



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest  
Service

Southwestern  
Region



# **2005 Project Funding Recommendations and Proposal Evaluation Comments**

## **Collaborative Forest Restoration Project, 2005 Technical Advisory Panel**

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TTY). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Printed on recycled paper – June 2005

# Content

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Proposal Review Process.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Funding Recommendations .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Recommendations, Strengths, Weakness, and Comments on Grant Applications .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Recommendations for Improving Review Process .....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Recommendations for Improving the CFRP Request for Proposals .....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Ideas for 2006 Workshop .....</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Appendix A.....</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Appendix B. Departmental Regulation 1042-138 .....</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>Appendix C. 2003-2005 Panel Members .....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>Appendix D. 2004 Request for Proposals .....</b>	<b>83</b>

# Executive Summary

The Collaborative Forest Restoration Program (CFRP) Technical Advisory Panel met in Albuquerque, New Mexico, April 25 through 29, 2005, to provide the USDA Forest Service Southwestern Regional Forester with recommendations regarding which project proposals submitted for funding under the CFRP best met the objectives of the program. The Secretary of Agriculture established the Panel as a Federal Advisory Committee on July 25, 2003 (CFR 1042-138) pursuant to the Community Forest Restoration Act of 2000 (Title VI, Pub. L. No. 106-393).

The Panel adopted bylaws and reviewed their responsibilities under the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The Panel then reviewed 39 proposals totaling \$11,083,652 to determine which ones best met the objectives of the CFRP. Using a consensus approach, the Panel recommends 13 of the 39 proposals totaling \$4,131,390 to correspond with the program funds available for grants in 2005.

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

This report includes the Panel's findings regarding recommended funding, strengths and weaknesses for each proposal, and recommendations for improving to proposal review process and Request for Proposals. Meeting notes including the meeting agenda can be obtained on the CFRP website ([www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/cfrp](http://www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/cfrp)) or by contacting Walter Dunn, USDA Forest Service, 333 Broadway Blvd. SE, Albuquerque, NM 87102, telephone (505) 842-3425. This report will also be available on the CFRP website ([www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/cfrp](http://www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/cfrp)).

# Proposal Review Process

Panel members individually evaluated each proposal to determine the degree to which they met the purposes, objectives and administrative requirements described in the 2005 Collaborative Forest Restoration Program (CFR) Request for Proposals (RFP). The Panel members then met to develop agreement on the strengths, weaknesses and funding recommendation for each proposal. The Panel developed a recommendation for the Forest Service Southwestern Regional Forester to fund 13 projects that together equal the available CFRP grant funding for 2005. Project proposals were discussed sequentially by forest. The Panel used a consensus based decision-making process to develop their recommendation. Public comment periods were scheduled each day of the Panel meeting.

The categories of decision were:

1. The panel finds that the proposal is an excellent match with the purposes and objectives of the Act, and recommends the project for funding;
  - 1(-) The Panel finds that the proposal is an excellent match with the purposes and objectives of the Act, but has concerns about some aspect of the proposed project that must be addressed before the panel can recommend funding.
2. The panel finds that the proposal is a good match with the purposes and objectives of the Act, but has concerns about some aspects of the proposed project that must be addressed before the panel can recommend funding; and
3. The panel finds that the proposal does not clearly address the objectives of the Act and/or successful implementation is doubtful.

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

1. Does the proposed project meet the eligibility requirements of the program in Section III and follow the format described in Section V, Application Information, of the Request for Proposals?
2. Will the proposed project reduce the threat of large, high intensity wildfires and the negative effects of excessive competition between trees by restoring ecosystem functions (including healthy watersheds), structures, and species composition, including the reduction of non-native species populations on Federal, Tribal, State, County, and Municipal forest lands?
3. Will the proposed project re-establish fire regimes approximating those that shaped forest ecosystems prior to fire suppression?
4. Will the proposed project replant trees in deforested areas, if they exist, in the proposed project area?
5. Will the proposed project improve the use of, or add value to, small diameter trees?
6. Will the proposed project include a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders as well as appropriate Federal, Tribal, State, County, and Municipal government representatives in the design and implementation of the project?
7. Does the proposal include a plan for a multiparty assessment that will: identify both the existing ecological condition of the proposed project area and the desired future condition; and monitor and report on the positive or negative impact and effectiveness of the project including improvements in local management skills and on the ground results?
8. Does the project proposal incorporate current scientific forest restoration information?

9. Will the proposed project preserve old and large trees?
10. Will the proposed project create local employment or training opportunities within the context of accomplishing restoration objectives? Are these opportunities consistent with the purposes of the program? Are summer youth job programs, such as the Youth Conservation Corps, included where appropriate?
11. Are the proponents capable of successfully implementing the proposed project?
12. Is the proposed activity in a priority area for hazardous fuel reduction?

The Panel also discussed the effect of the proposed project on long-term forest management. Two project proponents provided written comments to the Chair, and addressed the Panel during scheduled public comment periods. The Panel revisited both proposals. One remained at its previous category of decision and the other was raised from a (2) to a (1).

After all the proposals were categorized, the panel determined that the funds requested by the 17 proposals in category (1) exceeded the available CFRP project funding for 2005. The panel used a matrix to select which of the proposals in category (1) should be recommended for funding. The matrix included the following additional criteria to determine which of the proposals in category (1) to recommend for funding:

1. Part of a longer term comprehensive project;
2. Innovative approach that adds value to the CFRP;
3. Sustainability;
4. Quality of the collaboration; and
5. Adding significant capacity to restoration.



Funding Recommendations

Proposal #	Project Title	Contact	Lead Organization	Forest	Forest Service Request	Recommended Funding
CFRP12-05	Alamo Woodland/Forest Management Project	Lynda Taylor	Middleton	Cibola	\$358,210	\$0
CFRP13-05	Apache Collaborative Forest Restoration Proposal	James Kellar	Kellar Logging	Gila	\$119,900	\$0
CFRP14-05	Wood Resource Training Center	Barry Ragsdale	Career Health & Education Program	Gila	\$360,000	\$0
CFRP15-05	San Francisco Hot Springs Area Riparian Restoration Project	Lou Naue	San Francisco River Association	Gila	\$119,780	\$0
CFRP16-05	Improving Efficiency of Small Diameter Mill in Catron County	Alisa Estrada	Catron County Citizens Group	Gila	\$115,150	\$0
CFRP17-05	Biomass Utilization Plan	Joe McEnaney	St. Cloud Mining	Gila	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP18-05	Little Walnut Picnic Area WUI Restoration Project	Glenn Griffith	Gila Tree Thinners	Gila	\$359,009	\$359,009
CFRP19-05	Handing over the Small Diameter Mill Operation to Community Members of Catron County	Sandra Uzueta	Lower Frisco Wood Products	Gila	\$120,000	\$120,000
CFRP20-05	Inter-Tribal Bosque Restoration Along The Rio Grande	Charles Lujan	Pueblo of San Juan	Santa Fe	\$359,957	\$359,957
CFRP21-05	Pueblo de Cochiti Bosque Restoration Project	Roberta Chavez	Pueblo de Cochiti	Santa Fe	\$358,892	\$0
CFRP22-05	Outreach and Education to Enhance the Utilization of Compost and Mulch from Forest Residuals	English Bird	New Mexico Recycling Coalition	Santa Fe	\$187,863	\$187,863
CFRP23-05	Ecological Restoration and Wood Utilization Cooperative in Cuba, NM	James Hughes	Village of Cuba	Santa Fe	\$359,284	\$0

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Funding Recommendations

<b>Proposal #</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Contact</b>	<b>Lead Organization</b>	<b>Forest</b>	<b>Forest Service Request</b>	<b>Recommended Funding</b>
CRP36-05	Return Ecological Integrity to Picuris Forest Stands	Jon Fast Wolf	Picuris Pueblo	Carson	\$360,000	\$0
CFRP37-05	Native Fungi Restoration of Forested Lands, and Products from Thinned Small Diameter Trees	Lynda Taylor	Sustainable Communities	Carson	\$360,000	\$0
CFRP38-05	Equipping the Communities of the Vallecitos Sustained Yield Unit for Economic Utilization of Forest Restoration Products	John Ussery	Las Comunidades	Carson	\$359,287	\$0
CFRP39-05	Cedar Creek Break Restoration Project	Sherry Barrows	Sherry Barrows Strategies	Lincoln	\$360,000	\$360,000
<b>Total Federal Request</b>					<b>\$11,083,652</b>	<b>\$4,131,390</b>

# Recommendations, Strengths, Weakness, and Comments on Grant Applications

## **CFRP PROJECT #: 01-05**

ORGANIZATION: Forest Guild  
FOREST: Cibola  
COMMUNITY: Blue Water, NM  
CONTACT: Laura McCarthy  
PROJECT TITLE: Bluewater Wildland Urban Interface, Pinion Juniper and Meadow Restoration Project  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$359,565  
Matching Funds: \$89,078  
Total Budget: \$448,643  
Recommended Funding: \$359,565  
CATEGORY 1

## **STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders that will be involved in the project.
3. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
4. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health.
5. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
6. The proposal is clear concise, and well organized.
7. Good budget detail and work plan.
8. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
9. The project includes a good youth component, YCC.
10. Has demonstrated a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
11. Strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal
12. Has a clear and specific monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
13. Proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
14. NEPA is complete
15. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
16. This proposal includes treatments that are part of a broader landscape plan to restore natural fire regimes.
17. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
18. Attempts to mitigate a misguided reforestation effort in the 1980's planted pines in meadows.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. No letter of support from a key tribal partner that was described in text.
2. The distinction between this project and previously funded CFRP grants were not clearly described.
3. The proposal does not include private business or utilization collaborators.
4. The business owner should write a business plan with assistance (could use the small business development center.)
5. The match is insufficient, barely.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Adjust the match to required standards.
2. The 424a is incorrect; particularly section B and E.
3. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with businesses that will use the material.
4. Certify that the safety of operators and operations will be assured.
5. Business planning for utilization should take advantage of SBA and Small Business Development Center, and focus on multiple specific local businesses
6. Monitoring should include degree of success of the business plan in establishing or enhancing local businesses.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 02-05**

ORGANIZATION: P&M Plastics  
FOREST: Cibola  
COMMUNITY: Mountainair  
CONTACT: Phil Archuletta  
PROJECT TITLE: Innovative Use of Small Diameter Material from the  
Thunderbird Forest Restoration Project Area of the Cibola  
National Forest  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$360,000  
CATEGORY: 1

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders that will be involved in the project.
3. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
4. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan
5. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
6. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health.

7. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
8. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
9. The project includes a good youth component; YCC.
10. Has demonstrated a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
11. Proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
12. Good budget detail and work plan.
13. NEPA is complete
14. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
15. The proposal contributes additional in-kind contributions beyond the required 20 percent match.
16. Reduces fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico.
17. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
18. This proposal includes treatments that are part of a broader landscape plan to restore natural fire regimes.
19. The proposal recognizes the need for low impact equipment for restoration activities.

