficult to do due to a lack of overbank flooding on the Rio Grande and lack of other influences. People have been trying to do this as best they can for a long time.
- 6:08 p.m. Racher: We have seen examples where it does not come back with proper retreatment.  
Payne: We do not have examples where non-natives outcompete.  
Watson: Yes there are some examples, but it is a constant challenge.  
Racher: Notes if often has to do with the rainfall you get. Requests clarification.
- 6:10 p.m. Proponent: The hydrology has been changed but in this case there is a narrow band on the east side of the channel but they flood the area from the local landscape that helps the natives regenerate.  
Muldavin: Do you have opportunities have a chance to get water out of the river?  
Proponent: It would like take an Act of Congress.  
Watson: Recommends a #2 due to the weaknesses in the monitoring plan and the use of external groups.  
Norwick: Recommends a #2  
Racher/Berrens: To be consistent and fair with respect to the socio-economic monitoring issues it should be a #2.
- 6:11 p.m. Pratt Miles: confirms a recommendation of #2 and asks for public comment.

## Public Comment

### Public Comment #4

6:12 p.m. San Gil: Reads public comment #4 (letter) into the record as follows.

April 13, 2009

Dr. Mr. Dunn:

Please read this letter during public comment and before the review fo CFRP 29-09.

We are writing in regards to a grant application that has been submitted to the United States Forest Service requesting financial support (\$360,000) for K & B Expansion Project at Reserve Sawmill (CFRP 29-09). Our country is in a financial crises and tax payers money needs to be invested wisely. We request that the CFRP panel please consider our concerns outlined on this letter prior to approval of any new funding for this project.

The applicant has just received \$250,000 from a Woody Biomass grant from the United States Forest Service for the purchase of a new sawmill. If additional CFRP funding is awarded for this project the total tax payers money will be over half a million dollars. There has been no progress on the installation of the new sawmill even thought there are time frames that must be met. We are including copies of the grant time frames with this letter.

Under the Woody biomass grant the recipient is responsible to match the funding by doing all the site preparation for the installment of the new sawmill, as well as the 3 phase installation and to provide the personnel for these installations. On the woody biomass grant the recipient claims that they will increase their production of 750,000 board feet of claimed production is hard to believe even with the product ion of the 2 other sawmills located here in Reserve, NM.

The time frame for the objectives to be reached on the woody biomass grant is eighteen months from date of equipment purchase. The Helle scragg mill was purchased and arrived in Reserve NM in December 2008 it has not been installed nor has it been used.

- On the woody biomass grant under technical approach work plan it states, site prep 3 months to be completed by March 2009, task include level site, excavate footings, form and pour concrete footings backfill around footings. None of this has been done.
- Run 3-phase power from source to new mill site, includes excavating, backfilling, install sub-panels, switch gears, wiring, completion date end of April 2009. None of this has been done.

It is our understanding that this grant request will be reviewed April 29,2009. We would request that these concerns be addressed with those serving on the grant review panel. Before this grant application is approved the applicant should be re-evaluated to see that all tax payers monies are being used in a manner that will benefit the most citizens not just keep putting good money onto bad.

Sincerely, we the undersigned.

19 signatures dated 4/17/09 – 4/20/09  
Original on file  
(Workplan attachment included)

- 6:11 p.m. Dunn: Requests clarification from Jerry Payne as the USFS Biomass Coordinator.
- 6:11 p.m. Payne: The grant timeframes described are correct, however, most of the places around the country are way behind on this grant due to the economic conditions and the lab does not want people going broke due to the timeframes so we do not want them to extend their capital through these hard times across the country. It is expected that all work will be completed just during an extended timeframe.
- 6:13 – 6:29 BREAK**
- 6:29 p.m. Pratt Miles reconvenes the group and asks Ann Watson to provide an overview of proposal # 23-09.

**Proposal Presentation #23-09**

**Proposal # 23-09**

Forest Restoration Thinning on the Signal Peak North Project

**Proposal Presenter:**

Ann Watson

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, 25, 28 Final: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30 The addressed their weaknesses from the previous submission.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 24, 27 Final: 8, 27 There is no budget narrative.
<b>Recommendations</b>	1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

- 6:36 p.m.      Dunn: Notes that there is a detailed unit cost column which addresses weakness #24.  
                     Watson: Removes weakness  
                     Racher: Suggests adding strengths #14, #19, #20, #22 and #29.
- 6:39 p.m.      Berrens: Suggests adding strength that the project partnering with the forest Operations Research Lab of the USFS represents a unique opportunity in a Southwestern Forest Restoration Analysis to develop and generate production functions and treatment costs functions. This will help us understand what makes an important part of the restoration economy viable.
- 6:41 p.m.      Muldavin: The ecological monitoring goes beyond the base proposed and includes a robust monitoring plan with student involvement. Some pieces are missing and it needs to be clarified that the “etc” should clarify that all will be done. The point is extra work is being done that will be beneficial, such as the student GPS tracking. Also there is a lot of detail in the budget that would normally be in a budget justification the weakness is not particularly strong.
- 6:45 p.m.      Dunn: Adds a strength that the analysis and budgeting for average vs. difficult treatment acres would fill an information need to more accurately predict restoration treatment costs. Also adds that a lot of people in the USFS don’t have an accurate tool such as this but it would be very useful.
- 6:48 p.m.      Silva: The question is, what incentive is there for someone like me to figure all this out.  
                     Dunn: Would having a project like this be helpful for you?  
                     Silva: Yes.

- Payne: Uses of this would give the USFS a better cost understanding and accounting.
- 6:52 p.m. Berrens: We have debates about prescriptions but we don't have a complete understanding and we have to take anecdotes to understand them, so we need a function that controls for the types of outputs. This proposal has exactly the type of person you want to do this work as well. If we don't solve the cost side we cannot address the benefit side as well.
- 6:55 p.m. Brent: Would like to ask for a clarification regarding treatment per acre costs and hauling per trip. Are we talking one trip per acre or something different?
- Proponent: Generally there is more than one trip per acre so this is a cost per acre. It should say per trip not per acre.
- Brent: Recommends talking about past performance on grants or hitting targets. The proponent should indent specifically the 240 acres of thinning that is included in the budget.
- 6:58 p.m. Boreland: Recommends that the proponent works with the NM Forest Industry Association, the NRCS, and NM State Forestry and the Gila to collaborate on this subject to collect data and compile it to tie these average treatment costs to average density. Also adds weakness #8 that the specific treatment map is unclear and sketchy and could be improved especially tying in the deliverable of 240 acres.
- 7:02 Watson: Recommends a #1.
- Archuleta: Recommends adding the lack of budget justification to the Friday consistency review.
- Dunn: Confirms the "must include" language regarding the NEPA decision.
- Randall-Parker: The previous CFRP grant covered the NEPA, it was not new to the group and it is referenced in the District Ranger's letter.
- Dunn: Confirms that the administrative weakness of the lacking NEPA letter should be included as a weakness instead.
- 7:07 p.m. Berrens: Suggests a #1.
- 7:07 p.m. Randall-Parker: Suggests a #1 because of the improvement from the last round and the minor weaknesses.
- 7:08 p.m. Pratt Miles confirms the recommendation of a #1 and asks Arturo Archuleta to provide an overview of proposal 24-09.

**Proposal Presentation #24-09**

**Proposal # 24-09** Increased Treatment of SDT Through Low Impact Techniques

**Proposal Presenter:** Arturo Archuleta

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 6, 7, 12, 15, 19, 22, 28, 29 Final: 6, 7, 12, 15, 19, 22, 28, 29
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 1, 2, 4, 11, 18, 19, 21 Final: 1, 4, 18, 19, 21 No collaboration with partner groups, missing budget justification and no letter of endorsement from the Forest administrating the treatment, and it is not clear where the treatment will be conducted.
<b>Recommendations</b>	3
<b>Ranking Category</b>	3

- 7:15 p.m. Racher: The collaboration with conservation groups is not in the proposal but there is a letter of support from CBD.
- Bradley: Historically the bar for collaboration for purchasing equipment was not the same as for treatment. If there were asked to collaborate what would they do specifically?
- Nothing specified
- Berrens: Requests clarification with respect to the non-federal match.
- Proponent: That is the value of the use of the existing equipment (depreciated).
- Berrens: Is that a valid match?
- Payne: For a FPL grant it is not valid. For CFRP Melendez confirms that it is an acceptable match.
- Dunn: Clarification regarding the status of the USFS support in the district.
- Coordinator: A letter was written that did not express support.
- 7:21 p.m. Racher: Capacity building applications should include a long-term capacity building plan in their application to CFRP.
- Berrens: They need to talk about their long-term plan within the long-term plan of the forest community in addition to their own plan.
- Bradley: Suggests removing the weakness that products would not come from public land.
- 7:24 Archuleta: Recommends a #3.
- 7:25 p.m. Pratt Miles confirms a recommendation of #3 and asks for Matthew Silva to provide an overview of the project #25-09.

7:25 p.m. Dave Borland **recuses** himself.

**Proposal Presentation #25-09**

**Proposal # 25-09** PJ Sustainable Forest Wood Product Development  
**Proposal Presenter:** Matthew Silva

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 2, 3, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 24, 28, 29 Final: 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 24, 28, 29
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 2, 4, 6, 7, 23 Final: 2, 4, 6, 23 No outreach to Tribes
<b>Recommendations</b>	2
<b>Ranking Category</b>	2

- 7:28 p.m. Silva: There is no letter of support from Audubon or Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation.  
 Randall-Parker: Do we see discussion of how many cords of wood would be removed?  
 Silva: No.  
 Racher: They do talk about the amount that will be removed so it could be back calculated or approximated.  
 Silva: They do not have estimates of markets etc. (weakness #15).
- 7:33 p.m. Bradley: Regarding collaboration, suggest having a scientist as part of the collaboration that works in these systems such as Dave Huffman.  
 Dunn: They talk about markets in detail and it is supported in the letter, therefore weakness #15 should be eliminated.
- 7:35 p.m. Watson: Suggests removing weakness #7 because it is specified they will be going to the annual workshop.  
 Berrens: We should add to the strength Dunn just articulated that they have a letter of credit to purchase a significant quantity of wood in the first year which addresses the “will this work” question and is rather unique. The project proposal deals with the creation of a restoration treatment and utilization plan in the WUI for a ranch sub-division. This is a growing phenomena across the landscape and this project deals with it and may provide a model from other areas.
- 7:38 p.m. Muldavin: They indicate they will address the core ecological indicators on pg. 10 in the middle, but it is unclear. Is this to take NEPA and refine it through a collaborative process?  
 Dunn: Requests clarification from the proponent.

Proponent: The prescription has not been completed yet so that is one of the opportunities before us. I did not put it in the monitoring plan because the decision memo has not yet been signed. The NEPA is done but the prescription has not been completed.

Dunn: Suggests adding a strength that the collaborative approach to prescription design under the existing NEPA clearance will utilize the stakeholder expertise and is an excellent example of collaborative process.

7:42 p.m.

Huffman: Recommends that they monitor at a minimum the core ecological indicators under CRFP.

Dunn: Asks if the collaborative NEPA planning is identified in the workplan?

Proponent: It is not included and will be one of the first activities and it should only take a couple months because this prescription is all that remains on the NEPA clearance.

Dunn: Recommends adding that the collaborative planning process described is not included in the work plan.

