



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

**Southwestern
Region**

June 2009



Project Funding Recommendations and Proposed Evaluation Comments

2009 Technical Advisory Panel Collaborative Forest Restoration Program

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TTY). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

June 2009

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Proposal Review Process.....	3
Proposals	5
Proposal Evaluation: Strengths, Weaknesses, and Recommendations	9
Evaluation Matrix	63
Recommendations and Suggestions	65
Appendix A. Technical Advisory Panel Bylaws.....	67
Appendix B. Federal Advisory Committee Charter	71
Appendix C. Technical Advisory Panel Members (2008-2009)	77
Appendix D: Proposal Review, Common Proposal Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations	79

Executive Summary

The Collaborative Forest Restoration Program (CFRP) Technical Advisory Panel met in Albuquerque, New Mexico, April 24-28, 2006, 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 August 8, 2005 (DR 1042-138) pursuant to the Community Forest Restoration Act of 2000 (Title VI, Pub. L. No. 106-393).

The Panel reviewed their responsibilities as a Federal Advisory Committee, revised their bylaws, and discussed the Findings and Recommendations of the 2008 CFRP Panel Multi-Party Assessment Sub Committee. The Sub-Committee report can be found on the CFRP Website (www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/cfrp). The Panel then reviewed 39 proposals requesting \$12,055,271 in Federal funding to determine which ones best met the objectives of the CFRP. The Panel recommended 13 of the 39 proposals for funding, totaling \$3,938,530 to correspond with the program funds available for grants in 2009.

Pursuant to the Panel Bylaws, if a Panel Member or any member of their immediate family, or the organization employing them, would 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 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 consensus recommendations on strengths, weaknesses, and funding for each grant proposal, as well as recommendations for improving the proposal review process, the Request for Proposals, and CFRP Annual Workshop. This report and the Meeting Minutes, including the meeting agenda, can be obtained on the CFRP website noted above or by contacting Walter Dunn, USDA Forest Service, 333 Broadway Blvd. SE, Albuquerque, NM 87102, telephone (506) 842-3425.

/s/Walter Dunn
WALTER DUNN
Chairman and Designated Federal Official
U.S. Forest Service, Southwestern Region

06/01/2000
Date

Proposal Review Process

The categories of decision were:

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

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

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

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

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

The Panel ranked 21 of the 39 proposals in Category 1. Because there was not sufficient funding to fund all proposals in Category 1, the Panel reviewed all proposals in Category 1 again. Nine proposals were selected for immediate funding. The Panel then used a matrix to determine the remaining projects to recommend for funding. The matrix included five additional criteria to determine which proposals best met the program objectives. These criteria included:

1. Is the project part of a longer term and/or landscape level comprehensive forest restoration effort?
2. Does the project demonstrate an innovative approach that adds value to the CFRP?
3. Will the project generate benefits after the grant period?
4. Is the quality of the collaboration exceptional?
5. Does the project add significant capacity to conduct forest restoration?

The Panel ranked the remaining Category 1 proposals that best met all five of these criteria in order of priority; the proposals ranked as the highest priority were recommended to receive funding

Proposals

Proposal #	Project Title	Lead Organization	Fed. Req	Match	Recommended Funding	Regional Forester Approved Funding
CFRP 01-09	San Antonio de Las Huertas & Merced del Pueblo Abiquiu Collaborative Forest Restoration Planning Project	Mexicano Land Education & Conservation Trust	\$165,984	\$41,496	\$0	\$0
CFRP 02-09, Rev 1.	Canadian River Riparian Restoration Project	Canadian River Soil and Water Conservation District	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 03-09	Capacity Building, Restoration and Wood Utilization in the Bluewater Watershed	Forest Guild	\$359,939	\$89,985	\$359,939	\$359,939
CFRP 04-09	Increased Forest Restoration and Utilization in the Cibola	Mt. Taylor Machine, LLC	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 05-09	Bosque Community Planting Using Small Diameter Woody Biomass at the Pueblo of Santa Ana	Pueblo of Santa Ana	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 06-09	Ojo Peak Post-wildfire Remediation and Monitoring Project	Claunch Pinto Soil and Water Conservation District	\$213,268	\$42,680	\$213,268	\$213,268
CFRP 07-09	Red Canyon Forest Restoration Project	La Merced del Manzano c/o Claunch Pinto Soil and Water Conservation District	\$354,918	\$93,100	\$354,918	\$354,918
CFRP 08-09	Merced del Pueblo de Chilili Wildfire Fuels Reduction Collaborative Forest Restoration Project	Merced del Pueblo de Chilili	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP 09-09	Multi-Jursidictional Collaborative Landscape Analysis	Pueblo of Isleta	\$212,855	\$53,214	\$212,855	\$212,855
CFRP 10-09	El Ritito Forest Health Restoration Project	Andy Chacon Forest Restoration	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0

Proposals

Proposal #	Project Title	Lead Organization	Fed. Req	Match	Recommended Funding	Regional Forester Approved Funding
		Company				
CFRP 11-09	Forest Thinning for Fire Prevention and Education of Youth in Questa	Village of Questa	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 12-09	Quality Environment and Economic Sustainability Project	Jaramillo & Sons Forest Products	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 13-09	Navajo Dam Hazardous Fuel Reduction and Restoration Project	Cedar Valley Field Services LLC	\$330,783	\$67,038	\$0	\$0
CFRP 14-09, Rev. 2	La Jara Taos Pines Ranch FIREWISE Community Forest health Restoration/Education/Monitoring CFRP	Urban Interface Solutions	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP 15-09	Restoration of the Picuris Pueblo Traditional Grasslands for Sustainability of the Bison Pogram and Cultural Preservation of the Community	Picuris Pueblo	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 16-09	Multijurisdictional Public and Youth Education, Forest Restoration, and Water Supply Protection in the City of Raton Municipal Watershed	City of Raton	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 17-09	Forest Restoration on Carson National Forest	Amigos del Bosque	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 18-09	Engaging Young Adults in Sustainable Forest Stewardship and Restoration	Chimayo Youth Conservation Corps, Inc.	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 19-09	Forest Preventative Fuels Treatment on Taos Pueblo Lands	Pueblo of Taos	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0