**WEAKNESSES:**

20. Proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
21. The proposal did not include documentation of consultation with tribes.
22. Proposal does not address how the material to be removed, except for chips, will be transported from stump to utilization facility.
23. To understand proposals effectiveness, further clarification and more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
24. Safety and training around mechanical removal equipment is lacking.
25. The map provided does not include specific areas to be treated.
26. Youth component lacks detail on what they will learn, how many youth are to be involved, and what they will do.
27. The project depends upon a partnership with Las Humanas to thin and work together on hiring and training crews, yet the commitment to do so is not included in the support letter from George Ramirez.
28. The SF424 is incorrect, section b should only have one column filled out and the 424b assurances are missing.
29. The proposal lacks an estimate of volume to be removed.
30. There is no justification for the need for a feller-buncher based upon volume or market opportunities.
31. There is not enough specific information about the type of feller-buncher to adequately evaluate the need or impacts.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

32. Reevaluate fuel costs.
33. Proponents should collaborate with conservation groups in project design, implementation, and monitoring.
34. Assure that the 424b is complete and signed (assurances need to included and signed.)
35. The proposal would be strengthened by a discussion about how the feller-buncher and associated thinning and log handling techniques will be done in a low-impact manner.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 03-05**

ORGANIZATION: Pueblo of Acoma  
FOREST: Cibola  
COMMUNITY: Acoma, NM  
CONTACT: Samuel F Diswood  
PROJECT TITLE: Improve Forest Health and Wildlife Habitat on the Acoma Indian Reservation  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 2

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes letters of support from Collaborators.
2. The project adequately describes what will be accomplished with requested funds
3. The proposal will improve chances for beneficial wildfire/Rx fire in overstocked Pinon/Juniper areas by improving understory species that could carry a fire.
4. The proposal will decrease the chance for a total stand replacement wildfire (this is not necessarily a strength in this habitat type)
5. The project attempts to remedy a project that was not completed 50 years ago.
6. The project removes small diameter trees and protects old and large trees.
7. The project attempts to restore meadow to a natural state.
8. The project is clear, concise and well organized.
9. The project fits into an ecosystem approach, being a small part of a larger plan to treat over 54,000 acres on Cebollita Mesa. CFRP funds were used in 2001 in the area, as well as fuelwood sales for tribal members.
10. The project attempts to return native grasses to the areas.
11. Youth are involved from NMSU and SIPI.
12. The project has a strong monitoring plan, in theory.
13. NEPA will be done in the first year, allowing for greater collaboration and coordination with other stakeholders.
14. Budget items and salary (except for a \$41,000 truck) look appropriate.
15. Safety and safety training on crews are addressed in the proposal.

16. Equipment to be used will work with targeted species.
17. The proposal calls the CFRP program, prestigious.
18. The budget indicates an additional \$390,500 in-kind above the required match.
19. Multiple partners from outside the tribe including NMSU and Forest Service.
20. Has demonstrated a commitment to wildlife monitoring (elk telemetry study).

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. The proposal has a small list of collaborators who are actually involved in project design and implementation, SIPI, and Forest Service are only involved in collaboration as a field trip at the end of the project.
2. The project does not include a utilization plan or possible use of material generated by the project.
- 3.

Recommendations, Strengths, Weakness, and Comments on Grant Applications

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. The SF424 is incorrect.
2. The narrative does not effectively support the work plan and budget.
3. Certify that the safety of operators and operations will be assured in herbicide use.
4. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
5. The matching unit costs appear excessive, particularly the chainsaw rental.
6. The collaboration is primarily internal within the tribe.
7. The personnel costs seem to include contractor costs that are supposed to be in a different category.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The proposal would be strengthened by partnering with San Felipe Pueblo due to a shared boundary.
2. Proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups.
3. Move truck lease from equipment to other.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 05-05**

ORGANIZATION: Canyon De Carnue Land Grant  
FOREST: Cibola  
COMMUNITY: Tijeras, NM  
CONTACT: Moises Gonzales  
PROJECT TITLE: Building Community Land Grant Business, and Workforce Capacity To Perform Forest Restoration  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$346,501  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$85,740  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$432,241  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 2

**STRENGTHS:**

1. Strong education and outreach emphasis
2. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
3. Reduces fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico.
4. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
5. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health.
6. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
7. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
8. This is the first application from a community land grant.

9. The proposal addresses riparian health by reestablishing stream meandering.
10. The proposal addresses highway drainage mitigation.
11. Two land grants working together with outreach to other land grants is commendable.

### **WEAKNESSES:**

1. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal.
2. The proposal lacks detailed budget and work plan.
3. The proposal did not include documentation of consultation with tribes.
4. The proposal lists contractors in the budget as match without letters of commitment.
5. No qualification for included contractors was submitted with proposal.
6. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
7. The SF424 is incorrect; the assurances are incomplete.
8. The SF424 section B and C are incorrect, and Section D is not filled out.
9. It is unlikely the proponents can complete the NEPA and associated surveys in one year.
10. NEPA is not included in the budget.
11. The proposal lacks a clear distinction between NEPA and baseline information.
12. The non-Federal match is less than 20 percent, barely.
13. CFRP funds cannot be used to cut old and large trees.
14. Milestones are too general.
15. The proposal lacks clear and specific treatment plan.
16. No discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan.
17. There is limited discussion on uses of removed material.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Partnering with adjacent landowners or managers would strengthen the proposal.
2. Documentation of letters sent to potentially affected tribes should be included.
3. The Forest Service is responsible for verifying that appropriate NEPA is completed.
4. Need to describe in more detail the youth and training component.
5. The proposal could be strengthened by participation from local irrigation districts.
6. Consulting with the Army Corp of Engineers regarding the re-establishment of stream meandering could strengthen the proposal.
7. Assure support letters document commitments to matching funds, roles, responsibilities.

### **CFRP PROJECT #: 06-05**

ORGANIZATION: Claunch – Pinto Soil & Water Conservation District  
FOREST: Cibola  
COMMUNITY: Mountainair, NM  
CONTACT: Dierdre L Tarr  
PROJECT TITLE: Tajique Capacity Initiative in Forest Restoration and Monitoring

FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 1

**STRENGTHS:**

1. Proposal has a strong youth component, with both a YCC crew and workshops for youth focusing on medicinal plants and healthy forests
2. Fifty percent of the area to be treated is in the WUI
3. Treatment prescription calls for leaving clumps of trees, which will be more natural than regular spacing.
4. Slash will be treated.
5. Multiparty monitoring encompasses both ecological conditions and improvement in local management skills
6. Partner roles are well-described
7. Proponent has a strong track record of collaborating with partners on projects and monitoring.
8. Reduces fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico.
9. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
10. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
11. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
12. The project is consistent with HFRA.
13. Includes a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders.
14. Las Humanas, a past CFRP grantee, will be training the Chilili thinning crew.
15. The project would compliment treatment on private land done by the Soil and Water Conservation District.
16. The proposed project is an opportunity to treat the entire Tajique watershed by leveraging other funds and collaborating with other public and private land owners and partners.
17. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
18. Improves the use of and value of small diameter material.
19. Incorporates current scientific information.
20. Creates local employment for Chilili and Las Humanas.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. The SF424 is incorrect as it shows 4 yr of funding for total more than \$360,000 Federal funding.

4. The treatment areas were unclear in the maps provided.
5. No discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan.
6. The distinction between this project and previously funded CFRP grants were not clearly described.
7. Proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
8. Monitoring does not include indicators for proposal objectives D and F.
9. The budget reflects sawlog removal to the mill, but does not mention how logs will be skidded or loaded on the trucks.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Support letters need to reflect commitment of collaborators to roles and responsibilities (and financial obligations where appropriate) described in the proposal.
2. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups in project design, implementation, and monitoring.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 07-05**

ORGANIZATION: Ramah Navajo Community Enterprises, Inc.  
FOREST: Cibola  
COMMUNITY: Ramah, NM  
CONTACT: Jay Moolenijzer  
PROJECT TITLE: Forest Restoration Native Plant Nursery Project  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$371,151  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$78,849  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 1

**STRENGTHS:**

1. This project could add an important element to forest restoration practice. Restoration implies the return of ecosystem composition and function, including native species and disturbances, such as appropriate fire regimes. Having native plant species available could make forest restoration more feasible.
2. This is a well integrated plan to utilize small-diameter timber to fuel the heating of a greenhouse for propagation of native plants, to be used in comprehensive restoration efforts
3. Proponents appear to understand of the biomass and greenhouse infrastructure required. Acknowledgement that an experienced greenhouse manager and horticulturalist would have to be recruited, and that this might take some time for recruitment, reflects a realistic approach that will make success more likely.
4. Proposal presents a vision for a need and potentially profitable business that could supply the region with an affordable supply of native plants for revegetation applications.

5. Proposal builds on strong current collaboration between Ramah Band of Navajos and many partners
6. The budget appears to be sound, well planned and appropriate. Salaries are modest.
7. The multi-party monitoring plan is a combination of assessment of activities to determine the appropriateness of implementation, the level of community involvement and perception of the project, and an experimental project to assess the effectiveness of native species establishment, via a control-treatment design involving four 5-acres treatment plots.
8. The proposal is clear concise, and well organized.
9. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
10. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
11. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators
12. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders that will be involved in the project.
13. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan
14. Good budget detail and work plan.
15. Includes a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders.
16. The proposed project is innovative.

**WEAKNESSES:**

17. Milestones are too general.
18. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
19. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.
20. SF424 in incorrect, section B. In year 3 the budget does not add up correctly, proposal budget goes over \$450,000 limit.
21. The detailed budget justification worksheet does not follow RFP guidelines.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 08-05**

ORGANIZATION: Tree New Mexico, Inc.  
FOREST: Cibola  
COMMUNITY: Albuquerque, NM  
CONTACT: Suzanne Probart  
PROJECT TITLE: Reinventing the Bosque: A New Future for the Rio Grande  
Valley State Park  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$342,112  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$85,528  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$427,640  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 1-

### **STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators
2. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health.
3. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
4. This project leverages other projects and funding into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
5. The project includes a good youth component; YCC.
6. Has demonstrated a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. Proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
8. Good budget detail.
9. The proposal included a detailed monitoring plan.
10. There is a clear description how this proposal differs from previous CFRP grants.
11. The education and outreach component is strong.
12. The proposal would restore several vegetative components of the Bosque.
13. The project objectives are a good match to CFRP as the goal is to move beyond fuels reduction to the restoration of the Bosque.
14. Help to reduce fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico.
15. This project will reduce the risk of future high-intensity wildfire by reverting to pretreatment conditions through eventual planting of native vegetation.
16. Innovative use of jetty jacks.

### **WEAKNESSES:**

1. Milestones are too general.
2. The treatment areas were unclear in the maps provided.
3. Proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
4. The SF424 is incomplete, section A and the assurances are incomplete.
5. Cost of seed and other elements appear to be missing.
6. Unit costs in the budget are incorrect, (hydro gel, tubes, trees, and safety equipment).
7. There is no letter from ERI committing their support to development of a management plan.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Prior to grant award clarify that appropriate NEPA clearances have been completed for the use of Federal funds.
2. Proposal could be strengthened by including a larger group of diverse and balanced group of stakeholders in the development of the plan.
3. Before grant award more specific milestones need to be identified.
4. Prior to award certify that minimum liability insurance is in place.