Racher: Do we require the core ecological indicators to be monitored?

Dunn: They do mention them.

Bradley: They mention "some" ecological indicators.

Dunn: Recommends adding it is not clear that the project will include the required CFRP core ecological indicators.

7:47 p.m.

Racher: The project lacks a youth component. Also adds weakness #9.

Huffman: It is included on pg. 6 in the second to last paragraph in the middle. Weakness #9 is removed.

Racher: Also adds weakness #11 and #16. Also adds strength #4 because the letters included are strong and requests clarification on the worker safety training.

7:49 p.m.

Proponent: The worker safety training is included in the workplan (pg. 7).

Weakness #16 is removed.

Racher: Workers comp should be moved from indirect costs into fringe benefits.

Silva: The workers comp rate looks low. Requests clarification.

Proponent: Confirmed receipt of a specific quote from Hargrave Insurance and that is what it included.

Panel deletes workers comp language.

7:55 p.m.

Berrens: Notes this lacks a commitment to use the equipment for the majority of the use on public lands.

Silva: What does the applicant do if they are unable to secure contract from Federal agencies?

Panel moves weakness #11 to a recommendation.

Silva: Proposes a recommendation of #2 due to no outreach to local Tribes and the lack of a youth component.

Randall-Parker: I had this as a #1 and want to propose that this recommendation return with the corrections.

7:59 p.m. Pratt Miles confirms the ranking of a #2.

**Review of Day's Work and Agenda for Thursday, Day Four**

Pratt Miles congratulates the panel on their work for the day indicating 13 proposals were reviewed leaving 15 proposals in total left.

8:01 p.m. Dave Boreland **returns**.

**8:01 p.m. Panel adjourns for the day.**

**Thursday, April 30, 2007**

**Panel:**

Arturo Archuleta (not present today)  
Robert Berrens  
Dave Borland  
Anne Bradley  
Walter Dunn – Chairman  
David Huffman  
Carmen Melendez  
Esteban Muldavin  
Jim Norwick  
Brent Racher  
Tammy Randall-Parker  
Matthew Silva (part of the day)  
Ann Watson

**USFS Staff:**

Carmen Melendez – CFRP  
Jerry Payne – CFRP  
Alicia San Gil – CFRP

**Meridian Institute Staff:**

Jennifer Pratt Miles – Facilitator  
Robert Williams – Meeting Minutes

**Members of the Public in Attendance:**

Merry Jo Fahl, Sierra SWCD  
Greg Gallegos, SFCFD  
Dave Morgan, La Calandria Association, Inc.  
Kent Reid, NMFWRI  
South West Wood Products  
Gordon West, Restoration Technologies  
Michael Riveria, PSA  
John Preason, GNF  
Molly Jaramillo, Jaramillo & Sons Forest Products  
Clarence Montoya, Adelante RC&D  
David Warnack, USFS, Gila National Forest  
Russ Ward, USFS, Gila National Forest  
Bryan Bird, Wild Earth Guardians  
David Groenfeldt, Santa Fe Watershed Association  
Naomi Engelman, NMFIA  
Jeff Morton, Santo Domingo Tribe

8:36 a.m. Jennifer Pratt Miles convenes the Panel, reviews the agenda, progress from the previous day, the order of the proposals (09-09 then the 14 remaining) and asks members of the public to sign in. Panel members and members of the public introduce themselves.

Minutes, Thursday, April 30, 2009

- 8:40 a.m. All present introduce themselves. (Note: Matthew Silva is not present.)
- 8:41 a.m. Jennifer Pratt Miles and the Panel then discuss the review process the Panelists use to review proposals.
- 8:49 a.m. Pratt Miles asks Anne Bradley to provide an overview of proposal #09-09.

**Proposal Presentation #09-09**

**Proposal # 09-09** Isleta Multi-Jurisdictional Collaborative Landscape Analysis  
CFRP Proposal  
**Proposal Presenter:** Anne Bradley

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 26, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28 Final: 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 19, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28 The maps were particularly clear.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: none Final: none The letter of commitment from Kirtland is missing
<b>Recommendations</b>	Eligible for funding. 1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

- 8:53 a.m. Borland suggests a recommendation that the proponent collaborate with the BLM.
- 8:54 a.m. Muldavin requests clarification.
- 8:54 a.m. Fox is not aware of any BLM land. It did not appear in any of the maps they had available.  
Borland will confirm if there is any adjacent land.
- 8:55 a.m. Dunn adds strength #16 because this is innovative and unprecedented with a tribe, USFS, Land Grant and DOD. Also adds to strength #4 that the letter from the USFS Supervisor specifically indicates that the work proposed is included in the workplans for USFS personnel, indicating detailed pre-planning and collaboration.
- 8:58 a.m. Bradley adds to strength #2 that the proposal document includes much evidence of early collaboration.  
Muldavin: Requests further clarification.  
Bradley: Such as records of attendance, early documentation; the record is complete.  
Pratt Miles: Notes the inclusion of meeting notes and attendance and planning meetings is evidence.
- 8:59 a.m. Muldavin: This is a large scale scope in a very fire prone area and we need more depth to the conservation group involved due to the size of the project. Suggests adding as a recommendation.  
Melendez: On pg. 16 in the budget detail, recommends removing the federal funding under xvi.

Fox: Will change “match” to indicate “work” to clarify it is not match to clarify.

Randall-Parker: Suggests adding recommendations addressing the lack of industry groups.

9:06 a.m.

Racher: This is not a weakness.

The panel clarifies this is already included.

Bradley: Recommends #1 especially because of the cross-jurisdictional approach.

Berrens: I rank this as a #1 with very strong multi-jurisdictional planning.

Pratt Miles confirms the ranking of #1 and asks Brent Racher to provide an overview of #26-09.

**Proposal Presentation #26-09**

**Proposal # 26-09** Use of Distributed Generation Modular Biopower as a Management Tool for the Rio Grande Corridor Bosque  
**Proposal Presenter:** Brent Racher

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 6, 10, 13, 17, 24 Final: 1, 3, 6, 10, 13, 17, 19, 24, 29
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 4, 5, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 26 Final: 5, 15, 19 Letters were not included from all. There is no economic assessment of the project from feedstock to marketing
<b>Recommendations</b>	Between 1 and 2
<b>Ranking Category</b>	2

- 9:19 a.m. Racher: Requests clarification, are the old and large trees in part of the treatment area?  
 Proponent: No.
- 9:20 a.m. Racher: Are the CFRP core ecological indicators included?  
 Payne: The proponents did not test Saltcedar which may be a problem.
- 9:22 a.m. Silva: In order to make determination of combustion of Saltcedar, why a 35 acre project without a lab scale test?  
 Racher: There is a lab scale test.  
 The panel discusses the details of the testing.
- 9:25 a.m. Borland: Asks clarification if there are specs for planting.  
 Proponent: Yes we have some specifications, especially considerations for beavers.  
 Bradley: On the bottom of pg. 9, are these specifications appropriate.  
 Racher: We do not see the core ecological indicators included.
- 9:27 a.m. Huffman: The initial conditions they have included look at numbers of stems, dbh, and on pg. 10 they say they will develop indicators but it is vague. It's appropriateness here is a question and is another good discussion for Friday.  
 Muldavin: In this case these core ecological indicators would be relevant, especially considering the language in the Sierra Club endorsement letter, especially concerning the issue of carbon neutrality.  
 Pratt Miles: Asks how the panel wants to address this

- 9:32 a.m. Dunn: The proponent might consider tracking carbon sequestration implications of the proposed biomass utilization and planting.
- 9:33 a.m. Randall-Parker suggests adding strengths #1, #3, #19, (“experiments” instead of “supplies”), and #29. Also indicates where safety training is specified, removing weakness #16 and #15.
- 9:37 a.m. Racher: Encourages the proponent to utilize safety training programs for operators that are in place such as NMFIA NWSP.
- 9:39 a.m. Berrens: Adds, the monitoring plan should include an assessment of the costs of Saltcedar removal and chipping to be compared against the value of the generated utility grade electricity.
- Racher: Yes, this is a desired market analysis. Also adds a strength that this proposal provides an innovative analysis, one of the first we have seen, of utilizing forest residues with advanced energy technologies (e.g., beyond boilers to look at gasification).
- 9:41 a.m. Dunn: Requests clarification on weakness #26, regarding the lack of letter from the RCND.
- Proponent: The RCND is an NRCS employee but the council member is the contribution that is the sponsorship, not the staff person but not the council members.
- Racher: To be fair we still need a letter from the RCND.
- Panel confirms that the strengths (specifically #19) are the same.
- Dunn/Silva: Suggest removing weakness #13
- 9:45 a.m. Watson: Requests clarification about “species research and acquisition” on pg. 9.
- Proponent: To see what would be best to include for restoration.
- 9:46 a.m. Racher: On recommendation #1, wants to recommend that the project collaborates with biomass expertise within agencies, universities and industries in the State and the Southwest.
- 9:48 a.m. Muldavin: Returns to recommendation #1 and confirms this is included in weakness #15 as it should be.
- Melendez: Requests clarification on the rate for teachers/students.
- Proponent: NM Department of Labor gives costs and wages so it came from that site and the students will be volunteers.
- 9:49 a.m. Berrens recommends adding to weakness #19, the assessment of the Saltcedar as the source of biofuels to produce energy, as part of the monitoring plan.
- Dunn: It seems that is the whole purpose of this plan. What about, how will the results be reviewed by the multi-party monitoring committee? Requests clarification from the proponent.
- Proponent: We cannot determine the economic feasibility if we don’t know if it is going to work, but we cannot get to this point if we know it is going to work at all which is why we don’t know much about economic feasibility. The results would be in the project but not in the market analysis.

- 9:55 a.m. Racher: Started at a #1 because of the innovation and forward thinking nature but has some questions and the lack of core ecological indicators has dropped projects to a #2.
- Bradley: The primary purpose of this grant is to experiment with the fuel stock not restoration work and others felt comfortable with their approach.
- 9:57 a.m. Huffman: The focus of the project is experimentation, but when you look at the budget the majority of the request is for treatment. This might call for collaboration with another project that is already providing supply and make this project look just at the fuel stock.
- Muldavin: Concur, we cannot understand the response with what they are proposing. If they are talking about energy there needs to be a tie back to how they are monitoring this.
- Randall-Parker: In this part of the country this is where some of the first Saltcedar work was done so we should have good plans in place to figure out how to eradicate it so this is a logical extension of that previous work.
- 10:00 a.m. Muldavin: Saltcedar is a problem and what you do post treatment is important. There is not a strong sense of what they are going to do.
- 10:01 a.m. Dunn: Regarding weakness #19, it appears at the bottom of pg. 9 that some of the core ecological indicators are included so we should modify the language to say that it does not monitor all the indicators (e.g., surface fuels and crown base height).
- 10:03 a.m. Watson: Requests a clarification on the cost for treating the 35 acres.
- Proponent: That is based on past contracts done in our area. If we can find someone to treat it for less we would do more than 35 acres. Also some areas are hanging over the river so is a little more expensive to treat.
- Racher: Recommends a #2 due to the lack of ecological indicators and the fact that the innovation does not occur from stump to market.
- 10:07 a.m. Berrens: There is not enough monitoring so I do not think this is quite ripe yet but am currently sitting as a #2.
- 10:08 a.m. Borland: In fairness to other projects dealing with Saltcedar it should have the same ranking. The attempt to utilize biomass is important and it has implications for everyone doing with Saltcedar.
- Silva: This is such a pilot it is not fair to ask for such a developed business and monitoring plan.
- 10:10 a.m. Racher: Many things have to go on simultaneously, such as testing what the market will be and that needs to be continuously improved as you move forward.
- Norwick: suggests that, if the test of Saltcedar as a feedstock in the Community Power Corporation unit is positive the proposal should incorporate an economic assessment of the entire project from feedstock to marketing.
- Racher: Feels it is still a weakness that it would not track costs.
- Berrens: The weakness still holds, but I am wavering between a #1 and #2.
- 10:15 a.m. Dunn: It is more the distribution of the information not the tracking.

