Appendix

Proposal Evaluation Criteria: Does the proposal meet the criteria outlined in the Request for Proposals?

Yes	No	N/A	
			1. Meets the eligibility requirements of the program in Section III and follows the format described in Section V, Application Information, of the Request for Proposals?
			2. Reduces the threat of large, high intensity wildfires and the negative effects of excessive competition between trees by restoring ecosystem functions (including healthy watersheds), structures, and species composition, including the reduction of non-native species populations on Federal, Tribal, State, County, and Municipal forest lands?
			3. Re-establishes fire regimes approximating those that shaped forest ecosystems prior to fire suppression?
			4. Replants trees in deforested areas in the proposed project area?
			5. Improves the use of, or adds value to, small diameter trees? What markets are available to support the project, where is the resource base, and how much material will the project need to fulfill the project needs?
			6. Includes a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders as well as appropriate Federal, Tribal, State, County, and Municipal government representatives in the project design and implementation?
			7. Includes a multiparty assessment that will: a. Identify both the existing ecological condition of the proposed project area and the desired future condition; & b. Monitor and report on the positive or negative impact and effectiveness of the project including improvements in local management skills and on the ground results?
			8. Incorporates current scientific forest restoration information?
			9. Preserves old and large trees?
			10. Creates local employment or training opportunities within the context of accomplishing restoration objectives & consistent with the purposes of the program? Are youth job programs, such as the Youth Conservation Corps, included where appropriate?
			11. Are the proponents capable of successfully implementing the proposed project? Does the proponent have a viable business plan (if applicable)? How has the proponent performed on past grant awards?
			12. Describes the effects of proposed project on long-term forest management?
			13. Is the proposed activity in a priority area for hazardous fuel reduction?
			14. Are the costs of the project reasonable and within the range of the fair market value for similar work?

Strengths: Which of the following strengths does the proposal demonstrate?

	1. Includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
	2. Strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
	3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
	4. he proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
	5. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
	6. NEPA is complete.
	7. Proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
	8. The project includes a good youth component.
	9. Reduces fire risk in community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
	10. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
	11. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
	12. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
	13. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
	14. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
	15. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
	16. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
	17. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
	18. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
	19. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
	20. This proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
	21. Has a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
	22. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
	23. Good budget detail and / or work plan.
	24. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
	25. Applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.

Weaknesses: Which of the following weaknesses does the proposal demonstrate?

	1. The project title does not adequately describe what will be accomplished.
	2. Proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with _____ groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
	3. Youth component lacks detail.
	4. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal.
	5. Collaborator / contractor letters do not verify match.
	6. The proposal did not include documentation of consultation with tribes.
	7. There was no mention of attending the CFRP annual workshop.
	8. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided.
	9. Proposal does not include provisions for preserving old and large trees.
	10. There is no discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan.
	11. Proposal does not clearly indicate that the majority of material processed with CFRP purchased equipment will come from public lands.
	12. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
	13. The project will not add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
	14. Proposal lacks detailed explanation of herbicide application / safety efforts.
	15. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.
	16. Proposal does not state that safety of operators / operations will be assured.
	17. Proposal lacks a description or estimate of volume of restoration byproducts.
	18. The treatment and/or utilization plans are vague.
	19. Monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan.
	20. The narrative does not effectively support the work plan and budget.
	21. The proposal lacks detailed budget and work plan.
	22. Milestones are too general.

	23. Budget does not appear to adequately support the work plan.
	24. Budget does not include clear unit costs.
	25. Supplies are included in the budget line for equipment (or vice versa).
	26. The budget is unclear on whether the match is non-federal.
	27. Detailed budget does not follow RFP budget format.
	28. Distinction between project and previously funded CFRP grants is unclear.
	29. Panel's prior weaknesses and recommendations not adequately addressed.

Recommendations: Which of the following recommendations do you propose?

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