5. Clarify who will do thinning maintenance and how it will be funded.
6. Certify that the safety of operators and operations will be assured.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 09-05**

ORGANIZATION: Pueblo of Santa Ana  
FOREST: Cibola  
COMMUNITY: Santa Ana Pueblo, NM  
CONTACT: Governor Lorenzo Montoya  
PROJECT TITLE: Santa Ana Rio Grande Restoration Project  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$359,996  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$89,998  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$449,994  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$359,996  
CATEGORY: 1

**STRENGTHS:**

1. Overall, very strong proposal that is a good fit to CFRP.
2. Contributes to broader and to-date successful restoration effort.
3. Robust ecological monitoring: Ecological monitoring tiers to existing baseline and relates changes in vegetation to wildlife habitat use.
4. Detailed budget justification.
5. Detailed work / restoration plan.
6. Proponents have a demonstrated track record of success.
7. The applicant has done a good job of addressing the panel's prior recommendations.
8. Strong foundation of science.
9. Creates several new restoration jobs.
10. Roles of partners clearly depicted.
11. The proposal is clear concise, and well organized.
12. Outreach effort with neighboring tribes.
13. Proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
14. Reduces fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico.
15. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
16. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health.
17. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
18. This project involves elders. Information from them will be used to guide restoration plans.
19. The proposal complements WUI projects already funded and in place.
20. NEPA ready.

21. The proposal includes strong letters of support from Cibola NF describing specific accomplishments under previous CFRP grants.
22. Clear explanation of the current proposal and previous CFRP grant

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. Needs better rationale for chipping / chip spreading / lack of utilization.
2. Needs to better address personnel safety training / procedures.
3. The 424a is incorrect, section A and B, and Box A on the 424 indicates a new proposal and not a revision.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**CFRP PROJECT #: 10-05**

ORGANIZATION: Valencia Soil & Water Conservation District  
FOREST: Cibola  
COMMUNITY: Valencia County, NM  
CONTACT: Madeline Miller  
PROJECT TITLE: Los Lunas Westside Bosque Restoration Project  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$100,000  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$25,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$125,000  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 2

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders that will be involved in the project, especially MRGCD.
2. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire
3. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration
4. Has demonstrated a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
5. Both Valencia S&WCD and one of its partners are past CFRP grant recipients and proposal refers to past projects as being successfully implemented.
6. Reduces fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico.
7. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
8. Using native species for reforestation of the Bosque.
9. The work plan is based on current knowledge of Bosque restoration techniques identifying a three-year treatment cycle, initial treatment to final herbicide application.
10. There is a clear and concise work plan.
11. The partners are highly qualified and capable and their roles are clearly defined.
12. The objectives are clearly defined.

13. There is a clear explanation of the relationship between this proposal and the previous CFRP grant.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. The SF424 is incorrect.
2. The proposal lacks detailed budget and work plan.
3. Certify that the safety of operators and operations will be assured.
4. The proposal did not include documentation of consultation with tribes
5. The proposal does not demonstrate strong youth and educational component.
6. The fuel reduction treatment at \$1800/acre seems excessive.
7. Work plan does not include baseline monitoring.
8. The proposal needs discussion of herbicide use effects and mitigation.
9. Detailed budget does not follow RFP budget format.
10. Detailed budget is unclear and incomplete, some unit costs are missing and travel costs are included in the wrong area.
11. Milestones are missing.
12. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
13. The monitoring plan lacks clear indicators.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Utilization component should be considered.
2. Clarify timeline for environmental compliance and NEPA.
3. Clarify that the city is providing the match for contractor costs in the budget.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 11-05**

ORGANIZATION: Desert Sky Planning  
FOREST: Cibola  
COMMUNITY: Moriarty, NM  
CONTACT: Amanda Suzanne Odom  
PROJECT TITLE: Restoring Pine Forests and Rehabilitating the Watershed for  
Crystal Navajo Chapter  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$337,535  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$70,200  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$407,735  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 1-

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators

2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders that will be involved in the project.
3. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
4. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan
5. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health.
6. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
7. The proposal is clear concise, and well organized.
8. The project includes a good youth component; YCC.
9. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
10. Good budget detail and work plan.
11. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
12. Including elders to work with youth is innovative.
13. Has a clear and specific monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
14. Project fits within the scope of a reservation wide wildland urban interface strategy initiated in 2003, in which Crystal was considered a priority area.
15. The proponent has plans to continue the YCC program using state funds after project ends.
16. Involves planting trees in deforested areas.
17. The proposed activities encompass a broad range of restoration activities. The project integrates the thinning byproducts into the watershed rehabilitation.

#### **WEAKNESSES:**

1. The treatment areas were unclear in the maps provided.
2. No discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan beyond fire regime condition class.
3. Match is under 20 percent.
4. Not clear how slash will be treated.
5. ERI and ICE are mentioned in the narrative but not in the list of project partners, and there are no letters of commitment from them.
6. SF424 is incorrect, section D, no employee ID number.
7. Project partners should be more diverse and balanced; those listed in the proposals are mostly tribal entities.
8. Detailed budget does not have clear unit costs/units for supplies.
9. Contractor match isn't supported by the letter of commitment.
10. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Clarify planting stock types to be used in riparian restoration.

2. Proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups, especially Navajo forest activists.
3. Prior to award proponent needs to demonstrate that they have minimum liability insurance as set by Federal standards.
4. Provide clarification on costs per acre for thinning.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 12-05**

ORGANIZATION: Alamo Navajo School Board, Inc  
FOREST: Cibola  
COMMUNITY: Magdalena, NM  
CONTACT: Lynda G Middleton  
PROJECT TITLE: Alamo Woodland/Forest Management Project  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$358,210  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,336  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$448,546  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 2

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal makes an attempt to bring the Alamo Navajo into the Forest Restoration Process by establishing a Department of Nature Resources.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders that will be involved in the project.
3. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
4. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health.
5. The proposal is designed to preserve old and large trees
6. The project includes a good youth component; YCC.
7. The proposal addresses a need in an area of high unemployment.
8. The project has the potential to re-establish natural fire regimes, but there is no specific commitment from the BLM or Forest Service to pursue this.
9. Has a clear and specific monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. The SF424 is incorrect.
2. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.
3. The project will not add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
4. The letter of support from the BLM is weak and lacks specific support for the project.
5. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal.
6. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities, and the number of acres to be treated.
7. Much of the project is contingent upon negotiations that are not yet complete.

8. No estimation when the NEPA process will be completed.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The proponents could utilize other BLM NEPA ready lands that could be worked on in the short-term until the NEPA documents are completed on USFS lands.
2. Proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups.
3. Documentation of letters sent to potentially affected tribes should be included.
4. Clarify the source of the non-Federal match in the budget, especially regarding contractors.
5. The proposal should be more focused on initial treatments and shorter term goals, with appropriate milestones.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 13-05**

ORGANIZATION: Kellar Logging, Inc  
FOREST: Gila  
COMMUNITY: Reserve, NM  
CONTACT: James E Kellar  
PROJECT TITLE: Apache Collaborative Forest Restoration Project  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$119,900  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$24,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$143,900  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 1

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators.
2. Reduces fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico.
3. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
4. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan
5. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health.
6. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
7. The proposal is clear concise, and well organized.
8. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
9. The project includes a good youth component; YCC.
10. Has demonstrated a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
11. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
12. NEPA is complete
13. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.

14. This proposal includes treatments that are part of a broader landscape plan to restore natural fire regimes.
15. Strong letter of support from the Forest Service District Ranger.
16. The logs from the forest restoration treatments will go the Catron County Citizens Group Sawmill and sort yard, a previous CFRP Grant Recipient.
17. Multiple and diverse partners are involved in project design, implementation, and monitoring.
18. Two academic institutions are involved as partners to incorporate current scientific information.
19. Fifteen jobs will be created in Catron County.
20. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and prescribed fire.
21. The proponent has demonstrated a proven track record of successful implementation.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. Budget does not include clear unit costs.
2. Milestones are too general.
3. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
4. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.
5. Youth component lacks detail on what they will learn, how many youth are to be involved, and what they will do.
6. Being a near duplication of a previous proposal, no new learning or adaptation was presented.
7. The match is less than 20 percent.
8. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Work to coordinate the material delivery with the Reserve Mill.
2. The budget lists \$750 in match without adequate description of source or commitment (YCC).

**CFRP PROJECT #: 14-05**

ORGANIZATION: Career Health and Education Program  
FOREST: Gila  
COMMUNITY: Truth or Consequences, NM  
CONTACT: Barry Ragsdale  
PROJECT TITLE: Wood Resources Training Center  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0

CATEGORY: 1-

**STRENGTHS:**

1. Reduces fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico.
2. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health.
3. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
4. Strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal
5. Has demonstrated a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
6. The applicant has done a good job of addressing the panel's prior recommendations.
7. There is strong letter of support from the local District Ranger.
8. Does have a business plan in place, with markets identified.
9. Provides innovative use of salt cedar to value added products.
10. The proposal has a firm commitment from the bank for funding.
11. The salaries are in-line with the local living wage.
12. This project will indirectly reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
13. The proposal will indirectly preserve old and large trees.
14. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and prescribed fire.
15. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
16. This proposal includes treatments that are part of a broader landscape plan to restore natural fire regimes.
17. The project expects to be financially self-sustaining in three years.
18. The project partners include two large private landowners.
19. Three Universities are included as collaborators.
20. Proponent has over 25 years of experience in building material industry and has operated profitable businesses in the past.
21. This is a 501c(3) organization that gives it an advantage over for profit organizations.

**WEAKNESSES:**

22. The narrative does not effectively support the work plan and budget.
23. Certify that the safety of operators and operations will be assured.
24. Letters of commitment from all partners, indicating their roles and responsibilities, were not included in the proposal.
25. Details on multi-party monitoring are incomplete.
26. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the proposed activities.
27. Detailed budget does not follow RFP budget format.
28. The SF424 is incorrect, specifically title in Block 11.

29. Total column of year 1 detailed budget is incorrect.
30. Proposal lacks specific information about youth involvement; how many, what they will do, etc.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

31. Provides letters of commitment from appropriate partners, including the Rio Grande Salt Cedar provider, Wahoo Watershed Workgroup, and other contractors.
32. Provide more detailed information on how the marketing money will be spent.
33. Provide indicators and how they will be measured in monitoring plan.
34. Provide clarification on roles and responsibilities for monitoring plan partners.
35. Provide clear description how budget is aligned with work proposed.
36. Match in the budget needs to be supported by a letter of commitment.
37. Including documentation of market potential would strengthen the proposal.
38. A letter from contractors supporting commitment and match should be included.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 15-05**

ORGANIZATION: San Francisco River Association  
FOREST: Gila  
COMMUNITY: Glenwood, NM  
CONTACT: Lou Naue  
PROJECT TITLE: San Francisco Hot Springs Area Riparian Restoration Project  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$119,790  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$51,390  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$171,170  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 1-

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders that will be involved in the project.
3. Has a clear and specific monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
4. Project will reduce effects of flooding.
5. This is a strong riparian restoration project.
6. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
7. Has demonstrated a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
8. The proponents have extensive experience in riparian restoration.
9. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
10. The project would re-plant native vegetation in the riparian areas.