Berrens: I think it is both.

Payne: The core issue seems to be their monitoring plan is to be developed and we are recommending what to monitor.

Dunn: But the bulk of the funds are for treatment.

10:17 a.m. Huffman: Does it make sense to request a pilot study? How much Saltcedar do you need for a pilot study? If you do a pilot can you come back with a stronger study?

Berrens: I think this is a pilot study and we are giving advice concerning the monitoring and if they want to come back it would be with results and a more fleshed out business plan so I have moved to a #1.

Bradley: Expresses concern about the amount of money going to treatment.

Watson: It is innovative and would be very helpful if successful.

Norwick: After listening to the discussion I could support a #1.

10:22 a.m. Huffman: Still between a #1 and a #2.

Racher: In this proposal we have the proponents look at this as an industry but yet the non-governmental industry is not there. I am thinking of other projects in this state that are proposed by government. There will be many roadblocks and problems and there is a strong need for collaboration with others (agencies, universities, industry) to get this going.

Bradley: Suggests that if we go with a #2 that we strongly recommend that they return with the proposal next year.

10:26 a.m. Pratt Miles confirms a panel recommendation #2 and adjourns the group for a break.

**10:26 – 10:43 BREAK**

10:43 a.m. Pratt Miles reconvenes the group and asks Jim Norwick to provide an overview of proposal #27-09.

**Proposal Presentation #27-09**

**Proposal #** 27-09                      Use of Distributed Generation Modular Biopower as a Management Tool for the Rio Grande Corridor Bosque  
**Proposal Presenter:**                      Jim Norwick

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 5, 7, 11, 12, 16, 18, 20, 22, 27 Final: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21,22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 1, 3, 9, 10, 15 Final: 1, 15
<b>Recommendations</b>	1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

- 10:53 a.m.            Norwick: Requests clarification details on the expected NEPA clearance.  
                          District Ranger – Silver City: It will likely be a CE due to strong support. The process has not been started and should take 6 months.  
                          Coordinator: Also, the first phases of implementation do not take place within the first year so time for clearance is expected.
- 10:55 a.m.            Bradley: Recommends the incorporation of monitoring of the product’s effects on vegetative establishment and growth.  
                          Norwick: Retracts weakness #3 given earlier discussion on previous proposals, the discussion on pg. 9 is sufficient and laudable.
- 10:57 a.m.            Racher: Suggests strengths #1-4, #8, #15, #21, #23-26, and #29 and adds detail on weakness #15 which does not show where they are going to track and monitor that equipment production.
- 10:59 a.m.            Berrens: There is a lot of cost per unit, but you are looking for the performance of the equipment itself?
- 11:00 a.m.            Racher: Yes.
- 11:00 a.m.            Randall-Parker: What is a bark blower and what is the difference between these different bark blowers?
- 11:02 a.m.            Racher: It is like a reverse blower, like hydro mulching.  
                          Proponent: We own the bark blower and it is used by landscape companies to place bark so you can use it to transport biomass through a hose over long distances and you can direct it on the ground and is more specific and controllable.
- 11:03 a.m.            Dunn: On pg. 6 at the end of each bulleted paragraph there is an amount of volume mentioned which should address weakness #17.

Norwick: I think it does, along with the letter from Gila WoodNet stating how much biomass they will contribute.

Dunn: Suggests removal of weakness #9.

Panel removes weakness #9.

11:06 a.m. Dunn: Suggests an administrative weakness, at the bottom of the second page of Appendix A. The following information to be held as propriety, but pg. 13 of the proposal indicates they are in the public domain and not proprietary.

Payne: Asks why weakness #1 is listed.

Norwick: Wants to see more about what they are going to do with the biomass, but it is not a substantive weakness.

11:09 a.m. Huffman: Suggests that the strength that the monitoring uses a control. Also asks about monitoring native grass through photos but is there something more needed?

Bradley: Some of the components and salts are a concern and young plants tend to be a little more delicate anyway. Suggests incorporating a seeding component as a recommendation.

Huffman: Recommends leaving it as a strength and recommendation because it looks like they are doing a strong job but need a little more specifics.

Bradley: Adds seed germination and establishment of plants.

11:12 a.m. Dunn: Requests clarification.

Proponent reads the following missing page of the letter into record upon request of Anne Bradley.

“ .... water quality. The Standards are adopted by the Water Quality Control Commission, and then approved by the US Environmental Protection Agency under the federal Clean Water Act. Where feasible, I will assist the collection of water samples under controlled experimental conditions and at demonstration sites to be analyzed for metals, anions, electrical conductivity, Total Dissolved Solids (TDS), Total Suspended Solids (TSS), and other parameters of interest in comparison with control samples.

Another long-term effect of interest is the ability of vegetation to germinate and establish in areas applied with Zerosion. Vegetation establishment is a critical aspect for any permanent reduction of erosion. I will assist with the vegetation monitoring design, implementation, and replicated research plots at demonstration sites around Grant county, New Mexico. These research plots will be located in areas designated for Zerosion treatment, other comparable erosion control BMPs (e.g., Excelsior erosion mat, straw waddles, blown straw, etc.) and areas of no erosion control with similar aspect, soil and slope. Every plot will be surveyed before treatment to ensure rock/bareground proportions are similar. A commercial seed mix of native species appropriated to the area will be raked into all research plots to provide a consistent artificial seed bank. Point intercept transects will be established within each plot to avoid edge effects. At 0.5 meter intervals along each transect, the immediate type of ground cover (erosion control material, bare ground, vegetation species, rock, litter, etc.) will be

recorded. Herbarium specimens will be submitted to Western New Mexico University's dal A. Zimmerman Herbarium as appropriate. The data will be compiled and analyzed to compare the percent bareground, percent vegetative cover, and percent erosion control material cover between erosion control treatments. The commercial native seed mix will contain locally representative species of both forbs and grasses

- 11:16 a.m. Bradley: Retracts the recommendation and retains the strength.
- 11:17 a.m. Huffman: The monitoring of soil erosion is vague and is added to weakness #19.  
Proponent: Notes details in the letters of support.  
Norwick: Recommends weakness #19, the ecological component is strong but the economic could be strengthened.  
Huffman takes time to look through the letters.
- 11:19 a.m. Berrens: Suggests the following strengths. An important part of this project is the comparison of performance and cost measures for erosion and currently available market products. Also, this proposal represents good leveraging of public funds with USDA SBIR funds
- 11:21 a.m. Muldavin: Suggests removing weakness #30.  
Norwick: OK with that because the demo sites are not in the restoration site.  
Huffman: Notes pg. 2 of one of the letters does contain the soil measurement issues, though the proposals should reference the letters in the proposal for important issues such as this and measure the ecological monitoring measures generally.  
Panel removes weakness #19.
- 11:25 a.m. Berrens: The economic monitoring is brief but concise and is sufficient supporting the dropping of #19.
- 11:26 a.m. Dunn: Regarding weakness #18, pg. 5-6 seems to address the treatments issue.  
Panel removes weakness #18.
- 11:28 a.m. Racher: Regarding weakness #31, does NEPA need to be done?  
Dunn: For ground disturbing activities Federal dollars federalize the need for NEPA and makes it required, but requests clarification.  
Proponent: We had a discussion and it is on State land and they do not have a state NEPA but where they do have federal dollars they do federal NEPA. Because of this we thought we would include all demo sites under the NEPA process. It will include all lands.  
Group removes weakness #31.
- 11:33 a.m. Racher: Adds recommendation to assure that NEPA covers all land. Also reaffirms recommendation #7.
- 11:34 a.m. Norwick recommends removal of weakness #29. This is listed as a new proposal however the proponent addresses 2007 weaknesses and recommendations.  
Panel removes weakness #29.

- 11:37 a.m.      Randall-Parker: Requests clarification on Appendix E, year 2. For the contractors there is over \$50,000 for years 2 and 3 that have to do with biomass acquisition etc.
- Proponent: The Gold Gulch site will use locally acquired biomass but Gila WoodNet is supplying crews to make chips on-site.
- Racher: What was the origin of the source biomass.
- Proponent: All comes from restoration by the bounds of its mission and can be certified from biomass restoration activities. By the time of the this CFRP grant the previous will be complete.
- Norwick: Recommends #1.
- Berrens: Recommends a #1.
- Silva: Recommends a #1.
- 11:45 a.m.      Pratt Miles confirms a panel recommendation of #1.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

- None submitted.
- 11:44 a.m.      Pratt Miles reminds the public that it needs to be provided in writing to CFRP staff in advance of the public comment period.
- 11:44 a.m.      Pratt Miles requests Dave Borland provide an overview of proposal #28-09.

**Proposal Presentation #28-09**

**Proposal # 28-09**                      Recovering More Value from Pine Trees: Distilling Essential Oils and Hydrosols  
**Proposal Presenter:**                Dave Borland

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 27, 28, 29 Final: 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 27, 28, 29
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 2, 4, 6, 16, 20, 24, 27 Final: 2, 3, 4, 6, 13, 16, 20, 24, 27
<b>Recommendations</b>	2 or 3
<b>Ranking Category</b>	3

- 11:49 a.m.        Racher: Cost per ton is high but it is consistent with the previous applicant.
- 11:50 a.m.        Borland: Asks why the proponent is purchasing a distiller from Oregon.  
                          Proponent: This company has manufactured for the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs in Oregon and the results appear to be satisfactory.  
                          Borland: Following equipment purchase, what is the plan?  
                          Proponent: The plan is to start with a 100 gallon unit then upgrade to a 300 gallon unit with all the other equipment remaining the same. Our plan is to have a set of marketable products available without federal fund support. Development of a complete business plan would follow.
- 11:52 a.m.        Borland: Did you consult with the tribes?  
                          Proponent: A sample letter was provided.
- 11:53 a.m.        Dunn: A sample letter is not confirmation of consultation.
- 11:54 a.m.        Borland: Notes the 424 is overbudget.  
                          Racher: At first glance the cost for biomass/ton would be high, but the quantity of recovery is low due to the source, so I do not think the cost it out of line. Also adds strengths #3 and #23. Then adds weaknesses #3 and #13 because the project will not use large quantities of forest residue.  
                          Ranger Reserve Pearson: The slash is not piled so it is distributed. I support in concept but it is hard to guarantee that the slash will be there. It depends on market conditions.
- 12:00 p.m.        Dunn: Notes administrative weakness that 424 Section 18 does not match 424a Section A totals. Also, sections A, B, and C of the 424a are not filled out correctly. Also the supply of material for the project is in doubt.  
                          Racher: I think the source of the material for the grant is specified, but the long term supply is in doubt.