Proposal #	Project Title	Lead Organization	Fed. Req	Match	Recommended Funding	Regional Forester Approved Funding
CFRP 20-09	Camino Real/Ojo Pilot/Abeyeta P.J. Mountain Area of the Carson National Forest	El Greco	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 21-09, Rev. 1	Creating Careers from Forest Restoration	Northern NM College	\$240,000	\$60,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 22-09, Rev. 1	McMillan Native Vegetation Restoration Project	Carlsbad Soil and Water Conservation District	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 23-09, Rev 1	Forest Restoration Thinning on the Signal Peak North Project	Gila WoodNet	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP 24-09	Increased Treatment of SDT Through Low Impact Techniques	RC Forest Products, LLC	\$120,000	\$30,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 25-09	Piñon-Juniper Sustainable Forest Wood Product Development: Collaborative Stakeholder Involvement in PJ Restoration in Northern Catron County, NM	Geronimo Sustainable Forest Products, LLC	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 26-09	Use of Distributed Generation Modular Biopower as a Management Tool for the Rio Grande Corridor Bosque	Sierra Soil and Water Conservation District	\$120,000	\$30,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 27-09	Zerosion - An Engineered Composite Biomass Erosion Control Material	Restoration Technologies, Inc	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 28-09	Recovering More Value from Pine Trees: Distilling Essential Oils and Hydrosols	El Milagro Herbs, Inc.	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 29-09	K&B Expansion Project at Reserve Sawmill	K&B Timberworks, Inc.	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$360,000	\$360,000

Proposals

Proposal #	Project Title	Lead Organization	Fed. Req	Match	Recommended Funding	Regional Forester Approved Funding
CFRP 30-09	E-CWP (Engaging Communities in Wildfire Prevention): Reducing Fire Risk & Improving Forest Health	Santa Fe County Fire Department	\$358,683	\$91,228	\$0	\$0
CFRP 31-09	Sapello Watershed Restoration Project Phase 1 Planning	Biophilia Foundation	\$192,491	\$48,596	\$0	\$0
CFRP 32-09	Restoration Through Utilization and Educational Outreach Video	Northridge Forest Products	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP 33-09	Santa Fe Canyon Riparian Forest Restoration NEPA Clearance	WildEarth Guardians	\$119,992	\$30,000	\$119,992	\$119,992
CFRP 34-09, Rev. 1	Fire Protection Planning and NEPA Compliance in the Upper Pecos Watershed	Upper Pecos Watershed Association	\$157,558	\$39,440	\$157,558	\$157,558
CFRP 35-09	Forest Restoration on Santa Fe National Forest	Southwest Wood Products and Thinning	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 36-09	Developing a Strategic Forest Restoration Plan for the Santa Fe Watershed	Santa Fe Watershed Association	\$108,800	\$27,200	\$0	\$0
CFRP 37-09, Rev. 1	People, a Plan and P-J: Adaptive Landscape Management in the Fire, Insect and Disease-Prone Piñon-Juniper Woodlands of Santo Domingo Pueblo	Santo Domingo Tribe	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP 38-09	The Coyote Creek State Park Thinning Project and Restoration	Griegos Logging LLC	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 39-09	Barbero Grazing Allotment Collaboration and Restoration Project	NorthEastern Contractors Limited Liability Company	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$360,000	\$360,000
		TOTAL:	\$12,055,271	\$2,993,977	\$3,938,530	\$3,938,530

Proposal Evaluation: Strengths, Weaknesses, and Recommendations

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 01-09
ORGANIZATION:	Mexicano Land Education & Conservation Trust
FOREST:	Cibola
PROJECT TITLE:	San Antonio de las Huertas & Merced del Pueblo Abiquiu Collaborative Forest Restoration Planning Project
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$165,984
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$41,496
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$207,480
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	2
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal will be an innovative approach to developing a precedent for cross-jurisdictional restoration treatments on land grant and forest service ownership. It includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
10. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
11. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
12. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
13. The budget includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proposal does not include provisions for preserving old and large trees. However on page 5, the objectives state they will focus on removing overly dense areas of small diameter trees
2. There is no discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan.
3. To understand the proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site specific existing conditions, but the proponent is proposing to collect some of this information and was likely limited on space since this is a multi-jurisdictional project.

4. The proposal lacks a detailed budget. Unit costs under contractual are not well defined. "Other staff" listed in the personnel column is not well defined and makes up 100% of the proposals match.
5. The detailed budget does not follow RFP budget format. The budget exceeds the 1 year total and does not have a breakout of year 1 and year 2.
6. It is not clear in the monitoring plan template who will collect the monitoring data. See pages 8-10.
7. The proposal should include some basic description of anticipated byproducts.
8. The proposal lacks a statement of how the proponent will collaborate with industry and markets.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. From the beginning of the development of a restoration project, general estimates of volume of byproduct to be generated should be made for the purpose of co-developing the utilization strategy.
2. The proponent should verify that direct costs are not covered in the indirect budget line item. (See accounting costs shown in indirect costs.)
3. Proposal should have a general statement for planning purposes regarding the amounts and disposition for material coming off the project area.
4. Proposal should include partners from industry in the planning process to discuss implementation methods, costs of treatments, estimates of volume, products, etc.
5. Clarify that two separate NEPA documents will be produced in the project.

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 02-09 Rev. 1

ORGANIZATION:

Canadian River Soil and Water Conservation District

FOREST:

Cibola

PROJECT TITLE:

Canadian River Riparian Restoration Project

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$90,000

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$450,000

EVALUATION CATEGORY:

2

RECOMMENDED FUNDING:

\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. SF 424: Section E should only be for 2nd and 3rd years.
2. SF 424B: 2008 date at signature block missing.
3. SF 424: Section 2 – should not check resubmitted

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a somewhat diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. Strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal
3. NEPA is complete.
4. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative riparian forest restoration.

5. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
6. The project will create new jobs.
7. The prior weaknesses were not addressed because of substantial changes to the proposal, i.e. the increased collaboration in the project substantially changed the approach.
8. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
9. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal (collaboration with the Wild Turkey Federation and the Wilderness Alliance).
10. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
11. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
12. The project will maintain the capacity of restoration efforts (Canadian River Program and the associated industries).
13. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
14. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
15. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
16. The proposal monitoring goes beyond the core CFRP ecological indicators.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The project title does not adequately describe what will be accomplished.
2. The youth component lacks detail.
3. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal. Letters are missing from Plant Materials Center and NRCS.
4. There is no discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan.
5. The proposal narrative lacks detailed explanation of herbicide application / safety efforts.
6. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.
7. The proposal does not state that safety of operators / operations will be assured.
8. The proposal lacks a description or estimate of volume of restoration byproducts.
9. The treatment and/or utilization plans are vague.
10. The narrative does not effectively support the work plan and budget.
11. The proposal lacks detailed budget and work plan.
12. The budget does not appear to adequately support the work plan.
13. The budget does not include clear unit costs.
14. The budget does not follow RFP budget format.
15. Distinction between the project and previously funded CFRP grants is unclear.
16. The narrative does not clearly explain that this is a new rather than revised proposal.
17. Budget and Budget Narrative are not detailed or clear
18. Summary says treatment of 63 acres per year on page 6, but budget total of \$189,000 has only \$39,000 in year 3. The budget narrative says 294 acres of restoration per year at \$400 per acre which totals \$35,000 and they have \$45,000 in the budget – so budget is \$10,000 over what they plan to treat.