11. Proposed riparian restoration techniques are based on sound science and proven techniques.
12. Project has good collaboration in project design and implementation.
13. Fifteen jobs will be created.
14. The San Francisco River Association has a proven track record for getting funding to the ground and communities.
15. Proven track record of success in implementing a prior CFRP grant.
16. Excellent upfront collaboration with local Forest Service District.
17. Proposal includes an environmental interpretation component.
18. Proposal will contribute to wildlife habitat restoration, including threatened and endangered species.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. The SF424 is incorrect, specifically the assurances are not signed, and Section D.
2. The proposal is unclear on how tasks will be accomplished
3. Project will treat exotics but does not explain how re-growth will be controlled.
4. Proposal lacks detailed explanation and justification.
5. The proposal does not address how the recreation impacts that lead to degradation will be mitigated during and after restoration.
6. The project budget exceeds the \$150,000 annual cap.
7. It is not clear what the units are in the detailed budget
8. The work plan and monitoring plan do not include an implementation timeline with specific milestones.
9. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
10. The project lacks a diverse and balanced group of collaborators.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Youth component could be strengthened.
2. Proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups.
3. Clarify how the recreation impacts that lead to degradation will be mitigated during and after restoration.
4. Twenty percent match in the proposal budget and 424, over match can be covered in the narrative.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 16-05**

ORGANIZATION:	Catron County Citizens Group
FOREST:	Gila
COMMUNITY:	Reserve, NM
CONTACT:	Alisa Estrada
PROJECT TITLE:	Improving Efficiency of Small Diameter Mill in Catron County

FUNDING REQUESTED: \$115,150  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$29,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$144,150  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 2

**STRENGTHS:**

1. Letter includes letters of support from collaborators and stakeholders that will be involved in the project.
2. Indirectly helps to reduce fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico (Catron County in its entirety is considered 1 of the 20 Communities (WUI and major watersheds).
3. Project will indirectly reduce risk of high-intensity wildfire by providing and increasing and improving a utilization point infrastructure.
4. Project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
5. Project will uses small diameter material from NEPA ready forest health restoration projects.
6. Proposal is clear and concise and well organized.
7. Project improves efficiency in one of the few milling sites in Southwest New Mexico.
8. Project includes a good youth component specifically YCC funding already approved.
9. There has been strong collaboration from all parties for multiple years to support the development of the mill.
10. Proponent or their cooperators have extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
11. Work plan and budget detail complete.
12. Citizen's Group has contracted with third party monitor and implement monitoring program that will assess the success of existing operations, youth development and forest monitoring.
13. ERI Monitoring Partnership also included in multiparty monitoring process.
14. Proposal will insure long-term stability of a processing plant that will be able to utilize products from forest restoration products in and around Catron County.
15. Proposal leverages funds received from RCA, Four Corners/Southwest Sustainable Initiative, EAP, RBEG, and YCC.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. Certify that the safety of operators and operations will be assured.
2. SF424 is incorrect.
3. Emphasis on monitoring program should address increased efficiency and production due to improvements at mill site.
4. Proponent Greenhouse should have clarified the reasons for increasing the size of the original Greenhouse.
5. Proposal doesn't identify who will do the improvements and upgrades at the mill; it only lists number of units.

6. Proposal does not address how the improved efficiency and upgrades will result in increased volume of forest products utilized and processed and a greater value product.
7. The distinction between this project and previously funded CFRP grants were not clearly described.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Explain why the proposed activities do not duplicate the activities funded under CFRP 30-01.
2. The new grant award cannot be made until the previous grant, CFRP 30-01, has been completed including submission of multi-party assessment.
3. List people not receiving fringe benefits as contractors.
4. Clarify the match and assure the proper contractor letter of commitment is included.
5. Provide unit costs and number of units on collaborative process budget line.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 17-05**

ORGANIZATION: St. Cloud Mining  
FOREST: Gila  
COMMUNITY: Truth or Consequences, NM  
CONTACT: Joe Paul McEnaney  
PROJECT TITLE: Wahoo Watershed Workgroup – St. Cloud Mining Biomass Utilization Plan for Forest Restoration  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$360,000  
CATEGORY: 1

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders that will be involved in the project.
3. Reduces fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico.
4. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan
5. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan
6. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
7. The proposal is clear concise, and well organized.
8. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
9. The project includes a good youth component; YCC.
10. Strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal
11. The youth forestry field camp will provide three paid positions for students to conduct monitoring with oversight from licensed science teacher

12. The proponent sent a letter to a potentially affected tribe that was not actually listed on the RFP.
13. The cost for chipping hauling and handling material will be evaluated in the monitoring component.
14. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health.
15. The biomass-to-heat in which the project will supply material has a strong emphasis from legislative and executive branches of New Mexico State Government.
16. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
17. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and prescribed fire.
18. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
19. This proposal includes treatments that are part of a broader landscape plan to restore natural fire regimes.
20. Includes a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders.
21. NEPA is complete
22. The proponent plans on being sustainable after three years.
23. The proponent has proposed to spend a substantial amount of money to purchase the biomass heating combustion system.
24. The proponent has a letter of support from a conservation group.
25. The treatment detail is included in the Forest Service summary of decision.
26. The project builds upon ecological monitoring down by the Wahoo Watershed Working Group and the SWCD previous CFRP grant.
27. Jobs will be created for Kellar logging.

#### **WEAKNESSES:**

1. Budget does not include some unit costs.
2. Detailed budget does not follow RFP budget format.
3. Certify that the safety of operators and operations will be assured.
4. The monitoring component lacked clear measures.
5. The SF424 section B is incorrect, specifically box 11, the title.
6. The focus of the monitoring is on the economics of small diameter biomass utilization, but most of the grant request is for forest restoration work.
7. The proposal lacks estimates of volumes to be created versus the volumes needed.
8. The proposal is unclear on details regarding the match with regard to the CFRP workshop.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Cost in biomass maintenance need to be redirected to personnel costs.
2. The proposal could be strengthened by more detail on the biomass heating system and facility proposed.
3. The proponent should better evaluate material quantities and material flows.

4. Clarify the match regarding travel to the CFRP for Kellar logging and the grant proponent is not listed as attending.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 18-05**

ORGANIZATION: Gila Tree Thinners  
FOREST: Gila  
COMMUNITY: Silver City, NM  
CONTACT: Glenn Thomas Griffin  
PROJECT TITLE: Little Walnut Picnic Area WUI Restoration Project  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$359,009  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$449,009  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$359,009  
CATEGORY: 1

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders.
3. Reduces fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk
4. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire
5. The fire blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
6. The project will add capacity to restoration effort (equipment purchases)
7. The project includes removal of small diameter material to improve forest health
8. The proposed activities will preserve old and large trees.
9. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area
10. Treatments based on current science (historical reconstructions)
11. The project has a good youth component
12. Proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities
13. NEPA is near completed,
14. Great public outreach efforts (summer science academy and other educational outreach activities).
15. Good detailed work plan.
16. Practical monitoring plan, specifically monitoring “turnover rate of the crew” is innovative and may be quite informative

**Weaknesses:**

1. Letters missing from forest service committing to monitoring activities.
2. No monitoring of market development efforts (economic monitoring is focused on treatment costs not market development).
3. Detailed budget does not follow 2005 CFRP RFP budget format.
4. Certify that the safety of operators and operations will be assured.

**Recommendations:**

1. Purchase of equipment and supplies should come after NEPA is completed
2. Clarify the administrative and monitoring costs to assure they are in the right category and what the costs are composed.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 19-05**

ORGANIZATION: Lower Frisco Wood Products  
FOREST: Gila  
COMMUNITY: Reserve, NM  
CONTACT: Sandra Ann Uzueta  
PROJECT TITLE: Handing Over the Small Diameter Mill Operation to Community Members of Catron County  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$120,000  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$30,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$150,000  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$120,000  
CATEGORY: 1

**STRENGTHS:**

1. Has a clear and specific multi-party monitoring plan.
2. The project will indirectly reduce fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico.
3. Proponent has a solid record of working with YCC and other youth programs.
4. Project builds on success of past CFRP projects in the area, including the CFRP funding that assisted with the “start-up” of this mill.
5. There is strong support from the community for this proposal, as it will continue operation of the small-diameter mill and will provide related jobs.
6. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
7. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders that will be involved in the project.
8. The proposal is clear concise, and well organized.
9. There is a strong letter of support that highlights the available wood material.
10. The proposed project has an excellent opportunity to document the challenges and successes when local workers take over a local small diameter utilization facility.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities; it is unclear how much material will be treated and from where.
2. Milestones are too general.

3. The majority of material processed with equipment purchased with CFRP funds must come from public lands; proponents do identify NEPA ready areas as source of small diameter material.
4. Budget identifies contingency expenditures, which are not allowed (equipment repair should they be needed).
5. There is insufficient detail to distinguish between past grant purchases and this request.
6. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Seek supplemental training funding from other sources such as Implan training, JTPA, and WIA.
2. Explain more clearly why the proposed activities and equipment do not duplicate the activities funded under CFRP 17-04.
3. The proponent should better evaluate material quantities and material flows.
4. CFRP funds cannot be used to purchase logs funded in a different CFRP grant or from private lands or old and large trees.
5. Small Business Development Center could be consulted for potential business training.
6. Prior to award contingency costs need to be taken out of budget.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 20-05**

ORGANIZATION: Pueblo of San Juan  
FOREST: Santa Fe  
COMMUNITY: San Juan Pueblo, NM  
CONTACT: Charles W. Lujan  
PROJECT TITLE: Inter-Tribal Bosque Restoration Along the Rio Grande  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$359,957  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$449,957  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$359,957  
CATEGORY: 1

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators
2. The project will reduce the risk of wildfire in New Mexico
3. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health
4. The proposal will preserve old and large trees
5. The proposal is clear and concise and well organized
6. Project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration
7. The project includes a strong youth component, YCC
8. Proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities and in implementing a prior CFRP grant.

9. Good budget detail and work plan
10. The proposal includes collaboration between two tribes on a restoration treatment.
11. This project will remove non-native and plant native trees, shrubs, grasses, and forbs.
12. As proponents state in the proposal, restoration of natural fire regimes mean less fire, not more fire in the Bosque.
13. This project has the potential to consolidate and extend success of Bosque restoration far beyond the 120 acres proposed for treatment.
14. They will work with partners from multiple pueblos on reaching a common definition of riparian restoration success.
15. The proposal includes an evaluation of whether seeds sprout from shredded non-native tree material.
16. Proponents will form joint multi-pueblo implementation and monitoring teams.
17. The solid monitoring plan will be modified with input from ERI and discussions with participants from multiple pueblos.
18. There was some focus on restoring hydrologic function, as well as the riparian vegetation.
19. Good description of herbicide application according to label.
20. Project will reduce fire threat in an extremely critical area, specifically the Big Rock Unit that is located in downtown Espanola.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. Proposal lacks specifics on YCC involvement.
2. Plan calls for re-vegetation, yet the budget does not cover the proposed purchase of plant material.
3. The proposal is unclear and should have included information on prior treatments in the proposed project area.
4. The 424a is incorrect particularly section B.
5. The indirect charges exceed 10 percent.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Collaborating with the City of Espanola could strengthen proposal.
2. The proposal could be strengthened by including information on prior treatments in the proposed project area.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 21-05**

ORGANIZATION:	Pueblo de Cochiti
FOREST:	Santa Fe
COMMUNITY:	Cochiti Pueblo, NM
CONTACT:	Roberta L Chavez
PROJECT TITLE:	Pueblo de Cochiti Bosque Restoration Project
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$358,892
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,288

TOTAL BUDGET: \$449,180  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 2

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders that will be involved in the project.
3. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
4. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health.
5. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
6. The project includes a good youth component; YCC and involvement of elders.
7. Has demonstrated a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
8. Good budget detail.
9. Has a clear and specific monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
10. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
11. NEPA is complete
12. The proponents collaborated with the neighboring Pueblo.
13. The proposal includes wildlife monitoring.
14. The proposal has a slash treatment plan.
15. The proponents have demonstrated ability to complete the project.
16. The proposal follows a completed comprehensive management plan.
17. Passing on knowledge of bosque and bosque importance thru language program.
18. The project has baseline data that can be used to evaluate project effectiveness.
19. Reduces fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico.
20. Proponent includes the safety of operators and operations.
21. The proposal reforests the bosque.
22. 270 acres are proposed for treatment in three years.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. CFRP funds cannot be used to cut old and large trees.
2. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal.
3. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
4. The project will not add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
5. No discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan.