- Silva: I would characterize the supply as in doubt.
- Pearson: Slash from other WUI projects provides opportunities.
- 12:02 p.m. Ranger: We asked the proponent to be mobile to work on all 6 Ranger Districts.  
Panel removes supply weakness.
- 12:03 p.m. Bradley: Regarding the Keller Logging letter, there is specificity of working with them wherever they are.
- Berrens: Adds weakness, collaborator letters do not verify dollar amounts that are in the budget.
- Following discussion the panel removes strength #8 due to lack of strong youth component.
- Berrens: Suggests removing “matching funds” from strength #4.
- Racher: Requests clarification from the District Ranger. Are we putting a still in the forest and is the USFS OK with this?
- Pearson: Yes, there would be a plan developed and yes we are supportive.
- 12:08 p.m. Borland: We need this type of concept in the forest but I think we need a number of weaknesses addressed so I would make it a #3 or #2.
- Racher: I could support a #2.
- Bradley: How do we get clarity on this supply issue? Supply availability also determines the match. I would support a #3.
- Norwick: I would support a #3.
- 12:11 p.m. Pratt Miles confirms a panel recommendation of a #3 and asks Randall-Parker to provide an overview of proposal #29-09.

**Proposal Presentation #29-09**

**Proposal # 29-09**

K&B Expansion Project at Reserve Sawmill

**Proposal Presenter:**

Tammy Randall-Parker

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 12, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 29 Final: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 28, 29 A number of new jobs in a small community town.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 15, 17 Final: 15
<b>Recommendations</b>	1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

12:17 p.m. Racher: Confirms weakness #15 and #17 are the same (panel changes to #15). Also adds strength #10 which is an indirect benefit of the project. Also adds the strength that this is one of the few proposals that talks about adding this capacity to reduce the cost/acre to the forest service. The project recognizes the added capacity provided will help reduce the cost of forest restoration treatment.

12:19 p.m. Bradley adds strength #28, since the whole county has a CWPP.

12:20 p.m. Dunn: Adds to strength #8, which includes business orientation to development. Also mentions the project presents and innovative installation of a solar kiln.

12:21 p.m. Randall-Parker: Recommends a #1

12:22 p.m. Pratt Miles confirms a group ranking of #1 and asks Ann Watson to provide an overview of proposal #30-09.

12:24 p.m. Pratt Miles notices the proponents and coordinator are not present and adjourns the panel to lunch.

**12:24 – 2:00 LUNCH**

2:00 p.m. Pratt Miles convenes the panel and asked Bob Berrens to provide an overview of proposal #31-09 before #30-09 to allow time for the proponent to arrive.

**Proposal Presentation #31-09**

**Proposal #** 31-09

Sapillo Watershed Restoration Project Phase 1 Planning

**Proposal Presenter:**

Bob Berrens

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 22, 28 Final: 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 24, 28 Lots of youth groups are involved
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: narrative but no boilerplate Final: 9 Does not include core ecological indicators (removed) Difficulty to justify taking the highest bidder in NEPA + 20% contingency
<b>Recommendations</b>	1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

2:09 p.m. Racher: Notes the proponents selected the highest NEPA bid (which did include everything, a biological and cultural assessment) and added a 20% contingency which seems high.

2:11 p.m. Borland: Regarding the monitoring plan, looking at pg. 6 they have two phases and it is not relevant in the first phase (this grant). It will happen in phase two.

Dunn: Notes it is likely not necessary in a planning because this does not have ground treatment component. When CFRP funds NEPA there are unanticipated delays, so having a 20% contingency may be reasonable. Few go the way they are supposed to go.

Panel discusses the issue of consistency.

2:18 p.m. Berens: Are contingencies allowable in USFS cost accounting?

Melendez: No. You need a specific category.

Payne: It would all be considered an estimate, and this happens.

Berrens: Comfortable with dropping it as a weakness.

Randall-Parker: This morning the Isleta was for 8,850 acres and it was \$212,000 and this is more for around 800 acres. The planning costs seem high, and most of the money does not go to the youth.

Berrens: That is not directly comparable. The NEPA on Isleta was not as comprehensive and we have funded other projects with similar costs.

2:23 p.m. Dunn: This project is about much more than NEPA and lumping it all together and dividing by the total which ignores the objectives for the CFRP.

Bradley: They do not necessarily have to use it all. This is a cost reimbursable program.

- 2:26 p.m. Randall-Parker: Recommends looking for other cost estimates.
- Racher: Adds strengths #21 and #24. Also adds weakness #2, #3, and #9. The proponents do not demonstrate width and depth of collaboration with industry of conservation groups. The letters of support are not substantive. The outreach to industry is not involvement but saying we will provide you with this.
- 2:30 Berrens: We can debate definition of conservation groups, the proponent looks like a conservation group and the letter of support from the Wild Earth Guardians looks fine, but there is coordination between a large ranch with conservation interests on private lands so I see the coordination and collaboration.
- Bradley: Feels comfortable with outreach to conservation groups.
- Payne: Since this is a planning grant, this proposal could be enhanced by collaboration with local industry.
- Racher: Regarding weakness #3, all the money is being used to hire the youth outreach coordinator not going to the youth. References the River Source letter.
- 2:36 p.m. Berrens: If you look in year 2 there is \$1,800 in non-federal match with Youth Corps involvement.
- Racher: Asks if this is creating a Youth Corps program or if there is already one there. Asks proponent for clarification.
- Proponent: The climate youth corps component is a program of the Earthworks Institute, a collaborator and partner. There are a number (4) of youth that will receive training as coordinators. The Earthworks educational coordinator will lead the climate change component with the same 4 youth.
- Silva: Is this a youth or a young adult component?
- Muldavin: We have categorized it this way before. Is it about education of youth or employment of the youth? YCC has been involved as the youth component in many other projects.
- The panel discusses the youth component issue to determine what it is and if it is relevant. Removes #3 and retains Berrens' original lack of detail.
- 2:44 Norwick: struggling with width and dept of collaboration width industry group. Significant detail (e.g., 10 meetings) is included (step #3). This is strong collaboration for a planning project.
- Racher: The Las Vegas Wood Cluster does not feel like they are being properly engaged. I am going to bat for my people.
- Payne: Would the 10 meetings not create this collaboration.
- 2:49 p.m. Norwick: What is your understanding of what they want.
- Racher: They want to be engaged in the planning process not to be told what to do.
- Payne: Suggests the proposal could be strengthened by active, early, and in-depth collaboration with local industry representatives.
- Muldavin: Is there a vehicle in addition to the meetings that could be part of a recommendation?

- 2:51 p.m. Racher: Provides no other recommendations, and suggests that the recommendation language is sufficient.
- Panel discussion ensues about the listed weakness regarding involvement of industry, in contrast with the proposal language and the letter from the LVWG.
- 2:54 p.m. Borland: Regarding weakness #9, notes language discussing old and large trees and recommends adopting the NM restoration principles and removing the weakness.
- Payne: Notes the Goshawk guidelines are controversial and many people would disagree that this is sufficient protection of old and large trees.
- 2:59 p.m. Racher: Given discussion and the letters agrees to remove the weakness and retain the recommendation remains.
- 3:01 p.m. Berrens: Recommends a #1
- Bradley supports a #1.
- Norwick: For a planning proposal the only question I had was the cost and that has been sufficiently addressed.
- Silva: Recommends a #1
- Racher: I think what is needed in this area is collaboration and reaching out across the table, so this could be a very positive thing if done correctly.
- 3:03 p.m. Pratt Miles confirms a panel recommendation of #1 and asks Ann Watson to provide an overview of proposal #30-09.

**Proposal Presentation #30-09**

**Proposal # 30-09** E-CWP (Engaging Communities in Wildfire Prevention):  
 Reducing Fire Risk & Improving Forest Health in the Santa Fe  
 Bounty Wildland Urban Interface  
**Proposal Presenter:** Ann Watson

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29 Final: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29 Fosters a unique Tribal relationship.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 2 Final: 2, 25
<b>Recommendations</b>	1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

- 3:09 p.m. Bradley: Expresses concern about strength #16. It is across the county but scattered with small plots.  
 Strength #16 removed.  
 Racher: Adds strength #1, #5, #6 and #7. Granted there is a lack of conservation groups but it still has good collaboration. He also notes there are supplies listed in the travel portion of the budget .
- Melendez: Notes there is the use of a Chevy under the supplies.
- 3:15 p.m. Berrens: Adds a strength, the project incorporates an innovative element with individual property wildfire risk assessment using portable GPS and GIS technologies. This is very innovative. Fort Collins research shows that the transmission of risk behavior is how to capitalize the risk into home values and this project incorporates this in a very cutting edge type of way. This also comes with a recommendation, in the socio-economic monitoring plan the proponents are encouraged to track property values with and without risk assessments being done. In other words, build a control into the monitoring program.
- 3:19 p.m. Randall-Parker: They have done this in Telluride as well, so that provides another group to look into. Is wildfire prevention training appropriate for CFRP?  
 Dunn: I think that is a very good question. I don't think it is but maybe others disagree. While the project is innovative it might not fall within the bounds because it is basically all private ownership. References pg. 3 of the RFP in the second sentence. There is treatment of 200 public lands, but the risk assessment is on private lands.  
 Berrens: The risk assessment is of the risk on proximal public lands. That is an outreach community. They don't have to step foot on private property. They are

- assessing the property around them. They can assess the risk from a vehicle on a country road looking at fire risk on proximal lands.
- 3:25 p.m. Dunn: We have funded fire outreach, Firewise, type activities in the past.
- 3:26 p.m. Randall-Parker: Reads part of the proposal and asks if the work is being done on private lands.
- Boreland: They are recruiting and training these private people to be part of a team that can do these assessments.
- Berrens: You can supplement it with data from private property but it is not necessary. Additionally this has a strong education component. Fire spreads through propagation.
- Racher: Treatments are not going on public lands.
- Dunn: Can support it because of Firewise type projects.
- 3:29 p.m. Payne: There is no way people will look at this and not say this is not happening on private land.
- Discussion continues about the sensitivity of the private lands issue and comparison to other projects.
- 3:32 p.m. Dunn: We are legally OK if we stay away from treatment on private lands. Regarding the budget, pg. 2 for year 1, it shows the ecological monitoring training with NMFRI. Needs clarification because the grantee should be able to receive the training for no cost, but the Institute can be compensated for the training.
- 3:36 p.m. Proponent: Yes, the Institute will do the monitoring for the first year and train on-site so that we can do it on an ongoing basis.
- Bradley: Suggests recommendation that the project engages a conservation group.
- Huffman: Recommends that the proponents in the treatments in the persistent PJ woodlands should retain all age stand structure and leave some coarse woody debris on the ground in order to maintain forest health and include scientists in the collaboration on treatment design. We ought to maintain the WUI with as much ecological integrity as possible instead of just dealing with the fuel hazard.
- Discussion continues on this issue.
- Huffman: Changes recommendation to “encourage.”
- 3:44 p.m. Watson: Adds a strength concerning the monitoring and evaluation component.
- Dunn: Adds that the proposed project builds on the success of a previous CFRP project.
- 3:45p.m. Bradley: Can we say they are affirmatively preserving old and large trees.
- Huffman: Not larger than 16””? Large does not necessarily mean old and vice versa. In some places 12” is the “older” cutoff but I cannot say what it is here.
- Muldavin: We do not know.