19. There is no letter from the NMSU Range Improvement Task Force indicating that they will conduct the monitoring as the proposal states.
20. Treatment removal does not specify acres
21. There is no letter or information on pole planting, reseeding, or sources of material per the NRCS Los Lunas agreement.
22. Maps of treatment areas are not clear.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. From the beginning of the development of a restoration project, general estimates of volume of byproduct to be generated should be made for the purpose of co-developing the utilization strategy.
2. We strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised proposal next year with the recommendations and weaknesses addressed.
3. Proponent should address fire and whether a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) was developed. This information can be determined through consultation with NM State Forestry, NMFIA or NMFWRI.
4. Proponent should address how the planting will be protected.
5. Considering that much effort is put into determining ecological benefits of treatment, the project should consider incorporating an untreated area as a control in order to more clearly determine the effects of the restoration treatments. This does not mean to leave a “planned to treat” area untreated – but this would be useful if not all areas are treated.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 03-09
ORGANIZATION:	Forest Guild
FOREST:	Cibola
PROJECT TITLE:	Capacity Building, Restoration, and Wood Utilization in the Bluewater Watershed
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$359,939
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$89,985
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$449,924
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$359,939

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES: N/A

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. NEPA is complete.
5. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
6. The project includes a good youth component.
7. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List.

8. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
10. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
11. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
12. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
13. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
14. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
15. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
16. The proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
17. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
18. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
19. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
20. The log of communication is an effective means of describing consultation with tribes.
21. The proposed project attempts to develop a GIS based system that links restoration treatments with restoration costs.
22. Increases capacity of Ramah Navajo Chapter Forestry program, a previous CFRP recipient.
23. The proposal includes a strong letter of support from the District Ranger and the Executive Director of the Ramah Navajo Chapter.
24. The project includes an adaptive approach to restoration in an annual evaluation of monitoring data which is used to collaboratively refine prescriptions.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The youth component lacks detail indicating what or how much will be done.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Show justification for the Forest Guild salary rates and benefits.
2. The proposal would be improved by providing the potential for markets: firewood, pellets woodchips etc.

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 04-09

ORGANIZATION:

Mt. Taylor Machine, LLC

FOREST:

Cibola

PROJECT TITLE:

Increased Forest Restoration and Utilization in the Cibola

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$90,000

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$450,000

EVALUATION CATEGORY:

2

RECOMMENDED FUNDING:

\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. SF 424A: Lines 19, 20, 21 are blank.

2. SF 424A, Section E: Dollar amount should only include federal share (\$120,000) currently \$150,000

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List.
9. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
10. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
11. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
12. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
13. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire. The project is tied to the Bluewater Watershed EIS and the mechanical treatments are intended to set up the use of fire on the landscape.
14. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
15. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
16. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
17. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
18. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts. (pellet manufacturing)
19. The proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
20. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
21. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
22. Good budget detail: unit costs are broken out.
23. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
24. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
25. The project will create new jobs.
26. The project includes an adaptive approach to restoration in an annual evaluation of monitoring data which is used to collaboratively refine prescriptions.
27. The proposal includes the development of a wood utilization feasibility study to assess the cost of treatment across the landscape.
28. The proposal includes the development of merchantability criteria for biomass products to better determine sales, service and stewardship contract costs.

29. Project is part of a landscape level comprehensive forest restoration effort that significantly generates industry capacity and allows for scaling up to meet supply.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proposal does not mention attending the CFRP annual workshop.
2. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided.
3. The monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan. The socio-economic plan is vague in comparison to the ecological plan. Also - The density in the first two treatment areas are already below the targets identified on the monitoring plan.
4. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities. It is not clear if and/or why low density stands are being treated.
5. The budget does not appear to adequately support the work plan.
6. The work plan and timeline only goes to 2010 and the proposal is for three years.
7. Documentation of letters sent to potentially affected tribes should be included in the project proposal.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Move the “operating costs” shown in the equipment line on 424b to other (h).
2. Correct budget unit cost to show unit versus dollar costs. Move equipment costs shown to personnel.
3. The training and admin benefits should be moved to fringe benefits. Training costs need to be clarified, # of trainings, # of attendees, and actual costs instead of a percent.
4. The proponent should consider creating two separate tables on page 9 for each forest type to clarify the treatments and vegetation types being addressed.
5. The proposal should define more clearly the role of the conservation group in the collaborator table on page 5.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 05-09
ORGANIZATION:	Pueblo of Santa Ana
FOREST:	Cibola
PROJECT TITLE:	Bosque Community Planting Using Small Diameter Biomass at the Pueblo of Santa Ana
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. In SF 424A, columns 3 and 4 should be left blank.
2. Totals in Column 3 belong in Column 1.
3. The purchase of monitoring supplies should be listed as supplies, not under contracts.

STRENGTHS:

4. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
5. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
6. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
7. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
8. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
9. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
10. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
11. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured. The indicators are well matched to the goals of the program.
12. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
13. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
14. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
15. The project will create new jobs.
16. Using invasive plant species chips as mulch to increase the probability of survival of native species plantings is innovative. This might have been seen before, but it is further combined within an experimental design (water harvesting basin vs. mushroom plug spawn treatments that are crossed with land cover types –barren, deep leaf litter and woody debris)
17. The proponent is reaching out to other tribes and other non-tribal conservation groups.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with Bosque Environmental Monitoring Program: UNM&BHS groups in design, implementation, and monitoring. Collaboration appears limited.
2. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal: missing BEMP (UNM&BHS)
3. The NMED collaborator letters does not verify match.
4. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided, but difficult given size.
5. The proposal does not include provisions for preserving old and large trees.
6. The proposal does not state that safety of operators / operations will be assured.
7. The budget is unclear on whether the match is non-federal; the mulch may be created with federal funds, thus cannot be used as match. Mulch (\$ market value) is included as part of the non-federal match, but creation of mulch would appear to be at least partially funded by project itself (or possibly a previous CFRP project).
8. The budget includes line items for both gasoline and mileage; only one of these items should be included.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Clarify the match does not include federal funds (with respect to the mulch).
2. Clarify ambiguity from BIA letter on NEPA responsibility.
3. Incorporate a plan for worker safety in the proposal.

PROJECT NUMBER: **CFRP 06-09**
ORGANIZATION: Claunch Pinto Soil and Water Conservation District
FOREST: Cibola
PROJECT TITLE: Ojo Peak Post-wildfire Remediation and Monitoring Project
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$213,268
MATCHING FUNDS: \$42,680
TOTAL BUDGET: \$255,948
EVALUATION CATEGORY: 1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$213,268

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. The non-federal match is less than 20%.