6. There is no budget justification.
7. Detailed budget does not follow RFP budget format.
8. The SF424 is incorrect, section B.
9. The proposal lacks detailed work plan.
10. No improved use or value added component.
11. There is not a clear definition of equipment needed to complete the project.
12. Milestones are too general
13. Proposal lacks explanation of how they will prevent resprouting of exotics.
14. The proposal does not include sufficient information on what species will be introduced or eliminated.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups.
2. A letter from the Forest that would administer the grant should be included.
3. Prior to award budget categories from the 424 should be followed and costs reorganized accordingly.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 22-05**

ORGANIZATION: New Mexico Recycling Association  
FOREST: Santa Fe  
COMMUNITY: Santa Fe, NM  
CONTACT: English Bird  
PROJECT TITLE: Outreach and Education to Enhance the Utilization of Compost and Mulch from Forest Residuals  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$187,863  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$48,276  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$236,139  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$187,863  
CATEGORY: 1

**STRENGTHS:**

1. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
2. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts
3. The proposal is clear concise, and well organized.
4. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
5. The project includes a good youth component; YCC.
6. Strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal
7. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
8. Good work plan.

9. The proposal includes 19 strong letters of support and/or commitment from collaborators including 5 participating tribes.
10. Has a clear and specific monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
11. Indirectly, the project could increase the use of wildland fire use and prescribed fire.
12. Strong public outreach and education component.
13. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
14. Composting slash is a potentially viable alternative to burning in very high risk areas.
15. This project will create demonstration sites at three CFRP funded project sites, each will involve youth, and each is in a different vegetation type and land ownership.
16. Demonstrates slash treatment areas in 2 of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico that have limitations to conventional slash treatment.
17. The project proposes an innovative use for biomass from Bosque restoration projects.
18. Markets have already been identified and confirmed.
19. Includes a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders.
20. The products envisioned could lead to a sustainable small diameter utilization industry.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. The proposal lacks sufficient detail on processing rates and demand for compost.
2. The SF424 is incorrect, sections B and D.
3. The proposal lacks a budget justification for the number of hours for contractors.
4. The NMDOT letter does not confirm match.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Educational outreach component should include discussion the nutrient and other ecological impacts by removing all material or chipping and spreading
2. Educational and outreach component should include cons as well as pros
3. Prior to award the budget needs to be clarified regarding indirect costs, non Federal match.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 23-05**

ORGANIZATION: Village of Cuba, New Mexico  
FOREST: Santa Fe  
COMMUNITY: Cuba, NM  
CONTACT: James Richard Hughes II  
PROJECT TITLE: Ecological Restoration and Wood Utilization Cooperative in Cuba NM  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$359,284  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$89,892  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$449,266  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 2

## **STRENGTHS:**

1. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
2. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan
3. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health.
4. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
5. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
6. The project includes a good youth component; YCC.
7. Exceptional collaboration prior to submission of proposal
8. Has a clear and specific monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
9. NEPA is complete
10. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
11. Includes a very large group of diverse and balanced group of stakeholders.
12. The project will provide employment in an economically depressed area.
13. The project proposes to add value to small diameter trees.
14. One of the project partners has received two previous CFRP awards.
15. The proponent has agreements with two of its partners from whom wood supply will be obtained for the log sort yard.
16. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and prescribed fire.
17. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders that will be involved in the project.
18. BLM assistance agreement is in place that will provide over 2100 acres of Pinyon and juniper fuelwood, 200 acres of which is NEPA complete. An additional 1900 acres will be NEPA complete in 2006.
19. This proposal outlines an ambitious business cluster around small diameter utilization that is thoughtfully designed.

## **WEAKNESSES:**

1. Budget does not include clear unit costs, specifically “business plan for each wood cluster enterprise.”
2. The SF424 is incorrect
3. Ownership of the industrial park and log sort yard has not been determined and NEPA is required for land development at sort yard.
4. Funds for construction of the industrial park have not been secured.
5. Letters of commitments from all partners indicating their roles and responsibilities were not included in the proposal.
6. The letter from the Navajo Nation does not commit to the stated match for the youth component.
7. Capital for log sort yard has not been secured.
8. This proposal proposes to pay a quarter of the funds for many services that may be available through other existing agencies.
9. This project appears too ambitious for the money and time budgeted.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Utilize existing agency assistance programs for securing technical assistance.
2. Verify match from Navajo Nation for youth component.
3. If awarded, provide documentation that the match from American Forest Products is non-Federal in nature.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 24-05**

ORGANIZATION: Jemez Mountain School  
FOREST: Santa Fe  
COMMUNITY: Gallina, NM  
CONTACT: Robert Archuleta  
PROJECT TITLE: Hazardous Fuel Reduction through Wood Chip Utilization at Jemez Mountain School District  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$360,000  
CATEGORY: 1

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders that will be involved in the project.
3. Reduces fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico.
4. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
5. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan
6. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
7. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health.
8. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
9. The proposal is clear concise, and well organized.
10. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
11. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
12. The project includes a good youth component; YCC.
13. Strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
14. Has demonstrated a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
15. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
16. NEPA is complete
17. Includes a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders.

18. The proposal ensures the safety of operators and operations.
19. The letter from the line officer is excellent and describes their roles and responsibilities.
20. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
21. This project provides critical supply for a unique biomass heating system.
22. Velasquez logging will use some of the material for other value added products.
23. Provides excellent outreach and education component.
24. The proposal provides an unmatched opportunity to take lessons learned in biomass utilization tied to forest restoration to other parts of the State and region.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. The trailers bought with Federal funds (EAP) cannot be used as a match.
2. There is no letter of commitment from Hurd Brothers logging.
3. The budget does not identify fuel for transportation.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Ensure that the limited liability for insurance is met.
2. Clarify the budget line item regarding tuition, which cannot be paid for by Federal funds.
3. Costs for business manager, superintendent, and billing clerk need to be clarified as whether they are direct or indirect.
4. The proponent should describe material quantities and material flows.
5. Clarify the match assuring that Federal dollars are not being used as non-Federal match.
6. Move the equipment lease from equipment line item to other line item.
7. School should contact private land owners and land grants to secure future supply.
8. Other in-kind above the 20 percent could be described in the narrative or in letters of commitment.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 25-05**

ORGANIZATION: Forest Guardian  
FOREST: Santa Fe  
COMMUNITY: Santa Fe, NM  
CONTACT: Bryan Bird M.S.  
PROJECT TITLE: Road Decommissioning and Fuel Breaks for Forest Restoration and Fire Protection on the Santa Fe National Forest  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$240,000  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$60,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$300,000  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 2

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.

## Recommendations, Strengths, Weakness, and Comments on Grant Applications

2. The proposal is clear concise, and well organized.
3. The project proposes to plant native plants and shrubs.
4. High road densities do have an impact on forest ecosystems; the value of obliterating roads in areas of high road density is supported by science.
5. This proposal is unique and addresses an issue of forest restoration that has not been previously considered.
6. This proposal initiates collaboration from new partners.
7. The Ranger and all partners are to be commended for recognizing the value of this restoration strategy.
8. This proposal introduces the important concept of leveraging large acres of fire use with

2. Proposal should seek clarification regarding road decommissioning verses road obliteration.
3. Consult with the appropriate Federal agencies specific to road obliteration mitigation in stream channels.
4. Clarify the individuals to be trained to operate heavy equipment; in addition people under 18 may not be appropriate.
5. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with a greater diversity of partners in project design, implementation, and monitoring.
6. The proposal would be strengthened by more extensive collaboration with the Forest Service District early in the proposal development process.
7. The panel strongly recommends that all parties involved continue to work toward mutually agreeable restoration solutions.
8. We strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised proposal in the future with the strengths, weaknesses, and recommendation addressed.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 26-05**

ORGANIZATION: New Mexico Highlands University  
FOREST: Santa Fe  
COMMUNITY: Las Vegas, NM  
CONTACT: Vincent Carlos Garcia  
PROJECT TITLE: New Mexico Highlands University FMP Collaborative Forest Restoration Program  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$343,744  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$58,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$429,744  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 2

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders that will be involved in the project.
3. Reduces fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico.
4. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
5. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health.
6. The proposal will preserve old and large trees
7. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area
8. Strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal
9. Has demonstrated a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
10. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities

11. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
12. NEPA is complete.
13. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
14. This proposal includes treatments that are part of a broader landscape plan to restore natural fire regimes.
15. This proposal builds effectively on two successful CFRP grants.
16. Given the educational component the proponent is proposing a realistic treated acreage in this proposal.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. The proposal lacks detailed budget and work plan.
2. Budget does not include clear unit costs.
3. Milestones are too general.
4. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the proposed activities.
5. The proposal includes no discussion on fire regimes or of restoration beyond fuel hazard reduction
6. The proposal includes very little scientific basis for restoration as would be expected from a proponent who has completed CFRP projects and is heavily involved in education about forest restoration.
7. The budget lacks unit details for supplies.
8. The proposal lacks collaboration with businesses in the area that are engaged in similar activities and training.
9. CFRP funds cannot be used to cut old and large trees.
10. The 424a is incorrect, particularly section B.
11. The proposal is lacking letter of commitment for the match of pole peeler and flat bed truck.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The proposal would be greatly strengthened by building on scientific and other knowledge of restoration.
2. Treating more acres, especially to support the potential for control and experimental plot comparisons, would strengthen the proposal.
3. Monitoring would be strengthened by randomly locating plots.
4. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with businesses in the area that are engaged in similar activities.
5. Prior to award it is recommended that the proponent assure that NEPA and ESA compliance is current and completed.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 27-05**

ORGANIZATION: Las Vegas San Miguel Economic Development Corp.  
FOREST: Santa Fe  
COMMUNITY: Las Vegas, NM  
CONTACT: Dr. Luis Ortiz  
PROJECT TITLE: Las Vegas Wood Cluster Development Project  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 1-

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders that will be involved in the project.
3. Reduces fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico.
4. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire
5. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health.
6. The proposal is clear concise, and well organized.
7. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
8. Strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal with extensive outreach and recruitment effort to the surrounding communities.
9. Has demonstrated a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
10. Project will provide economic boost to one of the poorest counties in the state.
11. Provides an opportunity to retool forest-based industries in a forest dependent community.
12. Would provide vertically integrated structure for use of small diameter material.
13. Wood yard has a rail line and is close to the highway for ease of transport and it allows for expansion at a later date
14. Proposal recognizes and addresses worker safety.
15. Proponent is looking at a variety of innovative products, not just firewood.
16. Proponent has contacted organizations exploring bioenergy options.
17. This project would leverage material from a 365 acre FEMA project in the Gallina watershed.
18. The biomass-to-heat, in which the project will supply material, has strong political support both the legislative and executive branches of New Mexico State Government.
19. One of the proposal objectives is to be self-sustaining after initial start-up.