Removed as a strength but not included as a weakness. Already addressed by the previous recommendation.

Watson: Recommends a #1.

Randall-Parker: Is concerned about the eligibility requirements of this program.

3:49 p.m.

Dunn: We are not doing ground disturbing projects on private lands. This qualifies though it is getting close to the edge.

Berrens: This is now a fairness issue. If we already crossed this line in other cases we cannot treat this one differently. This is just a different way to address risk communication.

Randall-Parker: This is about data collection.

Dunn: But it is not treatment.

Randall-Parker: Reaffirms her concern but can still support the group decision.

3:56 p.m.

Pratt Miles: Confirms a group ranking of #1 and adjourns the panel to a break

**3:56 – 4:12**

**BREAK**

4:12 p.m.

Pratt Miles reconvenes the group, provides appreciation to the panel for their hard work, reviews the agenda, and asks Esteban Muldavin to provide an overview of proposal #32-09.

**Proposal Presentation #32-09**

**Proposal # 32-09** Restoration Through Utilization & Educational Outreach Video  
**Proposal Presenter:** Esteban Muldavin

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 29 Final: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 29 Strong youth component
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 18, 19, 24 Final: 19, 24 No detail to monitoring therefore core ecological indicators are not included
<b>Recommendations</b>	1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

- 4:26 p.m. Silva: Five letters are unsigned and some of the letterheads do not match the letterhead in other organizations.
- 4:27 p.m. Muldavin: I cannot evaluate the costs.
- 4:29 p.m. Racher: Regarding the treatment plans, they give example treatment practices, they give desired future conditions and that goes to prescriptions to me.  
 Muldavin: Are these written in 1992? All we have is a prescription but it will be determined on site. Reads portion of the proposal. Modifies weakness #18.  
 Racher: This wording might be unfortunate because they have strong treatment plans described in the proposal. Also suggests adding strength #11, #13 and that the weaknesses were adequately addressed (strength #25).  
 Borland: That is included on the bottom of pg. 8. Regarding #11 they do not give much detail about existing conditions.
- 4:36 p.m. Huffman: We do not have a strong standard to judge by here but it does not appear to be a significant strength or enough to retain #11.
- 4:37 p.m. Muldavin: Regarding #13, it is hard to reference this back to the work done in 1992.  
 Racher: There is some sufficient language and do not want to ding them for old NEPA.  
 Borland: Their objective is to return to a historic fire range, it is ok to leave #13.
- 4:39 p.m. Dunn: Adds an administrative weakness that 424a Section B is incorrect, and regarding weaknesses, on pg. 10 and pg. 8 last paragraph they do mention some of the core ecological indicators, so recommend modifying the weakness language #19.

- Racher: Adds a strength that this proposal provides a sounds business plan from treatment to markets and agreements made which is something we rarely see.
- 4:42 p.m. Berrens: The letter from Silver Dollar Racing and Shavings is particularly strong. Asks for clarification regarding the letter issue.
- Proponent: They were sent electronically.
- The support letter weakness is removed.
- 4:45 p.m. Muldavin: Remove #18 weakness because it was a recommendation and recommends a #1 due to the utilization theme and video and youth component and no substantive weaknesses.
- Huffman: Adds a recommendation that they conform to the NM Forest Practices instead of CFRP silvicultural principles.
- Borland: The proponent addressed the weaknesses from the past. Since the NEPA is outdated, recommends working closely with the silviculturalist on the forest.
- 4:49 p.m. Pratt Miles confirms a panel ranking of #1 and asks Dave Huffman to overview proposal #33-09.
- 4:49 p.m. Muldavin **recuses** himself.

**Proposal Presentation #33-09**

**Proposal #** 33-09

Santa Fe Canyon Riparian Forest Restoration NEPA Clearance

**Proposal Presenter:**

Dave Huffman

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 16, 22, 23, 24, 26, 29 Final: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16, 22, 23, 24, 26, 29 Good collaboration.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 8 Final: 3, 8, 9, 10 Could have strengthened monitoring plan
<b>Recommendations</b>	1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

4:56 p.m. Racher: Adds strengths #10 and #13. It is a planning so they do not have it now but are moving towards that. Also, regarding weakness #3 the letter of support from the high school was vague.

Huffman: They are including students in the proposal but the letter says we hope to participate. Suggests a weakness that the letter from the school does not make specific commitments regarding involvement.

Dunn: Regarding strength #8, adds that a strong youth component is involved.

4:58 p.m. Racher: Adds weakness #10, adds weakness #9 and asks for clarification on collaboration with local groups in the area. Is La Cienega a collaborator?

Proponent: We have a letter of support from the SWCD in the area which we can provide if necessary.

5:01 p.m. Racher: This is strong collaboration.

Dunn: Requests clarification, is the dark area the planning area:

Proponent: Yes, the dark land is the USFS land to be treated.

5:03 p.m. Dunn: Adds strength, innovative proposal by a well known conservation organization to conduct NEPA in a highly visible watershed.

Huffman: Suggests adding cross-jurisdictional to the strength.

Racher: What is innovative?

Dunn: In the not too distant past the submission of this proposal by this organization would be difficult to imagine.

5:05 p.m. Arturo Archuleta **enters** the room.

Bradley: Adds, the project thoughtfully adds to existing restoration efforts along the Santa Fe River. Also asks, regarding strength #10, this project was not really designed to do this. This is focused on restoration.

- 5:07 p.m. Strength #10 removed.
- 5:08 p.m. Huffman: Recommends #1.
- 5:08 p.m. Pratt Miles confirms a panel recommendation of #1 and asks Bob Berrens to provide an overview of proposal 34-09.
- 5:10 p.m. Esteban Muldavin **returns**.

**Proposal Presentation #34-09**

**Proposal # 34-09** Fire Protection Planning and NEPA Compliance in the Upper Pecos Watershed  
**Proposal Presenter:** Bob Berrens

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28 Final: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28 Good budget detail
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 3, 8, 13, 18, 29, 31 Final: 3, 4, 13 Limited landscape scale. Map is unclear.
<b>Recommendations</b>	1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

- 5:18 p.m. Archuleta: Regarding the lack of youth involvement, there is information between the letters regarding it as a specific and important goal of the project.
- 5:20 p.m. Muldavin: Do we have previous youth involvement with the development of the NEPA process?
- 5:21 p.m. Racher: I do not see outreach to youth.  
 Randall-Parker: Did not receive last page of proposal (response to previous weaknesses).  
 Language modified to strength #25 to exclude the youth component as a strength.
- 5:25 p.m. Dunn: Regarding weakness #18, it is a project to do NEPA planning. Regarding weakness #31, that is not a weakness. Regarding maps, they appear quite clear.  
 Weakness #8, #18 and #31 removed.
- 5:27 p.m. Racher: They mention Department of Game and Fish but there is no letter of support and they are the current land manager.  
 Berrens: The one that says we are likely to take this over has included a letter of support. I do not think we can ding them on this.
- 5:29 p.m. Watson: Is the youth component weakness because there is no detail?  
 Berrens; They are saying they will evaluate it but not involving them in the planning process per se.
- 5:31 p.m. Berrens recommends a category of #1 and notes Tom had ranked this as a #2.  
 Muldavin: When there are planning projects do they reduce wildfire and return projects to natural states.

Randall-Parker: The strengths and weaknesses for this fit well for implementation but these do not work as well for planning processes.

Muldavin: Removes the strengths dealing with fire because planning documents cannot make that guarantee.

Dunn: But when you head into a planning document you have some objectives so if those objectives are there it can be a strength and you can indicate that it “intends to...”

Strengths returned and edited slightly.

Berrens: Reads relevant proposal language that addresses fire issues.

5:38 p.m.

Pratt Miles confirms a panel recommendation of #1 and asks Anne Bradley to provide an overview of proposal #35-09.

**Proposal Presentation #35-09**

**Proposal #** 35-09

Forest Restoration on Santa Fe National Forest

**Proposal Presenter:**

Anne Bradley

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 13, 15, 18, 19, 22, 29 Final: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 29 Strong market identification.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 3, 19, Final: 3, 13, 19
<b>Recommendations</b>	2
<b>Ranking Category</b>	2

- 5:47 p.m. Bradley: Two of the core ecological indicators were included as part of the sample measures, but there is not a specific commitment to conduct monitoring of all.  
Dunn: Suggests, the monitoring plan does not specifically indicate if and how the core indicators will be measured.
- 5:52 p.m. Racher: Adds strengths #16 and #17 and weaknesses #13. Also indicates that the proposal does not use CFRP funds to leverage other funding and revenue sources for business and employment sustainability. Also adds a recommendation for clarification, to ensure the State funds committed are eligible because of pass through funds.
- 5:57 p.m. Bradley: A slightly different interpretation on the employment situation, the language from the letter read could be read in a different way as more of an observation.  
Norwick: We have not put this requirement, for leverage, on other projects. Therefore the leverage weakness is turned to a recommendation.  
Bradley: Reads additional positive language supporting the proponent for other support letters.
- 6:00 p.m. Racher: Yes, this shows an effort to reach out.  
Norwick: The proponent has performed on State Trust Lands so as a general comment they have sought other opportunities and done similar projects.  
Panel removes the leverage comment.  
Berrens: Adds language to the monitoring weakness, it is unclear what will be collected in the socio-economic monitoring component.  
Muldavin: Adds “ecological data” to the monitoring weakness language.

Bradley: Overall there was a lot that was strong and good partnerships but the thinking feels a little unripe so recommends a #2.

Berrens: Suggests a #2 because it has a lot of strengths but for consistency, especially with the monitoring components, it should be a #2.

6:04 p.m. Pratt Miles confirms a group recommendation of a #2 and adjourns the group to a break.

**6:04 – 6:17 BREAK**

6:17 p.m. Pratt Miles reconvenes the group and asks Esteban Muldavin to provide an overview of proposal #36-09. The group first sings happy birthday to Matthew Silva.

6:18 p.m. Ann Watson **recuses** herself and departs for the evening.

**Proposal Presentation #36-09**

**Proposal # 36-09**                      Developing a Strategic Forest Restoration Plan for the Santa Fe Watershed  
**Proposal Presenter:**                Esteban Muldavin

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 16, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28 Final: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 16, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 9, 10, 30 Final: 2, 9, 10, 28, 30
<b>Recommendations</b>	1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	2

- 6:22 p.m.            Muldavin: Requests clarification of Earthworks.  
  
                          Proponent: Earthworks is a 501(c)3 permanent organization that trains kids at risk and has done a lot of restoration work in the City of Santa Fe. It is similar to the Rocky Mountain Youth Corps.
  
- 6:25 p.m.            Dunn: Does the weakness #9 apply to this as a planning project? Suggests, the project has the potential of protecting a high priority municipal watershed at risk of fire and a drinking water supply.  
  
                          Weakness #9 remains.
  
- 6:27 p.m.            Berrens: Adds the strength that they are creating a Watershed Council which will add capacity.  
  
                          Muldavin: It was unclear what powers a Watershed Council would have and how it would sustain itself. Clarification requested.  
  
                          Proponent: The Watershed Council would not have any power other than developing the plan. But it will not be threatening either and we are trying to leverage this through other grants (e.g., EPA 319 grants). Additionally a forest restoration council is envisioned.
  