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
3. NEPA is complete.
4. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
5. The project includes a good youth component.
6. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
7. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
8. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
9. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
10. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
11. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
12. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
13. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
14. The project will create new jobs.
15. The proposal monitoring goes beyond the core CFRP ecological indicators.

WEAKNESSES:

1. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal: La Merced del Manzano, Crane Collaboration, La Merced del Manzano Youth Corps, Las Lunas Plant Materials Center.
2. The budget does not include clear unit costs. Costs for plant materials and training are lumped.
3. The narrative does not effectively support the work plan and budget. The budget justification regarding NMFWR course is not described in the proposal narrative.
4. Non-federal match displayed in budget is less than 20%. (Proponent clarified that there were plenty of other items that can be used to bring match to required amount, particularly from the water trust board.)

5. There are two partner 3's listed in the budget – Zeedack and NMFIA/ECRM. The latter is not in the justification.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The 424A should show combined federal and nonfederal in section B, column 1 and Section E, Column B.
2. Work plan and budget justification should clarify that the workers will be hired by the proponent.
3. The monitoring costs for SWCA in the budget should be more clearly broken down and provided somewhere in the proposal.
4. The proposal should consider increasing the sample size to better meet statistical reliability.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 07-09
ORGANIZATION:	La Merced del Manzano
FOREST:	Cibola
PROJECT TITLE:	Red Canyon Forest Restoration Project
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$354,918
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$93,100
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$448,018
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$354,918

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. SF 424A, Section E: year 2 and 3 federal \$ is blank.
2. 424A Sec. E, yr 2 and 3 are blank – needs to be filled out correction.
3. Thinning prescription details would help.

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List.
8. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
10. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
11. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
12. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.

13. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
14. The project is a good value for the money (NEPA costs per acre are low).
15. The plots will follow the common stand exam protocol used by the Forest Service.
16. The use of consistent socio-economic indicators already used by other projects will help to measure impact across programs.
17. The project will create new jobs.

WEAKNESSES:

1. To understand the proposal's effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities. Since the treatments have not been designed yet, it is difficult to determine the effect of thinning on fire behavior and the forests.
2. Some letters of commitment (SWCA) do not specify amount of effort/match.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proponent may benefit from referring to Matt Tuten's Masters thesis that looked at applying goshawk guidelines with restoration principles.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 08-09
ORGANIZATION:	Merced del Pueblo de Chilili
FOREST:	Cibola
PROJECT TITLE:	Merced del Pueblo de Chilili Wildfire Fuels Reduction Collaborative Forest Restoration Project
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$360,000

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES: N/A

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. NEPA is complete.
3. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List.
4. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
5. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information, including references to Ponderosa pine structure and natural processes.
6. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
7. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
8. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
9. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
10. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
11. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.

12. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
13. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
14. The project proposals includes innovative tribal/land grant cross jurisdictional activities.
15. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
16. The project will create new jobs.
17. The proposal includes potential products and potential values for material to be removed.

WEAKNESSES:

1. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
2. The local and regional lumber producers are not identified.
3. The proposal lacks a detailed budget; there is no annual break down of the budget.
4. The map does identify communities in relation to the proposed thinning areas and how the proposal would provide protection from wildfire.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proponent should ensure that any socio-economic surveys either 1) meet US Office of Management and Budget guidelines, or 2) do not use Federal dollars.
2. The proposal would be stronger if the proceeds from the sale of products were specifically earmarked for future restoration activities.
3. The final budget should break out the fiscal and administrative component and the socio-economic monitoring plan.

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 09-09

ORGANIZATION:

Pueblo of Isleta

FOREST:

Cibola

PROJECT TITLE:

Multi-jurisdictional Collaborative Landscape Analysis

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$212,855

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$53,214

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$266,069

EVALUATION CATEGORY:

1

RECOMMENDED FUNDING:

\$212,855

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES: N/A

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal. The inclusion of meeting notes and attendance of planning meetings indicates evidence of early collaboration.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
4. The letter from the Forest Supervisor specifically states that the work proposed is included in the work plans for affected personnel, indicating detailed pre-planning and collaboration.

5. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
6. The project includes a good youth component.
7. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List.
8. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
10. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
11. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
12. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort. This project is an innovative and unprecedented collaboration between the Isleta Tribe, land grant, Forest Service, and Department of Defense.
13. The project experiments with salt cedar as a bio-energy fuel.
14. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
15. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
16. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
17. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
18. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
19. The treatment areas are clear on the maps provided.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The letter of commitment from Kirtland is missing.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal might be enhanced by including the BLM in the project if the land tenure is appropriate.
2. The proposal would be enhanced by increasing the number and range of participating conservation organizations.
3. On page xvi, budget narrative, clarify that the USFS and Kirkland contributions do not qualify as match.

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 10-09

ORGANIZATION:

Andy Chacon Forest Restoration Company

FOREST:

Carson

PROJECT TITLE:

El Rito Forest Health Restoration Project

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$90,000

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$450,000

EVALUATION CATEGORY:

1

RECOMMENDED FUNDING:

\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. The 424a is incorrect, particularly Section B and E.

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
8. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
9. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
10. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
11. The proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
12. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
13. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
14. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
15. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
16. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
17. The project will create new jobs.
18. Hazardous fuel reduction treatments are taking place in a municipal watershed.

WEAKNESSES:

1. There is no discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan.
2. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal would be strengthened by explaining table three with more tree data. Of the 244 trees per acres what is the percentage of trees greater than 12”?
2. In the budget, contractor costs should be moved to personnel or other.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 11-09 Rev. 1
ORGANIZATION:	Village of Questa
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Forest Thinning for Fire Prevention and Education of Youth
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	3
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES: N/A

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support – letter from Congressional delegation.
2. NEPA is complete – FONSI included.
3. The project includes a good youth component used in the past with other CFRPs.
4. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
5. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information using FS silviculturalist.
6. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
7. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts. wood to community
8. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured – see monitoring plan.
9. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
10. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
11. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).