20. The scale and diversity of the project has the potential to utilize 100 percent of the by-products from restoration forestry.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. The detailed yearly budgets do not follow the RFP format, or include clear unit costs.
2. The budget is not clearly tied to the work plan.
3. There is no budget justification included.
4. CFRP funds cannot be used to cut old and large trees.
5. Milestones are too general.
6. The majority of material processed with equipment purchased with CFRP funds must come from public lands.
7. The proposal did not include documentation of consultation with tribes.
8. Proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
9. Youth component lacks detail on what they will learn, how many youth are to be involved, and what they will do.
10. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal (Mater Engineering).
11. Lacks an assessment of potential resource volume as compared to utilization.
12. The letter from Highlands University does not commit to the internship program discussed in the proposal.
13. It is unclear if there is sufficient NEPA ready material available for this project.
14. There is no clear description of how Las Vegas San Miguel Economic Development Corporation will provide administration.
15. The proposal does not clearly describe what the CFRP funded activities would be and what will be funded by other sources.
16. Narrative and work plan are not in 12-point font.
17. Many partner groups are named, but it is not clear what a number of them will do.
18. It is not clear whether the wood come from public or private lands.
19. The SF424 is incorrect, Section A, C, and D.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Documentation of letters sent to potentially affected tribes should be included.
2. Accomplishing ecological monitoring and training/youth component through Highlands University or other youth programs could strengthen proposal.
3. The majority of material processed with equipment purchased with CFRP funds must come from public lands through the duration of the grant.
4. We strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised proposal next year with the strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations addressed.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 28-05**

ORGANIZATION: Alfonso Chacon and Sons  
FOREST: Carson  
COMMUNITY: Ojo Caliente, NM  
CONTACT: Alfonso Chacon  
PROJECT TITLE: Ensenada Forest Health Restoration Project  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$360,000  
CATEGORY: 1

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders that will be involved in the project.
3. Reduces fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico.
4. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
5. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan
6. The project includes a good youth component; YCC.
7. Strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal
8. The applicant has done a good job of addressing the panel's prior recommendations.
9. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
10. Good budget detail and work plan.
11. Has a clear and specific monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
12. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
13. NEPA is complete
14. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
15. The proposal includes the development of two demonstration sites.
16. The proponents will provide interpretive signing describing the projects.
17. The proposal includes an excellent multi-party monitoring plan.
18. The proposal would create three new jobs.
19. The proposal certifies that the safety of operators and operations will be assured.
20. The 424 is CORRECT.
21. The proponent and Forest Service are to be commended for developing a strong agreement on restoration prescription that address concerns of the conservation community.
22. The proponent and the Forest Service are to be commended for overcoming past history to work with the environmental community.

23. The proposed treatment effectively addresses critical wildlife issues.
24. Forest Guild will provide education and outreach to people beyond the project team, this will include fire history, forest ecology, and medicinal plants.
25. The proposal includes clear milestones.
26. The proposal does a good job of explaining how treatment will be adjusted to site and stand conditions.
27. Roles and responsibilities are described in a clearly presented table.
28. An extremely diverse and balanced group of stakeholders.
29. Great documentation of the collaborative proposal development process appears in the appendix.
30. Involvement of the Jicarilla Apache Nation, in providing training on traditional knowledge.
31. The proposal includes a broad scope of restoration activities.
32. The proposal brings back the traditional way of making a living in this part of Rio Arriba County.
33. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
34. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration within the Vallecitos Federal Sustained Yield Unit.
35. The strong collaboration on this project could serve as a model for resolving conflict on other projects in this area.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. The letter of support from Forest Guardians is inconsistent with the proposal.
2. The proposal does not discuss follow-up management on aspen treatments.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. In the budget, under indirect costs, assure that some are not direct costs.
2. Items listed as leased should be moved to the “other” line item.
3. Part of the match is volunteer time, which must be documented to be an appropriate match.
4. The proposal could be strengthened by further elaboration of re-establishing natural fire regimes.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 29-05**

ORGANIZATION: Healthy Forest – Happy Potters, Inc.  
FOREST: Carson  
COMMUNITY: Taos, NM  
CONTACT: Pamela Sue Dean  
PROJECT TITLE: Healthy Forest – Happy Potters Pot Creek WUI Fuel Reduction Project  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$185,003  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$46,250

TOTAL BUDGET: \$231,253  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 2

**STRENGTHS:**

1. Letter includes letters of support from collaborators and stakeholders that will be involved in the project and have been involved with project since inception.
2. Strong community collaboration and support.
3. Helps to reduce fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico
4. Project will reduce risk of high-intensity wildfire by providing a unique utilization infrastructure.
5. Project will add capacity to restoration efforts.
6. Project will use small diameter material from a forest health restoration project that is scheduled to have NEPA completed by Spring 2006.
7. Proposal is clear and concise and well organized.
8. There has been strong collaboration from all parties for multiple years
9. Proponent or their cooperators have developed expertise in the proposed activities since initial funding was secured in 04.
10. Work plan and budget detail complete.
11. Proposal leverages funds received from multiple sources.
12. Purpose and need statement has been developed since last year.
13. Existing Condition has been described.
14. Desired future condition has been identified.
15. Critical species inventories are either complete or in process.
16. Strong letter of support from District Ranger.
17. Project will remove primarily Pinyon/Juniper and maintain/improve the Pine Component.
18. Treatment cost of \$740.00 per acre seems low.
19. Will treat between 185 and 200 acres in a fuel break, located Southwest of Pot Creek using ecologically sound techniques and emphasizing protection of wildlife and cultural resources.
20. Project has received positive media attention.
21. Wood from project will be distributed to artists, and local families in need.
22. Has support and commitment from Jicarilla Apache.
23. Support letter from US Forest Service is clear and specific.
24. This project complements ongoing fire hazard reduction in the wildland urban interface.
25. The proposal includes strong outreach to more diverse partners.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. Certify that the safety of operators and operations will be assured.
2. Storage site of wood yard has still not been finalized.

Recommendations, Strengths, Weakness, and Comments on Grant Applications

3. SF424 is incorrect, section B and E.
4. No estimate of the volume expected from the thinning project.
5. Treatment of slash is unclear, and will require FS to burn some of it (no support statement by USFS that they will do this)
6. Proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
7. The proposal lacks specific detail on how youth will be involved.
8. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
9. CFRP funds cannot be used to cut old and large trees.
10. The proposal lacks a clear or significant utilization component (in terms of volume)
11. The project will not add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
12. The proposal lacks a description of treatment methods and how they will protect cultural and archeological resources.
- 13.

4. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
5. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan
6. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
7. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health.
8. The proposal will preserve old and large trees
9. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area possibly approaching 100 percent of the byproducts.
10. The project includes a good youth component
11. Has a clear and specific monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
12. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
13. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and prescribed fire.
14. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
15. Includes a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders.
16. The project includes study of treatment response of culturally important plants.
17. Because it includes comparison of alternative treatments on the ground, this project has potential to contribute to our understanding of appropriate prescriptions and effectiveness of restoration treatments in mixed forests.
18. There is a completed management plan written by a certified forester in conjunction with NM State Forestry using Forest Land Enhancement Program cost-share funds.
19. There is an excellent map included in proposal.

#### **WEAKNESSES:**

1. Proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
2. The proposal lacks detail on the proposed treatment (how many trees, which trees) or desired future condition.
3. The project will generate alternatives for mixed conifer restoration treatments, but is not clear how these will be evaluated and which alternative will be chosen for implementation.
4. The 424 is incorrect, section A.
5. The forward summary makes it difficult to understand what has been done versus what is proposed.
6. The proposal lacks discussion of restoring natural fire regimes.
7. NEPA is not complete, and the timeline for completing NEPA and implementation of treatment overlap.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Including an estimate of total volume of restoration residue would strengthen the proposal.

2. The proposal would be strengthened if it included information the Forest Management Plan completed by the Pueblo.
3. We strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised proposal next year with the strengths and weaknesses addressed.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 31-05**

ORGANIZATION: Colfax County  
FOREST: Carson  
COMMUNITY: Raton, NM  
CONTACT: Roy Akerman  
PROJECT TITLE: Sugarite Canyon Watershed/Forest Restoration Program  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 2

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators.
2. The proposals has a broad group of collaborators/partners
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders (See concerns).
4. Reduces fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk
5. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire
6. The fire blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan (incorporating existing process infrastructure)
7. The project includes removal of small diameter material to improve forest health
8. The proposed activities will preserve large trees
9. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area
10. The project has a good youth component
11. Great public outreach efforts (see Partners and Collaborators section).
12. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective.
13. Monitoring efforts are integrated with existing monitoring efforts.
14. Since much of the monitoring activities are in place (wildlife/insect) there should be good baseline data to examine treatment impacts on the parameters
15. Attempts to treat a watershed that extends beyond state boundaries (CO) with support letters from Colorado entities.
16. Has demonstrated a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
17. This proposal includes treatments that are part of a broader landscape plan to restore natural fire regimes.
18. The proposal proposes to protect critical municipal water supply infrastructure
19. Collaborators include Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation and Wild Turkey Federation.

20. Direct involvement by new partner i.e. the county in forest restoration activities meets with the goal of the CFRP program.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. Letters of support are missing from Friends of Sugarite and Silver Dollar Shavings (Also, Friends of Sugarite are not listed as a Partner).
2. No clear description of treatments proposed.
3. Proposal proposes a use of herbicides beyond published labels.
4. Youth involvement could be stronger (no educational outreach in work plan for years 3 and 4).
5. Treatment areas were unclear on maps provided (could be a copying issue)
6. The proposal lacks detailed budget and work plan, and budget categories do not match.
7. Budget does not include clear unit costs.
8. The proposal does not include documentation with tribes.
9. Although the proposal mentions the goal of reestablishing fire regimes, there is no detailed description of a program to do so.
10. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities (map).
11. The proposal lacks a description or estimate of the volume of restoration byproducts.
12. Project is not NEPA ready.
13. The letter from the Cimarron District Forester is not signed.
14. The degree to which fire hazard is going to be reduced is unclear because proposal lacks detail on the proposed treatment.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Documentation with potential affected tribes should be included.
2. The proponent is encouraged to maintain permanent plots to measure the effectiveness of the treatments in protecting the water supply infrastructure in the event there is fire in the future.
3. The proposal could be strengthened by including a youth or training component in years 3 and 4.
4. We strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised proposal next year with the strengths and weaknesses addressed.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 32-05**

ORGANIZATION:	Town of Red River
FOREST:	Carson
COMMUNITY:	Red River, NM
CONTACT:	Ron Burnham
PROJECT TITLE:	Pioneer Canyon Watershed Preservation Project
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000

TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$225,000  
CATEGORY: 1  
Revised Budget based on only completing work in zones 1 & 4.  
Funding Request \$225,000

### **STRENGTHS:**

1. Because this is a municipal watershed near town and the ski area, it has been identified as a high priority for fire hazard reduction by the USFS and the collaborative community fire protection plan (CWPP).
2. Reduces fire hazard in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk from wildfires in New Mexico.
3. This proposal blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
4. The proposed treatment will involve youth in forest treatments.
5. Good budget detail and work plan.
6. Proponents address most of the weaknesses and recommendations from the 2004 CFRP panel.
7. Strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
8. NEPA is complete.
9. Very strong letter of support from the District Ranger.
10. The proponent has a strong record of completion with previous grants.
11. Clear and concise descriptions of the current fire hazard, stand conditions and proposed treatments.
12. Strong biomass utilization plan for composting in coordination with the town of Red River.
13. Strong partnership between municipal, state, Federal and private sector.
14. Good baseline data exists on the existing ecological condition.