- 6:31 p.m.            Racher: Adds weakness #2 because industry groups were not directly involved. Also in, in reference to the last one funded, worries there is too much planning for a small area. The actual NEPA being proposed is only 60 acres.  
  
                          Muldavin: This includes areas that were not included in a previous CFRP effort. Requests further clarification.  
  
                          Proponent: The two areas are critical areas defined in the previous plan that were finished with a CFRP from two years ago and the actual delineation is not yet described.  
  
                          Racher: Would it not be beneficial to do a broader watershed scale NEPA?  
                          Proponent: We are trying to be broad in the plan and targeted in the NEPA.

- 6:36 p.m. Berrens: What is the distinction between this plan and the previously funded watershed plan funded two years ago?
- Proponent: Provides clarification on the distinction and the maps included and showing how the lands in question are different. The two NEPA areas are on the edge of the watershed and prioritized as municipal.
- 6:39 p.m. Racher: Contractors are listed in the budget as personnel (administrative weakness).
- Archuleta: Because of the scope of this project the core ecological indicators should be included as part of the monitoring plan.
- Dunn: Before did we not include it as a recommendation?
- Randall-Parker: They have planning occurring at three different scales, site specific, the huge area to talk about landscape scale planning. It would have been better as two projects. It makes it difficult to evaluate.
- San Gil: Asks about the RFP encouragement of landscape scale planning.
- Muldavin: If they just did a NEPA plan for 60 acres, what would you request?
- Berrens: Notes there is no monitoring plan.
- Randall-Parker: The different scales of planning proposed in the project make it difficult to evaluate and understand.
- Dunn: The treatments resulting from the planning process should include the CFRP core ecological indicators; because this proposal does not include treatment it is just planning.
- 6:44 p.m. Multavin: They have a monitoring plan for the plan, but our problem is that we don't have a mechanism that deals with monitoring at these scale differences in the planning process.
- Berrens: They have some deliverables such as the Council and meetings and outputs, so there could be a socio-economic monitoring plan for outputs such as this.
- 6:48 p.m. Dunn: Do you want the following language, the proposal would be easier to understand if the plans were submitted separately?
- San Gil: This most addressed the large scale more than any other proposal we have seen.
- 6:50 p.m. Payne: There are two other little projects added to this one large scale process.
- Huffman: Concerned that some key players, such as State Lands, are not included in this large scale planning effort. Recommends that the State Land office is included as a partner.
- 6:53 p.m. Dunn: Regarding weakness #2, does that mean forest industry groups, because there is language on pg. 4 regarding other industry.
- Changed to "forest" industry.
- Muldavin: Reminds the panel that the complexity is a response to the work we have asked them to do before and includes the larger concept as well.

Archuleta: The issue is one of lack of clarity of the proposal. Also needs to add the strength that it builds on the work of previous CFRP projects.

Discussion continues about the lack of the monitoring plan, both the ecological and the socio-economic which differ depending on the multiple scales. The resulting language becomes a weakness.

Muldavin: Recommends category #1 because it is in the stream of the work done before and well presented. It is a model for how to get things done at these complicated scales.

Randall-Parker: Would recommend a #2 due to the clarity issues.

7:01 p.m. Racher: Notes the panel has dropped other projects to a #2 because of a lack of monitoring plans.

Huffman: Agrees with a #2 due to consistency.

Borland: Recommends taking people from the Hyde Park community to show them the treatment areas (outreach) and include residents in the planning process.

7:04 p.m. Muldavin: If this is all about the monitoring, is this the fault of the RFP?

Payne: If you are going to fund a project with deliverables you need a monitoring plan.

Bradley: Do we strongly encourage these proponents to return next year.

Panel agrees, yes.

7:07 p.m. Pratt Miles confirms a group recommendation of a #2. Pratt Miles confirms that the proponents for proposals #38-09 and #39-09 are able to return tomorrow, and asks Arturo Archuleta to provide an overview of proposal #37-09.

**Proposal Presentation #37-09**

**Proposal # 37-09** People, a Plan and P-J: Adaptive Landscape Management in the Fire, Insect and Disease-Prone Pinon-Juniper Woodlands of Santa Domingo Pueblo

**Proposal Presenter:** Arturo Archuleta

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 Final: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 Addressed the feedback from last year.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 26 Final:
<b>Recommendations</b>	1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

- 7:14 p.m. Archuleta: Moves weakness #26 to a recommendation to ensure the NMFWR match does not include federal funds.  
Silva: Asks if the proponent contacted the Tribes.  
Confirmed.
- 7:17 p.m. Racher: Adds strengths #14, #17, #18, and #20. Also adds weakness #18 because the pilot areas are not consistent throughout the grant, sometimes 48 acres, in others 64 acres. Requests clarification.  
Proponent: The treatment area will be 64 acres, 48 acres treated and 16 acres of control.  
Berrens: Adds strength that the proposal uses experimental design.  
Huffman: Recommends that they are encouraged to maintain an all age structure.
- 7:23 p.m. Bradley: Notes, pg. 6 cites a document guiding their treatments and Brian Jacobs is supporting this project and is willing to provide technical advice.  
Racher: Notes the area is not up to 1 ton/acre and requests clarification.  
Proponent: It does not fit into either type easily. Lower is more savannah and the upper areas are rockier. We will rely on the expertise of our collaborators.
- 7:25 p.m. Payne: Notes collaborative group is going to develop the prescriptions and advises the panel to not get too prescriptive.  
Weakness #18 removed.  
Bradley: Adds strength that the project has the potential to provide valuable information for future CFRP projects. Also adds, the narrative shows evidence that the proponent is trying to leverage other funds.

Archuleta: They have leveraged and continue to leverage.

7:28 p.m. Racher: Asks if the Christenson fund has been awarded.

Proponents: It was recommended to the board but they did not have funding and re-submittal was recommended. This will affect match but there are other match sources that are available.

Huffman: Suggests, the proposal seeks to evaluate alternative treatment prescriptions by utilizing and experimental design that includes replication and experimental control.

Berrens: And they also track the costs of those treatments.

7:30 p.m. Archuleta: Recommends a #1.

7:31 p.m. Pratt Miles recommends a panel recommendation of #1.

### **Review of Day's Work and Agenda for Friday, Day Five**

7:31 p.m. Pratt Miles congratulates the panel on their work for the day indicating 13 proposals that were reviewed leaving 2 proposals for the morning. She reviews the agenda for tomorrow and encourages panelists to review the draft report summary materials provided.

**7:34 p.m. Pratt Miles adjourns the panel for the day.**

## Friday, May 1, 2009

### **Panel:**

Arturo Archuleta  
Robert Berrens  
Dave Borland  
Anne Bradley  
Walter Dunn – Chairman  
David Huffman  
Carmen Melendez  
Esteban Muldavin  
Jim Norwick  
Brent Racher  
Tammy Randall-Parker  
Matthew Silva  
Ann Watson

### **USFS Staff:**

Carmen Melendez – CFRP  
Jerry Payne – CFRP  
Alicia San Gil – CFRP

### **Meridian Institute Staff:**

Jennifer Pratt Miles – Facilitator  
Robert Williams – Meeting Minutes

### **Members of the Public in Attendance:**

Rachael R. Mondragon, Urban Interface Solutions  
Ruth Ann Greuling, Santa Fe County Fire Department  
Ian Fox, USFS, Cibola National Forest  
Juan Sanchez, Chilili Land Grant  
Sandra and Troy Ford, Taos Pines Ranch POA  
Brian Bader, SWCA

8:35 a.m. Jennifer Pratt Miles convenes the Panel, reviews the agenda for the day and asks members of the public to sign in. Panel members and members of the public introduce themselves.

8:42 a.m. Pratt Miles reviews the criteria, evaluation process and asks if there is public comment.

### **Public Comment**

8:43 a.m. Dunn: Reads public comment #5 (letter) into the record as follows regarding proposal #33-09.

Fm: Santa Fe – Pojoaque Soil and Water Conservation District

To: Mr. Bryan Bird, WildEarth Guardians

April 24, 2009

Dr. Mr. Bird

It is my understanding that your organization is seeking support for the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program (CFRP) grand funding, which seeks to fund the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) required process, for restoration activities on federal lands along the Santa Fe River south of the village of La Cieneguilla.

In this context, the Santa Fe-Pojoaque Soil & Water Conservation District (SF-PSWCD), during its March meeting, voted to express their support for undertaking the NEPA analysis under the CFRP process. Furthermore, the SF-PSWCD, being one of many local governmental entities with stakeholder interests in the Santa Fe watershed (including the stretch of river covered in your proposal) wish to actively participate in the collaborative process, along with other, to guide any further restoration activities that may be undertaken on these federal lands.

Sincerely,

Jose J. Varci Lopez  
Chairman  
Santa Fe-Pojoaque SWCD

8:47 a.m.

Dunn: Reads public comment #6 (letter) into the record as follows regarding proposal #38-09.

To: Griegos Logging, LLC

Fm: Pueblo of Isleta, Governor's Office

March 17, 2009

Dr. Mr. Griego:

This letter is in response to your letter dated February 25, 2009 regarding the proposed project for the Coyote Creek State Park.

I am pleased to inform you that this project will not have an impact on religious or cultural sites affiliated with the Pueblo of Isleta.

However, in the event that discoveries are found during construction, we would appreciate being advised of such findings. Please forward all environmental assessment plans to our office.

Thank you for your consideration in contacting this office to express our concerns.

Sincerely,

Pueblo of Isleta  
J. Rober Benavides  
Governor

8:49 a.m.

Pratt Miles asks Matthew Silva to provide an overview of proposal 38-09.

**Proposal Presentation #38-09**

**Proposal #** 38-09

The Coyote Creek State Park Thinning Project and Restoration

**Proposal Presenter:**

Matthew Silva

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 29 Final: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 29 The match is good and the discussion of the project is clear.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 2, 16, 31 Final: 2, 16, 31
<b>Recommendations</b>	1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	2

8:55 a.m. Borland: Asks if NEPA is complete?

Silva: No, but the Parks letter indicates it will be complete. Also, did not see safety training for the operators.

8:56 p.m. Muldavin: Concerned about the lack of conservation groups involved.

Bradley: This seems like a great opportunity to engage other conservation groups (recommendation).

Silva: Can this be done through the NEPA.

Bradley: It depends on where they are with the NEPA, but there is always an opportunity even post-NEPA. Special consideration could be given to the bird populations.

8:58 a.m. Watson: The discussion of socio-economic issues is limited, especially the existing conditions and how they are going to make improvements. It seems very heavily weighted on restoration.

Silva: You are correct. There is a lot of detail on tree detail and species. That detail was appreciated but it should be more balanced in the proposal.

Watson: They mention training for the workforce, but it is very vague and requires more detail.

Berrens: The project lacks detail in the socio-economic component in either the existing conditions or the monitoring plan.

9:01 a.m. Racher: Asks for clarification on the purchase of a brand name, Valmet.

Proponent: It is a processor, the whole machine.

Muldavin: Asks what will happen to the chipped materials.

Silva: It is not clear. It appears that they will be burned. Is that appropriate?

Randall-Parker: You can burn some, it just matter on the amount.

Payne: If they have been packed down they will not burn well, they just smolder.

Silva: It appears they will be burned on the third year. They will wait two years.

Payne: My preference would be to lop and leave some air in it. It will smolder without the air.

9:05 a.m. Borland: Recommends, they should insert in the workplan on table 2 to develop a treatment prescription in collaboration with conservation groups and silviculturalists utilizing the NM Forest Restoration Principles.