WEAKNESSES:

1. The collaborator / contractor letters do not verify match. (Singing River Group)
2. The proposal does not include provisions for preserving old and large trees.
3. The panel's prior weaknesses and recommendations were not adequately addressed.
4. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation group in design, implementation, and monitoring.
5. There is no discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan.
6. The project will not add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
7. The youth component lacks detail.
8. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
9. The treatment and/or utilization plans are vague. Specific Detail: see page 5 describing justification for treatments but little discussion of science behind forest restoration or what will be done.
10. The budget does not include clear unit costs, specifically the educational component was not clear in the budget.
11. Contractors are included in the budget line for personnel.
12. The detailed budget does not follow RFP budget format.
13. Piñon-juniper restoration objectives are not adequately addressed in the proposal.
14. The monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan.
15. There is no discussion of socio-economic monitoring
16. The equipment costs associated with the match on the chipper are excessive (\$225/hour for 12" chipper is very high rate).
17. The contract labor of \$1,600/acre seems high absent other information about density or degree of difficulty. The estimate of cords/acre appears low for the per acre cost.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.
2. We strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised proposal next year with the recommendations and weaknesses addressed.
3. The proposal should address the panel’s prior weaknesses and recommendations.
4. SF 424a, Section A column B listed N/A should read 10.679- CFDA number.
5. In the budget narrative under “other”, there needs to be clarification for the amount listed as educational component.
6. There are no fringe benefits listed. If those are part of personnel, they should be broken out.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 12-09
ORGANIZATION:	Sierra Soil and Water Conservation District
ORGANIZATION:	Jaramillo and Sons Forest Products
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Quality Environment and Economic Sustainability Project
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES: N/A

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
10. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
11. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
12. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
13. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
14. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
15. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.

16. The proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
17. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
18. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
19. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
20. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
21. Project identifies and has gotten letters of support, and prices from local sawmill, latillas, vigas & firewood processors

WEAKNESSES:

1. The collaborator / contractor letters do not verify match, Wild Earth Guardians letter commits to between \$2,000 and \$4,000 in match, budget includes the \$4,000 figure only.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 13-09
ORGANIZATION:	Ruidoso Municipal Schools District
ORGANIZATION:	Cedar Valley Field Services
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Navajo Dam Hazardous Fuel Reduction and Restoration Project
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$330,783
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$67,038
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$397,821
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	2
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. SF 424, #18 left blank.
2. The 424 is incomplete, #18. The 424a, column (b) does not indicate the CFDA number.
3. The budget does not show fringe benefits.
4. Indirect charge is over 10%

STRENGTHS:

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

9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
10. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
11. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
12. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
13. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
14. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured. They provide excellent use of data analysis.
15. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
16. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
17. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
18. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
19. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
20. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
21. The proposal seeks to exceed the basic requirements for monitoring i.e. bird surveys.
22. The project will create or maintain new jobs.

WEAKNESSES:

1. Supplies are included in the budget line for equipment (or vice versa). Seems the proponent is listed as a contractor instead of under personnel.
2. There is no mention of socio-economic monitoring in the proposal. Job creation is one of the objectives of the proposal, thus monitoring should be included.
3. The non-federal match is less than 20%.
4. Travel needs a better description breakdown.
5. The description of meeting costs is vague and the number of people should be clarified.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The panel encourages the proponent to work with BOR in the final design phase to further enhance the de-channelization of the river and the natural watering in the site to reconnect with the flood plain.
2. The proponents and operators should consider utilizing NMFIA worker safety training.
3. The proposal should incorporate socio-economic indicators in the monitoring plan.
4. The proponents must develop a strong socio-economic monitoring plan before the award can be funded.
5. A full 20% non-federal match must be assured prior to award.
6. The proponent should reach out to fishing guides and outfitters and include them as match to increase the economic stability of the proposed project.

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 14-09 Rev. 2

ORGANIZATION:

Urban Interface Solutions

FOREST:

Carson

PROJECT TITLE:

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

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$360,000

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

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

Proponent did not sign or date SF424.

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List.
9. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
10. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
11. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
12. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
13. The project aims to help overcome the concerns for use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
14. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
15. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
16. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
17. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
18. The proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
19. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
20. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
21. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
22. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
23. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
24. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
25. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
26. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
27. The project will create new jobs.
28. The expenditure of these public dollars would expand private efforts of the community to reduce fire risk exposure; these are strategic acres.

29. Dollars from sales of merchantable materials will be used to fund further treatment.
30. The project builds on firewise designation of the community.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided.
2. There is a letter of support from the Carson Forest Watch in the appendix; it is not clear whether their concerns were addressed in the proposal

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The 424a is incorrect, particularly Section B
2. Program income was mentioned but not included in budget.
3. Fringe benefits need to be listed separately, and not included in the personnel costs.
4. The proposal should clearly indicate that the majority of material processed with CFRP purchased equipment will come from public lands.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 15-09
ORGANIZATION:	Picuris Pueblo
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Restoration of the Picuris Pueblo Traditional Grasslands for Sustainability of the Bison Program and Cultural Preservation of the Community
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	4
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES: N/A

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
2. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
3. The project includes a good youth component.
4. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
5. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
6. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
7. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
8. The proponent working with the Wind River Ranch Foundation demonstrates unique collaboration.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided.
2. The proposal does not include provisions for preserving old and large trees.

3. There is no discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan.
4. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
5. The proposal lacks a description or estimate of volume of restoration byproducts.
6. The monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan.
7. Protection of “Leave” trees is not addressed. There is no grazing buffalo plan explaining how long buffalo will be in the area.
8. The proposal is not a good fit with the purposes and objectives of the Act

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with Audubon groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.
2. Proponent may wish to contact NRCS regarding their cost share program related to wildlife.
3. Any revision should focus on the forest restoration aspects of the proponent’s objectives.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 16-09
ORGANIZATION:	City of Raton
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Multi-jurisdictional Public and Youth Education, Forest Restoration, and Water Supply Protection in the City of Raton Municipal Watershed
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
RECOMMENDED CATEGORY:	2
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. The proposal uses different budget format.

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The project includes a good youth component.
7. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List.
8. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.

10. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
11. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
12. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
13. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
14. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
15. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
16. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
17. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
18. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
19. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
20. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
21. The project will create new jobs.
22. The Park would be an effective educational forum and provide an excellent opportunity for discussing restoration issues.
23. The ecological monitoring exceeds the baseline requirements.
24. Builds on a previous CFRP planning grant for Sugarite Canyon.
25. Project partners will use the success of the Santa Fe Watershed management as a learning opportunity for local government officials concerned about fire in a municipal watershed.
26. This project seeks to protect a city watershed that is the drinking supply for 9,000 people.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not have a letter of support from TNC.
2. The project will not add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
3. The milestones are too general.
4. Given the existing stand density, non removal of woody material may inhibit under story recovery. The Panel has concerns about the depth of chips left on the ground and there is no mention of this in the prescription.
5. There are no socio-economic component of the monitoring plan that addresses the education and recreational goals.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. We strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised proposal next year with the recommendations and weaknesses addressed.
2. The proposal would be strengthened by providing more detail about what 7th grade water quality monitoring activities will involve.
3. The proposal should incorporate socio-economic indicators in the monitoring plan (eg. recreation visitation counts, attitudes and perceptions, counts of educational participation and activities, etc.)
4. The proponents must develop a strong socio-economic monitoring plan before the award can be funded.
5. The proposal would be strengthened by better addressing why chipping the material was the chosen prescription and provide information regarding the depth of chips and

recovery of vegetation. The proponent should investigate removal of biomass from the site or ways to mitigate the negative ecological effects.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 17-09
ORGANIZATION:	Amigos del Bosque, LLC
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Forest Restoration on Carson National Forest
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	3
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. The SF424, Section 18, does not match section C on 424A – both concern the non-federal match.