### **WEAKNESSES**

1. Forest restoration is more than fire hazard reduction, yet this is not recognized or addressed in the proposal. The treatment is clearly designed to reduce the amount and vertical continuity of fuel, and is not well justified as a forest restoration treatment.
2. Target densities for mixed conifer zone are low (50-75 trees/acre in mixed conifer and 110-120 trees/acre spruce/fir) relative to published historical tree densities in southwestern mixed conifer forests.
3. 2004 CFRP panel was concerned about the high probability for windthrow of the trees given the great difference between current and treated tree densities and the very low densities that would result from treatment
4. It is unclear how proponents will provide for the safety of the youth who will carry out the treatments in dense stands on steep slopes.
5. The proposal lacks a description or estimate of the volume of restoration byproducts.
6. The higher value utilization potential is not explored.

7. The 424 is incorrect, section E does not add up.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Clarify the discrepancy between trees/acre and basal area.
2. The proponent is encouraged to seek additional utilization partners.
3. Delete zone 2 components from the application as it will not significantly change or improve restoration and suppression.
4. Use zone 4 as a research site to determine fuel reduction techniques that protects the economic vitality of these areas as well as help to determine the proper silvicultural prescription to protect aesthetics and reduce the threat of historic stand replacement fire.
5. The proposal would be strengthened by inclusion of an interpretive program to explain the purpose of forest management to reduce fire hazard.

Recommend a 1 Ranking and partial funding for the treatment identified in Zone 1 and 4.

## CFRP PROJECT #: 33-05

ORGANIZATION: Pueblo of Taos  
FOREST: Carson  
COMMUNITY: Taos, NM  
CONTACT: Anne Sandoval  
PROJECT TITLE: Forest Watershed Restoration and Preventative Fuels Treatments on Taos Tribal Lands  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$360,000  
CATEGORY: 1

## STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders that will be involved in the project.
3. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfires.
4. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health.
5. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
6. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
7. Good budget detail and work plan
8. Reduces fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico.
9. The proponent's goal of managing for a fire permeable landscape is a good one.
10. Has demonstrated a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.

11. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
12. The proponents will replant trees in appropriate areas.
13. The proposal addresses early phase restoration efforts on a disturbed landscape.
14. This proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100 percent utilization of the generated by-product.
15. Proposal offers great potential for collaboration during project design.
16. The proposed activities are supported by a burned area emergency rehabilitation report that provides initial rehabilitation suggestions and can be used to create site-specific treatments.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. To understand proposal effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
2. Youth and training components lack detail on what they will learn, how many will be involved, and what they will do.
3. The proposal is not clear on how slash will be treated and material resulting from treatment will be transported (it is not identified in the budget.)
4. Detailed budget does not follow RFP budget format, it is presented in phases not years as described in the RFP.
5. The proposal lacks a description or estimate of the volume of restoration byproducts.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Ensure that Federal funds are not used to purchase food, as described on Page 6, involvement of the community.
2. From the beginning of the development of a restoration project, general estimates of volume of byproduct to be generated should be made for the purpose of co-developing the utilization strategy.
3. Since the proposal addresses post-disturbance restoration and intends to use erosion control measures, sediment control should be monitored for control measure efficacy.
4. Proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 34-05**

ORGANIZATION: Rocky Mountain Youth Corps  
FOREST: Carson  
COMMUNITY: Taos, NM  
CONTACT: Carl Colonius  
PROJECT TITLE: Collaborative Forest Restoration Program.  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$265,914  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$68,800  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$334,714  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 1-

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders that will be involved in the project.
3. Reduces fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico.
4. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
5. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan
6. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
7. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health.
8. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
9. The proposal is clear concise, and well organized.
10. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
11. The biomass-to-heat, in which the project will supply material, has strong political support both the legislative and executive branches of New Mexico State Government.
12. The project includes a good youth component; YCC.
13. Strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal
14. Has demonstrated a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
15. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
16. Good budget detail and work plan.
17. Has a clear and specific monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
18. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
19. NEPA is complete
20. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
21. The proposal does have a slash treatment plan.
22. The proposal provides excellent maps.
23. The proposal includes an outstanding youth component.
24. This proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100 percent utilization of the generated by-product.
25. This proposal addresses squirrel habitat and treatments are timed to minimize bark beetle activity.
26. The proposal includes a strong letter of support from the District Ranger.
27. The applicant have successfully completed and submitted a multiparty assessment from a prior CFRP grant.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. The proposal lacks adequate budget justification.

2. Proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
3. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.
4. Contractor and other collaborators letters do not confirm or verify match.
5. The contractual line items do not match letters.
6. There is no explanation of how the safety of the youth operators will be assured.
7. There is no mention of how wood products will be transported to the wood lot and the biomass facility, nor does the budget reflect the cost.
8. The narrative portion of the proposal lacks sections A & B.
9. The proposal lacks a description or estimate of the volume of restoration byproducts.
10. The applicant did not summarize in the appendix the panel's prior recommendations; therefore it is unclear if all the weaknesses and recommendations were addressed.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Clarify the match does not include Federal funds.
2. Before award, the budget discrepancies need to be addressed, specifically the ERI monitoring costs, and the costs for Martha Schumann.
3. The proposal could be strengthened by ensuring education reflects our best current knowledge about forest restoration, fire hazard reduction, and the similarities and differences between them in a variety of forest types.
4. The proposal could be strengthened by ensuring education reflects our best current knowledge about forest restoration, specifically leaving clumps and gap stand structure, which will be equally effective in reducing fire hazard and be a more sustainable restoration and fire mitigation treatment in the landscape.
5. Proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups.
6. Proponents should collaborate with conservation groups in project design, implementation, and monitoring.
7. 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.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 35-05**

ORGANIZATION: Colfax County  
FOREST: Carson  
COMMUNITY: Raton  
CONTACT: Roy Ackerman  
PROJECT TITLE: Cimarron Canyon Watershed/Forest Restoration Program  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 2

## **STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal exhibits good collaboration prior to submission.
2. The proposal seeks to restore natural fire regimes.
3. Reduces fire hazard in the New Mexico Communities at Risk in NM.
4. Project would reduce the risk of a high intensity fire.
5. Project would occur in the Wildland Urban Interface.
6. The project blends forest restoration and utilization.
7. The proposal has identified and included local wood products business as a collaborating partner.
8. The project includes removal of small diameter trees.
9. The proposal is among other efforts to reduce fire threat to the communities in Coflax County.
10. The project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
11. Direct involvement by new partner i.e. the county in forest restoration activities meets with the goal of the CFRP program.
12. This proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100 percent utilization of the generated by-product.

## **WEAKNESSES:**

1. NEPA is not complete; how NEPA will be completed is unclear, though a contingency strategy is included.
2. Though a rough monitoring outline is included, the monitoring plan “has not been decided yet” and there is no monitoring budget.
3. The herbicide application, drilling, is not consistent with label guidelines.
4. CFRP funds cannot be used to cut old or large trees.
5. Work plan is still in “draft” form.
6. In order for the panel to evaluate the effectiveness of this proposal, several aspects would need more specific description: proposed treatments, treatment systems, utilization integration, job creation, GIS imagery, and most importantly the existing and desired ecological conditions.
7. The relationship between the budget, work plan, and objectives is unclear.
8. The proposal does not include a youth component.
9. It is unclear how prescribed fire treatments will occur in treatment areas.
10. Science doesn’t support the objective of thinning to enhance water yield.
11. The Game and Fish letter does not commit monitoring support as described in the proposal nor does it state that it allows permission on Game and Fish land.
12. The letter from the Nature Conservancy does not commit to a match amount.
13. The proposed activity of stacking large wood would slow rather than speed decomposition.

14. Game and Fish Department was not included as part of the collaboration team even though they have a Conservation Service Division specifically designed for this type of activities.
15. The Game and Fish support letter, as well as the NM State Forestry support letter are the exact same letter used in the Sugarite Canyon proposal.
16. There is no signature on the letter from the State Forestry Division.
17. The proposal budgets \$75,000 in both year one and two for NEPA development which may be excessive.
18. The goal of the project is to have healthy large trees rather than healthy stands with diverse size classes of trees.
19. The proposal lacks a description or estimate of the volume of restoration byproducts.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The panel strongly encourages the proponent to submit a revised proposal next year, taking into account that the proposal would benefit from:
  - a. NEPA completion
  - b. a budget justification;
  - c. a more detailed work plan, including use of grass seed and clarification of chips as mulch.
  - d. a detailed monitoring plan;
  - e. including a youth component;
  - f. all necessary letters of support;
  - g. more clearly describing ecological conditions, desired conditions, proposed treatments and corresponding utilization systems.
2. Documentation of letters sent to potentially affected tribes should be included.
3. From the beginning of the development of a restoration project, general estimates of volume of byproduct to be generated should be made for the purpose of co-developing the utilization strategy.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 36-05**

ORGANIZATION: Picuris Pueblo  
FOREST: Carson  
COMMUNITY: Penasco  
CONTACT: Jon Fast Wolf  
PROJECT TITLE: Return Ecological Integrity to Picuris Forest Strands  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 2

### **STRENGTHS:**

1. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan
2. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
3. The project adds value to small diameter trees.
4. The proponent recognizes the value of and need to integrate historic and cultural principles with restoration.
5. The project proposes using native fungi spores to decompose slash and stumps.
6. The proponents recognize that this project could improve relations among divided communities.
7. The proponents will perform soil restoration and encourage organic farming.