Muldavin: Requests clarification from the proponent on the prescription.

Proponent: The most will be 2” in depth and broadcast scattered.

Bradley: Notes a strength that the proposal includes both thinning and fire.

9:09 a.m. Borland: Notes the discussion of a fire line and recommends to further improve collaboration they should include collaboration with Tribal forestry contract groups.

Racher: Suggests collaboration with adjacent Tribal forestry personnel.

Silva: There is significant detail before this is done and there is an opportunity to get a sense of costs and if they could monitor this (time spent etc.) it will provide valuable data. Also adds to strength #3, including specifically the letter from the Pueblo of Isleta.

Racher: Modifies strength #12 to note that the proponent is adding capacity with the capital investment in equipment that will allow for value-added processing. Also recommends that the proponent should clarify how the capital will be used on material from public lands in the future.

Silva: Recommends a #1 due to the clarity, depth, and high visibility of the project.

Muldavin: Expresses concern about the conservation issue.

Bradley: Added as it is, it requires collaboration but the wording should be strengthened

Discussion continues and also includes the question about prescription development – detail determined in the proposal that treatment prescription has already been completed. The group questioned if the prescription should be reviewed.

9:22 a.m. Borland: The proponent should review the prescriptions in collaboration with conservation groups.

Huffman: The proposal moves from very specific descriptions to very general

Bradley: Suggests “refine” instead of “review.”

Muldavin: Requests addition of, “and depth and disposition of the materials” to that language.

Silva: Right now it seems realistic to find a market for the chips. It says if there is a market we will sell and if not we will leave it no deeper than 2”.

Muldavin: OK to leave out.

9:25

Dunn: Requests clarification on the status of NEPA, i.e. is work being done?

Proponent: I don't know, State Parks is working on it.

Dunn: We say in the RFP that if NEPA is not done that is a separate proposal. When delays occur due to NEPA the timeline jeopardizes the work on the ground within the timeframe on the grant.

Payne: We are also asking them to go back and re-open the discussion.

Archuleta: Need to add similar language regarding socio-economic monitoring from the other project that included the Parks.

Racher: We do not need to be purchasing large capital while NEPA is pending therefore recommends adding recommendation #7.

Dunn: Reads information from the RFP detailing information on how and when NEPA will be complete. It does not exactly clarify but includes the intent. Notes the need to clarify this further, and the separation of NEPA planning and implementation projects, in the RFP for next year.

Randall-Parker: This proposal seems like a #2 due to lack of clarify.

Watson: I agree, that and the lack of socio-economic monitoring as well.

Berrens: Yes, this appears to be a #2. In their defense they did indicate they were going to follow the FRI guidelines, but with the lack of collaboration and NEPA concerns it is a very good project and not quite right and wants to strongly recommend that we see this proposal again.

9:36

Bradley: Concur.

9:36

Pratt Miles confirms the panel ranking of a #2 with a recommendation for resubmittal and asks Brent Racher to provide an overview of proposal #39-09.

**Proposal Presentation #39-09**

**Proposal # 39-09**                      Barbero Grazing Allotment Collaboration and Restoration Project  
**Proposal Presenter:**                Brent Racher

<b>Strengths</b>	Initial: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 23, 24, 25 Final: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 23, 24, 25
<b>Weaknesses</b>	Initial: 11 Final: 11
<b>Recommendations</b>	1
<b>Ranking Category</b>	1

9:42 a.m.                Randall-Parker: Adds that the project leverages funds from the Equip program. Also notes the commitment of restoration for 25,000 acres of restoration to be done in a leveraged fashion. There is good breadth of collaboration on many projects and this includes livestock owners which is a new and innovative project.

Racher: In that commitment with the livestock grazing permittee, this leverages dollars and commitments (strength).

9:45 a.m.                Berrens: Notes the impressive letter from the District Ranger which points to very strong collaboration. The project proponent has worked for the last two years to collaboration with the USFS district, stakeholders from the conservation community and traditional agricultural producers (strength).

9:47 a.m.                Muldavin: Yes, this has been collaborative from the start. It might be strengthened if a few conservation groups had been involved in the monitoring process (recommendation).

Racher: I don't think we can require the proponent to involve them.

Payne: The recommendation says, "should invite."

Randall-Parker: Wild Earth Guardians appear to be a partner in the letter.

Muldavin: Recommendation removed.

Bradley: Adds a strength that this includes thinning and prescribed burning.

9:51 a.m.                Dunn: Notes the NEPA is not complete.

Racher: The proposal has addressed that delay and the USFS commits an additional 550 acres that is NEPA cleared if the NEPA is delayed. (Contingency plan strength)

Dunn: Withdraws weakness.

Norwick: Asks clarification regarding where they are with NEPA due to recollection of proposal submission last year.

Montes: This area is one of the epicenters regarding restoration areas so it is high on the priority of work schedule and has been working with the proponent and they have been working together. Cannot provide exact specifics, would have to defer to the district staff.

Muldavin: Adds strength, they are addressing the three different structural types of PJ woodlands in their woodlands.

Randall-Parker: The NEPA costs are included in the budget for the first year so the assumption and the costs are very reasonable at \$30/acre (strength).

Dunn: Notes that the cost/acre is affected by the complexity of the area to work in, so if a project has a cost/acre is high it might still be reasonable, we just have to be careful.

9:57 a.m.

Racher: The cost is probably reasonable because of the large scale and the corresponding economy of scale.

Dunn: Notes this discussion of cost is only relevant in direct comparison by type.

Racher: Recommends a #1.

Borland: Recommends a #1 as an excellent blend of range and forest science.

Watson: This is much improved from last year and is therefore a #1.

10:00 a.m.

Pratt Miles confirms a panel recommendation of #1 and adjourns the group to a break.

**10:00 – 10:23 BREAK**

## **CONSISTENCY REVIEW**

10:23 a.m.

Pratt Miles congratulates the group on the completing a review of all proposals for 2009. She provides an overview of the agenda for rest the day. She then provides an overview of how the consistency review process works reminding panelists that it is a time to review all proposals to ensure consistency in treatment. She makes the reminder that “consistently” does not mean “the same” due to differences in circumstances. Examples of issues the panelists consider in their review include:

- Treatment of budget weaknesses or missing budget detail.
- Missing letters of support or issues concerning match

10:26 a.m.

The panel takes time to review all proposals for consistency before group discussion. Then panelists begin to discuss issues as they note them from their review.

### **Proposal #04-09**

10:37 a.m.

Bradley: Questions the strength noted concerning the or existence of the monitoring plan.

Watson: Based on review of other proposals there are a few weaknesses that cause concern and might argue for a change in ranking. Regarding weakness

number #19, it only went to 2010 on a 4 year process. The workplan and timeline do not match. The socio-economic monitoring was vague compared to the ecological. Weakness #12 and #23 have moved other projects to a #2. Suggests ranking of #2.

10:42 a.m. Bradley: Agrees and wants to hear from others. .

Racher: Does not include consultation with Tribal interests and that is a strong weakness.

10:43 a.m. Pratt Miles: **Confirms new group ranking of #2** due to weaknesses #12, #19, and #23 plus the lack of letters to the Tribes.

Group continues to review.

San Gil: Posts flipcharts with the weaknesses for each of the projects that were ranked as a #1 to assist with the consistency review.

10:53 a.m. Pratt Miles: Asks if there are any other issues to review for consistency.

Dunn: Reminds coordinators they can provide input through the Chairman.

#### **Proposal #05-09**

10:56 a.m. Randall-Parker: Asks panel to review proposal #5 for consistency due to the amount of weaknesses.

Berrens: Proposal #05-09, weakness #26 and #32 are basically the same weakness (32 removed), and weakness #8 was a very minor weakness and weakness #9 was also minor.

11:01 a.m. Dunn: Notes weakness #34 should have been removed. (Removed)

Pratt Miles: Confirms panel retention of ranking #1 for #05-09.

#### **Proposal #06-09**

(Archuleta Arturo **recuses** himself from discussion of 06-09)

11:03 a.m. Dunn: Notes the “letters of match” weakness was considered a minor weakness and should have been a recommendation instead.

#### **Proposal #07-09**

(Bradley and Racher **recuse** themselves from discussion of #07-09)

11:05 a.m. Dunn: Notes same issue for #07-09

#### **Proposal #30-09**

Dunn: Notes proposal #30-09 was not missing a collaborator letter – removed from flipchart

Silva: Notes the “difficult to evaluate because of no estimate of markets” weakness should be removed because the markets will be established through the planning process.

Payne: Notes the same for a youth component because it is not a requirement of the program.

11:09 a.m. Pratt Miles panelist attention to an Excel spreadsheet that totals the funding requests of all projects ranked as a #1 against the total available budget of

\$4,004,209 and notes there is a negative balance of \$1,805,495. She notes that the previous panels have used the “matrix” tool for project comparison at this point.

San Gil: Reminds the group that it needs to make the budget recommendation match the available balance but also keep 2 projects in reserve in case additional funding came available in an undetermined manner.

Archuleta: Asks if stimulus funds might be available.

Dunn: That was proposed but additional funds were not allocated to CFRP.

11:14 a.m. Pratt Miles reminds the group that generally the panel has nominated projects that were particularly strong and did not need matrix review. The panelists begin to work down the following list of all projects ranked as #1 to determine if they should be approved for funding (go) or go through matrix review.

Group takes time to review before nomination process begins.

Go = approved for funding

Matrix = additional review

- 03-09 = go (Racher recuses)
- 05-09 = matrix
- 06-09 = matrix (Archuleta recuses)
- 07-09 = matrix (Bradley, Racher recuses)
- 08-09 = go
- 09-09 = go
- 10-09 = matrix
- 12-09 = matrix
- 14-09 = matrix
- 21-09 = matrix
- 23-09 = go
- 27-09 = matrix
- 29-09 = go
- 30-09 = matrix
- 31-09 = matrix
- 32-09 = matrix
- 33-09 = matrix (Muldavin recuses)
- 34-09 = go
- 37-09 = go (Watson recuses)
- 39-09 = go

11:35 a.m. Pratt Miles: Reviews the following five matrix criteria:

- Part of a longer term CFR
- Innovative – adds value to CFRP
- Will generate benefits after the grant period
- Demonstrates high quality collaboration

- Adds significant capacity to conduct forest restoration

Pratt Miles: Initiates the matrix review process asking panelists to review each of the projects just identified. During the review panelists are to determine if each project demonstrates sufficient characteristics to “check the matrix criteria.” The greater number of criteria aspects checked the higher the ranking of the project.

#### **Proposals 10-09 and 12-09**

11:38 a.m. Silva: Notes on pg. 10 of proposal #10-09 there is relevant information.

Archuleta: Based on the fact there are two (#10 and #12) this helps make it more collaborative and a longer term process.

Bradley: Yes, by engagement with this program it helps make it restoration.

Archuleta: They are also related to proposal #21.

#### **Proposal 14-09**

11:43 a.m. Berrens: Innovative, it leverages with Firewise and the 500 acres already treated and part of the larger 24,000 acre reduction.

Bradley: Innovative because the sale of product would fund further restoration.

Norwick: Generate, yes because of the funds issue.

Bradley: Capacity, yes because purchasing equipment for ongoing use.