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List.
9. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
10. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
11. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
12. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
13. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
14. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
15. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
16. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
17. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
18. The proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
19. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
20. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.

21. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
22. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
23. The project will create new jobs.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The collaborator / contractor letters do not verify match.
2. There is no discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan.
3. To understand the proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities. The proposal does not mention three of the five CFRP core indicators.
4. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.
The proposal lacks a description or estimate of volume of restoration byproducts.
5. The treatment and/or utilization plans are vague.
6. The monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan.
7. The milestones are too general.
8. The budget does not appear to adequately support the work plan.
9. The detailed budget does not follow RFP budget format.
10. Letters from collaborators do not verify the match that is displayed in the budget,
11. Workers compensation should be listed as a fringe benefit in the budget.
12. The proposal addressed most of the CFRP purposes and objectives (except planting), but the format made it very difficult to read and understand.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Leasing equipment is not a supply, it is equipment
2. Budget lacks detail on youth and training that would be needed before funding.

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 18-09

ORGANIZATION:

Chimayo Youth Conservation Corps

FOREST:

Carson

PROJECT TITLE:

Engaging Young Adults in Sustainable Forest Stewardship and Restoration

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$90,000

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$450,000

EVALUATION CATEGORY:

2

RECOMMENDED FUNDING:

\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES: N/A

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
3. NEPA is complete.

4. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
5. The project includes a good youth component.
6. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
7. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
8. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
9. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
10. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
11. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
12. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
13. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
14. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
15. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
16. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
17. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
2. Frank Rand Boy Scout camp was listed as partner, but there was no letter of support from the camp explaining their role in the project.
3. To understand proposals effectiveness, more information is needed on the site- specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
4. The budget is unclear on whether the match is non-federal.
5. The Budget is unclear on the non-federal match. If federal dollars pay for crew, crew supervisor, mileage, mileage for pick-up and delivery of firewood, then you appear to have covered all or a significant fraction of the costs of firewood. Thus they cannot use value (\$120/cord) of firewood as non-federal match.
6. The Pueblo of Picuris was listed as a Collaborator with multiple roles (page 28), but there was no letter of support from them.
7. Contractors are incorrectly listed as personnel costs in the budget.
8. USFS and BLM are shown as providing non-federal match (pages 27-28).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.
2. The proponent should clarify that the match does not include federal funds.
3. The proposal could be strengthened by including desired future condition by forest/structural types in the table on page 10 of project narrative.

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 19-09

ORGANIZATION: Pueblo of Taos

FOREST: Carson
PROJECT TITLE: Forest Preventative Fuels Treatment on Taos Pueblo
Lands
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY: 3
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. There proposal did not provide a budget

STRENGTHS:

1. NEPA is complete.
2. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List.
3. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
4. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
5. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
6. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
7. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups and business interests missing in design, implementation, and monitoring.
2. The youth component lacks detail.
3. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal; Forest Guild, BIA, Rocky Mountain Youth Corp, National Renewable Energy Lab, HR Vigil, Taos Pueblo Fire Program
4. The proposal did not include documentation of consultation with tribes.
5. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal.
6. The proposal lacks a description or estimate of volume of restoration byproducts.
7. The monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan.
8. The proposal lacks the required detailed budget as described in the RFP.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The project should either specifically add a socio-economic component to the monitoring plan or include more detail on the Taos Canyon CFRP Coalition MOU that speaks to socio-economic monitoring.

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 20-09

ORGANIZATION: El Greco
FOREST: Carson

PROJECT TITLE:	Camino Real/Ojo Pilot/Abeyeta P.J. Mountain Area of the Carson National Forest
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	3
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. SF424A Budget Sec. B only (1) Grant Program (should not express by year)

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
3. NEPA is complete.
4. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
5. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
6. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
7. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
8. The proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
9. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
10. The project will create new jobs.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring and there was no letter of support from the Community Forestry Alliance.
2. The youth component lacks detail.
3. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal; specifically the letter from the Pojaque Pueblo.
4. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided.
5. The proposal does not include provisions for preserving old and large trees.
6. The project will not add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
7. The proposal lacks a description or estimate of volume of restoration byproducts.
8. The monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan.
9. The potential road work and the aspen regeneration are mentioned in the narrative but not in the workplan or budget..
10. The panel's prior weaknesses and recommendations not adequately addressed. It is not clear in the text how many acres will be treated.
11. The proposal does not include a letter of collaboration concerning monitoring from the NM Game and Fish.

12. The proposal does not add significantly to restoration efforts in that the treatments that are proposed are sanitation and maintenance cuts, not restoration.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.
2. From the beginning of the development of a restoration project, general estimates of volume of byproduct to be generated should be made for the purpose of co-developing the utilization strategy.
3. The treatment acres in the proposal should match the acres in the District Ranger's letter.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 21-09 Rev. 1
ORGANIZATION:	Northern New Mexico College
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Creating Careers from Forest Restoration
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$240,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$60,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$300,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. The project totals in 424 A and B do not match.

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The project will indirectly reduce fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List.
9. The project will indirectly reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
10. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
11. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
12. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
13. The proposal includes a diverse array of products.
14. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
15. Good budget detail and/or work plan.

16. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
17. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
18. The project includes cross-jurisdictional planning and educational activities.
19. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
20. The project will create new jobs, including jobs with a technical training component (GIS).
21. The project incorporates GIS based information in both the CWPP and the educational component, which allows the student to access forest modeling, restoration tools, Landfire data etc.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring. In the development of projects that would utilize forest material, conservation groups should be involved in the supply of material. The conservation groups should also be consulted in the development of CWPP and in pre-NEPA collaboration.
2. The letters of support from Santa Fe Community College and the BLM are missing.
3. The proposal does not clearly indicate that the majority of biomass material processed with CFRP purchased equipment will come from federal lands.
4. The proposal lacks a description or estimate of volume of restoration by products .It would help to see an estimate of the biomass that could be used to support the kiln and an estimate of an amount needed if the college went to a biomass heating system.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Verify the role of Forest ERA and if it will continue participating in the project given Haydee Hampton's absence.
2. The proposal would be strengthened by representation of conservation groups.

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 22-09

ORGANIZATION:

Carlsbad Soil and Water Conservation District

FOREST:

Lincoln

PROJECT TITLE:

McMillan Native Vegetation Restoration

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$90,000

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$450,000

EVALUATION CATEGORY:

2

RECOMMENDED FUNDING:

\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. 424 A indicates 1 year of funding and the total in 424E exceed the \$120,000 yearly CFRP budget allowance.