### **WEAKNESSES:**

1. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
2. Equipment is anything valued at over \$5,000 per unit; below this level they are supplies; ramps, saws, and miscellaneous equipment costs need to be moved to supplies.
3. The SF424 is incorrect sections A, B, and, C and 424B is missing.
4. The proposal lacks detailed budget and work plan.
5. Certify that the safety of operators and operations will be assured.
6. CFRP funds cannot be used to cut old and large trees.
7. Milestones are too general.
8. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal.
9. The proposal did not include documentation of consultation with tribes.
10. The treatment areas were unclear and no maps were provided.
11. Youth component lacks detail on what they will learn, how many youth are to be involved, and what they will do.
12. The proposal lacks a description or estimate of the volume of restoration byproducts.
13. Indirect costs exceed 10 percent.
14. The proposal identified needs and objectives, but does not clearly discuss how they will be addressed.
15. NEPA is not complete.
16. There is no support letter from NMSU committing to any of the match or support.
17. There is no documentation regarding the 2004 capital outlay appropriation.
18. There are no letters of support from neighboring communities or the Picuris-Penasco coalition.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The panel strongly encourages the proponent to submit a revised proposal next year, taking into account that the proposal would benefit from:
  - a. NEPA completion

- b. a budget justification;
  - c. a more detailed work plan, including use of grass seed and clarification of chips as mulch.
  - d. a detailed monitoring plan;
  - e. including a youth component;
  - f. all necessary letters of support;
  - g. more clearly describing ecological conditions, desired conditions, proposed treatments and corresponding utilization systems.
2. Documentation of letters sent to potentially affected tribes should be included.
  3. From the beginning of the development of a restoration project, general estimates of volume of byproduct to be generated should be made for the purpose of co-developing the utilization strategy.
  4. Collaborating with surrounding communities and clarifying their roles could strengthen the proposal.
  5. Verify that there are not direct costs covered in the indirect budget line item.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 37-05**

ORGANIZATION: Sustainable Communities, Inc.  
FOREST: Carson  
COMMUNITY: Santa Fe  
CONTACT: Lynda Taylor  
PROJECT TITLE: Native Fungi Restoration of Forested Lands, and Products from Thinned Small Diameter Trees  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000  
PROGRAM INCOME \$6,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$456,000  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 2

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators
2. The proposal is clear concise, and well organized.
3. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
4. The project includes a good youth component; YCC.
5. Strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal
6. Has demonstrated a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. Good budget detail and work plan.
8. Proposal includes letters from the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, State Land Office, the Forest Service District Ranger, State Forester, and Picuris Pueblo.

9. Proposal is innovative and highlights the importance of beneficial fungi for forest health and soils.
10. The 424 is correct.
11. Innovative use of small diameter material.
12. Diverse and balanced group of stakeholders.
13. To the degree that fungi speeds decomposition, the project may contribute to reduced fire hazard.
14. A business plan is being prepared by a small business center.
15. The project provides hands-on opportunities to involve youth in the science arena.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. The proposal did not include documentation of consultation with tribes.
2. The proposal lacks budget details for mushroom supplies.
3. The distinction between this project and previously funded CFRP grants were not clearly described.
4. The proponents do not scientifically justify that the native fungi community in the soil is unhealthy or will benefit from augmentation.
5. Youth component lacks detail on what they will learn, how many youth are to be involved, and what they will do.
6. The proposal lacks indicators, timeline, and roles in monitoring.
7. Until the pilot has proven the concept, there is no justification for moving to implementation.
8. CFRP cannot fund two projects simultaneously that are not independent of each other.
9. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Verify that there are not direct costs covered in the indirect budget line item.
2. The proposal would be strengthened by adding discussion about the scientific justification that the native fungi community in the soil is unhealthy or will benefit from augmentation.
3. The proposal would benefit by including a control with no fungi.
4. Documentation of letters sent to potentially affected tribes should be included.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 38-05**

ORGANIZATION: Las Comunidades  
FOREST: Carson  
COMMUNITY: El Rito, NM  
CONTACT: John William Ussery  
PROJECT TITLE: Equipping the Communities of the Vallecitos Sustained Yield Unit for Economic Utilization of Forest Restoration Products  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$359,287

MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,020  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$449,912  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0  
CATEGORY: 2

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders that will be involved in the project.
3. The proposal is clear concise, and well organized
4. The project includes a good youth component, YCC.
5. Strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal
6. Has demonstrated a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
8. Good budget detail.
9. The proponent is developing a business plan.
10. The project will involve both youth and elders.

**WEAKNESSES:**

1. Milestones are too general.
2. The proposal did not include documentation of consultation with tribes.
3. Proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
4. The proposal lacks a description or estimate of the volume of restoration byproducts.
5. The proposal lacks a business partner for utilization.
6. The proposal lacks a clear link to a restoration forestry project.
7. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal.
8. The monitoring plan lacks clear indicators, roles, and timelines.
9. The 424, section B is incorrect.
10. Work plan does not clearly define who will do what or when they will do it.
11. There is no specific work plan for the outreach activities.
12. The description of partners does not clarify what their roles will be in project implementation.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Stipends should be described to reflect payment for employment.
2. Ensure that no Federal funds are used for food or entertainment.
3. Documentation of letters sent to potentially affected tribes should be included.

4. The proposal would benefit from having restoration practitioner partners and utilization partners.

**CFRP PROJECT #: 39-05**

ORGANIZATION: Sherry Barrow Strategies  
FOREST: Lincoln  
COMMUNITY: Ruidoso  
CONTACT: Sherry Barrow  
PROJECT TITLE: Cedar Creek Break Restoration Project  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000  
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$360,000  
CATEGORY: 1

**STRENGTHS:**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from stakeholders that will be involved in the project.
3. Reduces fire risk in one of the New Mexico Communities at Risk of wildfire in New Mexico.
4. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
5. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
6. The project does include removal of small diameter material to improve forest health.
7. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
8. The proposal is clear concise, and well organized.
9. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
10. The biomass-to-heat, in which the project will supply material, has strong political support both the legislative and executive branches of New Mexico State Government.
11. The project includes a good youth component; YCC.
12. Strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal
13. Has demonstrated a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
14. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
15. Good budget detail and work plan.
16. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
17. This project leverages other projects into an integrated regional perspective on restoration.
18. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
19. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and prescribed fire.
20. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.

Recommendations, Strengths, Weakness, and Comments on Grant Applications

21. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
22. This proposal includes treatments that are part of a broader landscape plan to restore natural fire regimes.
23. Includes a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders.
24. This proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100 percent utilization of the generated by-product.
25. A high percentage of the funds go directly for restoration treatments.
26. The proposal includes a strong letter of support from the local District Ranger.
27. The 424 is correct.
28. Low impact logging equipment will be used.
29. Monitoring plan is clear and concise and includes indicators specific to the project objectives.
30. YCC and Ecoservants will be used in monitoring.
31. Proposes to treat an area that has a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
32. Will provide a restoration demonstration site visible from the Forest Service district office.
- 33.

# Recommendations for Improving Review Process

## What Went Well?

- The process worked extremely well and
- The exchanges and debates were fruitful and respectful.
- The level of respect has evolved and increased over the two years of this panel
- The level of trust has grown significantly over time.
- The quality of the proposals has improved overall.
- The quality of the proposals has improved due to the coordinators and the collaborative team that is in the field working in this arena.
- The humor and openness of the panel helped improve the dynamics.
- An interdisciplinary review panel has helped improve communication and collaboration in the panel and it is carried over to many areas of the State.
- The transparency of the process is one of its greatest strengths.
- The method for interacting with the proponents and the coordinators was more effective
- Not putting the ranking on a screen helped the panel remain neutral.

## What Needs to be Improved?

- Add a fourth category with definitions blending excellent match with some reservations, eliminating any pluses or minuses.
- Coordinators should be offering clarification, not analysis.
- The panel needs better information on the status of past projects.
- The panel requests a one or two page synopsis of all CFRP projects with objectives and status.
- Staff, not the panel, will handle problems with the 424.
- Make sure the panel gets boiler plate strengths and weaknesses.

# Recommendations for Improving the CFRP Request for Proposals

- In the RFP we need to ask for a questionnaire that includes, if applicable:
  - What will be done?
  - How many acres?
  - Where will it be done?
  - Land ownership?
  - What product will be produced?
  - Estimates of volume used, and produced?
  - Jobs to be created?
  - Vegetation type?
  - What type of training, to whom, how many individuals?
  - What type of education and outreach, to whom, how many individuals?
- Explore ways of getting better, clearer, maps.
- Consider different language regarding the project total limit.

# Ideas for 2006 Workshop

- Include a workshop and/or presentation about what we know and don't know about natural fire regimes in the different ecotypes in the state.
- Make a succinct synthesis of the workshop available for proponents.
- Presentation on available technical assistance available (Laura McCarthy)
- Make information available about markets and products that have been explored and developed by CFRP grants.
- A presentation regarding water yield in relationship to forest treatments.
- A presentation on the role of individual projects on within a comprehensive landscape management program, especially one focused on restoring natural fire regimes. (Taylor)
- List of utilizers looking for material
- List of proponents that have treatment areas looking for utilizers.
- Presentation on how others have successfully evaluated volumes generated versus capacity to handle and utilize material.

# Appendix A

## Bylaws

### Collaborative Forest Restoration Program Technical Advisory Panel

April 25, 2005

#### **Section I: Purpose:**

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

#### **Section II: Authority:**

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

#### **Section III: Membership Selection and Appointment:**

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

news release will be sent to television stations, radio stations, and their local translators in New Mexico soliciting nominations for Panel membership. Letters will also be mailed to individuals who have expressed an interest in the program or are involved in the forest restoration issue in New Mexico. Information on the Act and how to submit an application for membership on the Panel will also be posted on the Forest Service Southwest Regional Internet Website at: [www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/community](http://www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/community).

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

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

#### **Section IV: Meeting Procedures:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Section V: Role of Panel Members:**

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

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

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

If a Panel Member or any member of their immediate family, or organization employing them, will directly or financially benefit from a CFRP grant proposal being evaluated, or if a Panel Member was directly involved in the development of the proposal, that Panel member **shall leave the meeting room during the discussion of that proposal and recuse themselves from the**

**Panel's decision** to avoid a conflict of interest. Panel members may answer questions from grant applicants regarding the eligibility and appropriateness of project proposal ideas and still engage in the discussion and decision on a proposal.

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

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

## **Section VI: Process For Developing Recommendations**

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

## **Section VI: Expenses and Reimbursement**

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

# Appendix B. Departmental Regulation 1042-138

See <http://www.usda.gov/directives/files/dr/DR1042-138.htm> or for a PDF copy see: <http://www.usda.gov/directives/files/dr/DR1042-138.pdf>.

## Appendix C. 2003-2005 Panel Members

NAME	ORGANIZATION	INTEREST GROUP
Vicky Estrada	District Ranger, Mountainair Ranger District, Cibola National Forest, USDA Forest Service	Federal Land Management Agency
Delfinia Montaña	Wildlife Biologist-Regional Fire Consultation Coordinator, US Fish and Wildlife Service	Federal Land Management Agency
Doug Boykin	District Forester, Socorro District, New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department, Forestry Division	New Mexico State Natural Resources Official
Thora Padilla	Program Manager, Division of Resource Management & Protection, Mescalero Apache Tribe	Tribal or Pueblo
John Harrington	Associate Professor & Superintendent, New Mexico State University	Independent Scientist
Penelope Morgan	Professor, Department of Forest Resources, College of Natural Resources, University of Idaho	Independent Scientist
Thomas Sisk	Associate Professor of Ecology, Northern Arizona University	Independent Scientist
Todd Schulke	Forest Restoration Policy Director, Center for Biological Diversity	Conservation Interests
Taylor McKinnon	Program Manager, Grand Canyon Trust	Conservation Interests
Tabitha Romero	Assistant Director and Planning and Development Officer, Pueblo of Pojoaque	Local Communities
Rick DeIaco	Director of Forestry, Village of Ruidoso	Local Communities
Phil Archuleta	CEO, P&M Signs, Inc. and P&M Plastics	Commodity Interests
Gordon West	Owner, Santa Clara Woodworks	Commodity Interests
Walter Dunn	CFRP Program Manager, Cooperative and International Forestry, Southwestern Regional Office, USDA Forest Service	Chairman and Designated Federal Official

# Appendix D. 2004 Request for Proposals

See <http://www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/cfrp/2005program/index.shtml>.