#### **Proposal 21-09**

11:49 a.m. Archuleta: Longer term, because of the relationship between 10-09 and 12-09.

Muldavin: How is it related?

Randall-Parker: Did not indicate where the material would come from.

Archuleta: Maybe it was an assumption on my part.

Norwick: One of the weaknesses was lack of collaboration with conservation groups.

Bradley: Capacity, this was capacity building because it was designed to get more skilled people out on the ground.

Racher: Don't see where the dollars spend will go to capacity, it is indirect not direct.

Norwick: Direct and indirect was my distinction between category E and G.

Archuleta: The furniture making component builds capacity to utilize small diameter equipment.

Muldavin: And they are purchasing a kiln which is capacity.

Randall-Parker: They are going to train students to do energy audits which adds to capacity.

Racher: This is still indirect.

Bradley: They are going to conduct a NEPA and CWPP, is that indirect.

Racher: That is benefits beyond the project. (Capacity not included)

**Proposal 27-09**

- 12:09 p.m. Norwick: Longer term, could be if it was successful.
- Muldavin: That is sufficient in this case.
- Huffman: This is a stretch because the Zerosion process is a very small scale and a test of a product and it is not part of a longer-term agreement with Gila WoodNet but a one-time trial.
- Berrens: The key point was tracking the cost and comparing across time.
- Berrens: Benefits, it has a learning and evaluation component.
- Watson: Capacity, too new to know if it would do this.
- Muldavin: Have experimental design, and if it works you have a way to do this in a way you did not have before.
- Huffman: Does this also apply to the Pueblo where they are using material from the Bosque to test success of the plantings and plugs.
- Muldavin: Adds capacity if successful to other restoration efforts.
- Bradley: Too early to say it adds capacity, might be the next grant.

**Proposal 30-09**

- 12:14 p.m. Norwick: Longer term, they will continue to do this on an ongoing basis after the grant and will help facilitate this as part of the County wildfire plan.
- Berrens: Innovative, the use of the technologies in an innovative way.
- Randall-Parker: Requests clarification from the proponent.
- Proponent: The GIS and GPS is education and outreach. We want to put the ecological landscape characteristics on-line as a resource. We are also working with a Tribe.
- Bradley: Collaboration, they had letters of support from homeowners association which is often difficult to do.
- Norwick: The weakness said they did not include conservation groups in design, implementation and monitoring.
- Racher: Yes it is broad.
- Bradley: It was identified as a lack so it cannot be there.
- Borland: It will have some cross-training of the crews in restoration and monitoring which is useful for other agencies.
- Watson: Capacity, they are reaching out to and working with Tribes which has not been done.
- Huffman: But training is Column E not Column G and is indirect.
- Muldavin: We are not jumping up and down on this issue.
- Borland: The strength says adding significant capacity.
- Racher: If we treat this differently we need to add it to 21 and 30.

Pratt Miles: If it is really not that clear neither should be made. (Not market)

**Proposal 31-09**

12:29 p.m. Barrens: Longer term, they have committed to 15,000 acres on a longer plan

Muldavin: Is that comprehensive? What is the unit of reference.

Watson: It was listed as strength #7.

Norwick: This is the first step in a longer term CFR.

Berrens: This was a planning proposal so it meets the criteria.

Bradley: Benefits, Yes, through the engagement of the youth climate change group.

Randall-Parker: Collaboration, recommendation was could improve outreach with industry groups.

**Proposal 32-09**

12:38 p.m. Muldavin: Longer term, because there is a lot of other work going on in the area?

Archuleta: Involved with many other projects and sources and there is an output for other projects.

Muldavin: But is that about capacity and not restoration.

Complete matrix for this

Muldavin: Asks for clarification from the proponent on relationship to other projects.

Proponent: A section 18 review will be done by the institute and the whole logging part of the area has been removed and returned for thinning.

Pratt Miles: Is where this project located related to other projects.

Proponent: Four independent areas that are related.

Coordinator: Corroboration.

**Proposal 33-09**

12:43 p.m. Watson: Benefits, yes and related to other projects.

**Proposal 07-09 (Racher and Bradley recused)**

12:44 p.m. Archuleta: Innovative, they are talking about developing prescriptions through a larger community engagement process, and they are doing socio-economic monitoring.

Muldavin: Innovative within a constrained set of considerations.

Archuleta: Treating while developing NEPA in other areas and moving forward.

Randall-Parker: It was a well-written grant.

Add innovative.

**Proposal 05-09**

- 12:51 p.m. Archuleta: Capacity, they are adding a chipper and it is an expensive piece of equipment.
- Muldavin: They expect to keep using it.
- Watson: Based on all the work done and their track record.
- Pratt Miles: Sharpen the distinction about significant capacity.
- Bradley: A mill, or number of jobs created and reduction of the per/acre costs
- Silva: More than number of jobs but a skilled trained work force
- Archuleta: It would probably create a job or a crew, potentially a tribal chipping crew.
- Racher: The size of the chipper we are talking about is not that significant, it is about the ability to get more work done at a lower cost/acre. A chipper is helpful but not the type of capitalization that helps to increase capacity.
- Watson: By getting that chipper will help get benefits.
- Archuleta: Notes the difference between chipper rentals vs. lowering the costs.
- Pratt Miles: Repeats criteria distinction: 1) number of jobs created and 2) skilled work force and the ability to reduce per acre cost, and 3) scale and regional impact.
- Archuleta: Do other Tribes have a chipper and trained workforce.
- Watson: We have a chipper and a goal of creating this as a one or two.
- Muldavin: Yes, that sounds like capacity.
- Huffman: We are talking about a chipper for this one Tribe and not on a larger more significant scale. A mill builds capacity on a larger scale.
- Silva: Chips are not a product; it is just something that needs to be disposed of in some way.
- Norwick: It is about the scale and this is not a significant scale. Training a work force and buying 5 chippers would be a larger scale.
- Archuleta: Determines it is not necessary to discuss further.
- 1:08 p.m. Pratt Miles: Confirms there is no need for additional discussion and requests a recalculation of the funding request with all the initially recommended “go” projects and all projects from the matrix review with 5 check marks and 4 check marks.
- 1:24 p.m. Pratt Miles: Confirms there is sufficient funding for the addition of all projects with 5 check marks and 4 check marks from the matrix review. The following projects are added to the funding recommendation:
- 06-09 (Archuleta recusal)
  - 07-09 (Bradley, Racher recusal)
  - 14-09
  - 32-09

- 33-09 (Muldavin recusal)

1:25 p.m. Dunn: Notes that at the end of the fiscal year there are sometimes additional funds available so there may be opportunities to fund additional projects and the panel should nominate two additional projects to be held in reserve from the following remaining list of proposals initially receiving a #1 ranking.

Proposal #	Lead Organization	Part of a longer term comprehensive CFR	Innovative approach that adds value to CFRP	Will the project generate benefits after the grant period?	Quality of the collaboration	Adds significant capacity to conduct forest restoration
CFRP 05-09	Pueblo of Santa Ana	X	X	X		
CFRP 10-09	Andy Chacon Forest Restoration Company	X			X	X
CFRP 12-09	Jaramillo & Sons Forest Products	X			X	X
CFRP 21-09, Rev. 1	Northern NM College	X	X	X		
CFRP 27-09	Restoration Technologies, Inc		X	X	X	
CFRP 30-09	Santa Fe County Fire Department	X	X	X		
CFRP 31-09	Biophilia Foundation	X		X		

1:28 p.m. Pratt Miles: Requested nominations from the 7 remaining for potential funding.

Archuleta: Nominates 05-09.

Berrens: Nominates 21-09.

Racher: Nominates 30-09.

Berrens: Suggests the following criteria for selection among the three, “which are the most ready vs. which would be best served by going back for revisions.”

1: 32 p.m. Pratt Miles: Confirms panel recommendation of proposals #05-09 and #30-09 as proposals to be held in reserve in case there is additional funding or problems with the other proposals recommended for funding.

1:33 p.m. The following funding recommendations are displayed for panel review.

**Approved for Funding**

CFRP 03-09	Forest Guild
CFRP 06-09	Claunch Pinto Soil and Water Conservation District
CFRP 07-09	La Merced del Manzano c/o Claunch Pinto Soil and Water Conservation District

CFRP 08-09	Merced del Pueblo de Chilili
CFRP 09-09	Pueblo of Isleta
CFRP 14-09, Rev. 1	Urban Interface Solutions
CFRP 23-09, Rev. 1	Gila WoodNet
CFRP 29-09	K&B Timberworks, Inc.
CFRP 32-09	Northridge Forest Products
CFRP 33-09	WildEarth Guardians
CFRP 34-09, Rev. 1	Upper Pecos Watershed Association
CFRP 37-09, Rev. 1	Santo Domingo Tribe
CFRP 39-09	NorthEastern Contractors Limited Liability Company

Proposals Held in Reserve

CFRP 05-09	Pueblo of Santa Ana
CFRP 30-09	Santa Fe County Fire Department

1:34 p.m. Pratt Miles confirms TAP funding recommendation.

**Public Comment**

1:35 p.m. Pratt Miles confirms there is no public comment and adjourns the panel to break.

**1:35 – 1:48 BREAK**

## **Review of Process**

1:48 p.m. Pratt Miles: Reconvenes the group to provide feedback on three particular aspects of the process:

- Review of the 2009 CFRP TAP Evaluation Process
- Review of the 2009 RFP to suggest Areas for Improvement in 2010
- Suggestions for the 2010 Annual CFRP Workshop

## **Review of 2009 CFRP TAP Evaluation Process**

Panel members identified the following strengths and opportunities for improvements in the TAP evaluation process.

### **Strengths**

- Development and inclusion of core ecological indicators
- Clarified how public comment should be addressed
  - o Made change in bylaws at outset
- Refined use of the matrix tool
- Assessed consistency throughout the week
- Inclusion of NEPA decision documentation
- Flexibility to adjust matrix
- Use of boiler plate strengths and weaknesses as a starting point with the ability to add other relevant language
- Refined language for evaluation categories

### **Opportunities for Change**

- S,W,R for planning
- Development of core indicators for riparian and socio-economic monitoring
- Make the agenda timeframes more realistic
- Not clear if proponent understood NEPA documentation - proponent needs to provide a summary of the proposed treatment in the narrative, in addition to attaching the NEPA documentation as an appendix
- Start Monday in the morning and order in a working lunch
- Consider ways to have food available in the late evenings

## **Review of 2009 RFP**

Panel members made the following suggestions regarding the RFP:

- NEPA – make it clear the proponent needs to describe treatment in proposal narrative not just rely on the NEPA documentation
- Highlight the Core Indicators

- Separate NEPA/Planning from Implementation
- Update checklist
- Include bibliographic reference on current scientific information as a resource
- Develop riparian monitoring indicators
- Develop socioeconomic monitoring indicators
- Clarify resubmittal process and determination

### **Suggestions for Annual CFRP Workshop**

The TAP offered the following ideas for the 2010 CFRP Annual Workshop:

- Include session on the socio-economic indicators
- Have discussion about what was learned and came out of the lessons learned workshop

### **CLOSING**

2:23 p.m.       Dunn: Thanks panelists for their dedicated work and notes that the panel can be considered the real heart of CFRP and the projects are the terrain upon which the group negotiates. This effort and dedication is what makes the program strong.

2:24 p.m.       **Pratt Miles: Adjourns the panel.**