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support.

3. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
4. NEPA is complete.
5. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
6. The project includes a good youth component.
7. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
8. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
9. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
10. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
11. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
12. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
13. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
14. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
15. The project will create new jobs.
16. This riparian restoration project is apart of the Pecos Rover Non Native Phreatophyte Management Plan, and could create a significant economic impact on NM state water compact delivery obligations.
17. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with external conservation/wildlife groups could improve monitoring.
2. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal. (NM Game and Fish)
3. The monitoring plan is vague and does not include socio-economic indicators or indicators with regard to wildlife.
4. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided.
5. The project does not include a socio-economic component in either the goals or the monitoring plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with external conservation groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 23-09 Rev. 1
ORGANIZATION:	Gila WoodNet
FOREST:	Gila
PROJECT TITLE:	Forest Restoration Thinning on Signal Peak North Project
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1

RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$360,000

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES: N/A

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The project includes a good youth component.
7. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List.
8. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
10. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
11. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
12. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
13. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
14. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
15. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
16. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
17. The proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
18. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
19. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
20. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
21. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
22. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
23. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
24. The project will create new or maintain existing jobs.
25. The proposal would track monitoring of other existing and future CFRP projects.
26. Partnering with the USFS Forest Operations Research Lab would present a unique opportunity in Southwestern Forest Restoration analysis and lead to the development of production and treatment cost functions.
27. The analysis and budgeting for average versus difficult treatment acres would help predict restoration treatment costs more accurately.
28. The Forest Service letter mentions past performance on grants.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided, where are the specific 240 acres to be treated.
2. The detailed budget does not follow RFP budget format; no budget narrative. The monitoring plan lacks two of the five Core Ecological Indicators.
3. The Forest Service letter of support references a decision memo, but the decision memo was not included as an appendix in the proposal.
4. Units for hauling are more appropriately a per acre cost.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proponent should identify specifically the 240 acres of thinning that is included in the budget.
2. The proponent should work with the NMFIA, NRCS, NM State Forestry, and the Gila National Forest along with Bob Rummer to compile average treatment costs with density in the economic analysis.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 24-09
ORGANIZATION:	R.C. Forest Products, LLC
FOREST:	Gila
PROJECT TITLE:	Increased Treatment of SDT through Low Impact Techniques
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$120,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$30,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$150,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	3
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. No letter of support indicating where material for processing will come from.

STRENGTHS:

1. NEPA is complete.
2. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
3. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
4. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
5. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
6. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
7. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
8. The project will create new jobs.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The project title does not adequately describe what will be accomplished or where treatment will occur.

2. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal, specifically NM Association of Conservation Districts.
3. No letter of endorsement from the Land Management Agency where treatments would occur.
4. The treatment and/or utilization plans are vague.
The monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the CFRP Core Ecological Indicators.
5. The proposal lacks detailed budget justification.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.
2. A letter of endorsement from the Forest that would administer the grant should be included in the proposal.
3. The proposal should include a long-term capacity building plan within the context of the larger community.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 25-09
ORGANIZATION:	Geronimo Sustainable Forest Products LLC
FOREST:	Gila
PROJECT TITLE:	Piñon-Juniper Sustainable Forest Wood Product Development: Collaborative Stakeholder Involvement in PJ Restoration in Northern Catron County, NM
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	2
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES: N/A

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
4. NEPA is complete.
5. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
6. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
7. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
8. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
9. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
10. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
11. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
12. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
13. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.

14. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
15. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
16. The project will create new jobs.
17. The proposal includes a letter of credit to support purchase orders of \$200,000 in the first year.
18. The project deals with the creation of a combination of a restoration treatment and a utilization plan for the WUI of a ranch subdivision.
19. The collaborative approach to prescription design under the existing NEPA clearance is an excellent example of the collaborative process.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with tribal groups in design, implementation, and monitoring. (Alamo Navajo)
2. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal i.e. Audubon, Rocky Mountain Elk, and State Land Office.
3. The proposal did not include documentation of consultation with tribes.
4. The budget does not adequately support the work plan (i.e. workers comp rate).
5. The proposal did not include an estimate of how much firewood would be removed and sold.
6. The collaborative planning process is not clearly described in the work plan.
7. It is not clear that the project will include the required CFRP core ecological indicators.
8. The proposal lacks a youth component.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with tribal groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.
2. The proposal would be strengthened by incorporation of a youth component.
3. Documentation of letters sent to potentially affected tribes should be included in the project proposal.
4. The proposal could be strengthened with inclusion of a woodland ecologist that works in these systems as a partner.
5. The proposal at a minimum should monitor the core CFRP Ecological Indicators.
6. Workers Compensation should be moved from indirect costs from fringe benefits.
7. The proposal should clearly indicate that the majority of material processed with CFRP purchased equipment will come from public lands.
8. The proponent is strongly encouraged to resubmit this proposal next year addressing the weaknesses and recommendations of the panel.

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 26-06

ORGANIZATION:

Sierra Soil and Water Conservation District

FOREST:

Gila

PROJECT TITLE:

Use of Distributed Generation Modular

Biopower as a

Management Tool for the

Rio Grande Corridor Bosque

FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$120,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$30,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$150,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	2
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES: N/A

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
3. NEPA is complete.
4. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
5. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
6. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
7. The project experiments with materials for bio-energy efforts.
8. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
9. The project will create new jobs.
10. This proposal provides an innovative analysis of utilizing forest residues with advanced energy technologies.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The RC&D did not include their letter of support verifying match.
2. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal. If the test of salt cedar as a feedstock in the Community Power Corporation unit is positive, the proposal lacks an economic assessment of the entire project from feedstock to marketing.
3. The monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan.
4. Specific Detail: does not monitor all of the Core Ecological Indicators, e.g. surface fuel and crown base height.
5. The proposal is unclear on how the assessment of the salt cedar as source of biofuel to produce energy will be included as part of the multiparty assessment.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaborating with biomass expertise within agencies, industries, and universities.
2. As the monitoring plan is developed, the proponent might consider tracking the carbon sequestration implication for net carbon change.
3. The proponent is encouraged to use established safety trainings programs like the NMFIA FWSP certification.
4. The monitoring plan should include an assessment of the costs of salt cedar removal and chipping to be compared against the value of the alternative generated energy.
5. If the test of salt cedar as a feedstock in the Community Power Corporation unit is positive, the proposal should incorporate an economic assessment of the entire project from feedstock to marketing.

6. The proponent is strongly recommended to resubmit this proposal addressing the strengths and weaknesses noted by the panel.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 27-09
ORGANIZATION:	Restoration Technologies, LLC
FOREST:	Gila
PROJECT TITLE:	Zerosion - An Engineered Composite Biomass Erosion Control Material
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. In the proponent's responses to the previous Panel's Weaknesses and Recommendations (Appendix A), the proponent requested that the information provided be proprietary. However, all information discussed in an open Federal Advisory Committee is in the public domain and will be considered non-proprietary (Page 13, 2009 CFRP-RFP).
2. In 424, Section 19, the wrong box is checked.

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. The project includes a good youth component.
6. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
7. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
8. The project will create new jobs.
9. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
10. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
11. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses and recommendations.
12. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
13. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
14. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
15. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
16. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
17. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
18. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.

19. The proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
20. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
21. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
22. The use of a control adds strength to the monitoring plan.
23. An important output of the project is the comparison of performance and cost measures for Zerosion against currently available market products
24. This proposal represents good leveraging of public funds with USDA SBIR funds.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The project title does not adequately describe what will be accomplished.
2. With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal. There is no estimate of equipment production.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proponent should ensure that the purchase of equipment and supplies will occur after NEPA is completed.
2. The proponent should provide an estimate of equipment production. The proposal would be strengthened by referencing in the narrative the measures taken to address ecological monitoring provided in the Appendix.
3. The proponent should confirm that NEPA compliance for FS land will include the non FS land project sites.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 28-09
ORGANIZATION:	El Milagro Herbs, Inc.
FOREST:	Gila
PROJECT TITLE:	Recovering More Value from Pine Trees: Distilling Essential Oils and Hydrosols
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	3
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. SF424 over budget.
2. The 424, Section 18, total does not match the 424a, Section A, total.
3. Sections A, B and C of the 424A are not filled out correctly

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to the roles and responsibilities described in the proposal.

4. NEPA is complete.
5. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List.
6. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
7. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
8. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
9. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
10. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
11. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
12. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
13. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
14. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
15. The project will create new jobs.
16. Good budget detail and/or work plan.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with tribal groups in design, implementation, and monitoring of the project.
2. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal (Oregon).
3. The proposal did not include documentation of consultation with tribes.
4. The proposal does not state that safety of operators / operations will be assured.
5. The narrative does not effectively support the work plan and budget.
6. The budget does not include clear unit costs.
7. The detailed budget does not follow RFP budget format.
8. The youth component lacks detail.
9. The project will not add significant capacity to restoration efforts. The project will not utilize significant amounts of forest residue.
10. Collaborator letters do not verify the dollar amounts that are utilized in the non federal match of the budget (Kellar Logging and NM Highlands).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with Oregon USFS Research groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.
2. Documentation of letters sent to potentially affected tribes should be included in the project proposal.

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 29-09

ORGANIZATION:

K & B Timberworks, Inc.

FOREST:

Gila

PROJECT TITLE:

K&B Expansion Project at Reserve Sawmill

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$90,000

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

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES: N/A

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
6. The youth component is orientation toward business development.
7. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
8. The project will indirectly lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
9. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
10. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
11. The proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
12. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
13. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
14. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
15. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
16. The project will create new jobs.
17. Equipment will lead to increased utilization plan, acres treated with forest utilization, etc.
18. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
19. The project recognizes that the added capacity that this will provide will help reduce costs of forest restoration treatments.
20. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
21. Project presents an innovative installation of a solar kiln.

WEAKNESSES:

1. There is no discussion of the markets/products or efficiencies that will result from the added equipment.
2. There is no reference to increased production or value.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 30-09
ORGANIZATION: Santa Fe County Fire Department
FOREST: Santa Fe

PROJECT TITLE:	E-CWP (Engaging Communities in Wildfire Prevention): Reducing Fire Risk & Improving Forest Health in Santa Fe County Wildland Urban Interface
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$358,683
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$91,228
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$449,911
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES: N/A

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners, although conservation groups appear to be lacking.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. Since NEPA is not complete on San Ildefonso land, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List.
9. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
10. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
11. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
12. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
13. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
14. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
15. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
16. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
17. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
18. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
19. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
20. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
21. The project will create new jobs.
22. The project incorporates the innovative element of individual property wildfire risk assessments using portable GPS, GIS technology.
23. The monitoring and evaluation results will be used for adaptive management purposes.
24. The proposed project builds upon the success of previous CFRP project.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
2. Supplies are included in the budget line for equipment (or vice versa). Travel is listed as a supply and a Pickup use is listed in supply, but should be moved to other.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. In the socio-economic monitoring plan the proponents are encouraged to track property values and assessments with and without the incorporation of the wildfire risk assessment.
2. The proposal could be strengthened with collaboration with conservation organizations.
3. Since the treatments are designed in the persistent Piñon juniper woodlands, proponents encouraged to retain an all age stand structure and leave some coarse woody debris on the ground.
4. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with woodland ecologists on prescription development.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 31-09
ORGANIZATION:	Biophilia Foundation
FOREST:	Santa Fe
PROJECT TITLE:	Sapello Watershed Restoration Project Phase 1 Planning
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$192,491
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$48,596
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$241,087
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES: N/A

STRENGTHS:

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

13. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
14. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
15. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
16. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
17. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
18. The proposal places a planning emphasis on building a collaborative restoration program that explicitly recognizes and connects to significant commitments from an adjacent private ranch.

WEAKNESSES:

1. While there are some explicit statements and figures, because of the multiple youth groups (3), it is hard to track exactly how many youths will be trained or participate in what activities.
2. The proposal does not include provisions for preserving old and large trees.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proponent should ensure that any surveys either 1) meet US Office of Management and Budget guidelines, or 2) do not use Federal dollars.
2. Proposal budget and narrative could be strengthened with more specific breakouts (by exact numbers of hours and activities) for the multiple youth groups.
3. The costs in the proposal may be high, other contractors and options should be explored.
4. The proposal should seek to strengthen its collaboration with local industry representatives in the planning effort.
5. The proposal and the proposed NEPA analysis could be strengthened by adoption of the New Mexico Forest Restoration Principles.

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 32-09

ORGANIZATION:

Northridge Forest Products

FOREST:

Santa Fe

PROJECT TITLE:

Restoration Through Utilization and Educational Outreach Video

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$90,000

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$450,000

EVALUATION CATEGORY:

1

RECOMMENDED FUNDING:

\$360,000

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. 424, Section B, is not correct.

STRENGTHS:

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

4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component by including a video that is by and for the youth.
8. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List.
9. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire, as described in the NEPA.
10. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
11. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
12. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
13. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
14. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
15. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area (i.e. the production of wood pallets will be distributed through Old Wood and Silver Dollar Shavings).
16. The proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
17. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
18. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
19. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
20. The project will create new jobs.
21. This proposal provides a sound business plan that goes from treatment and processing to markets identification and finalized agreements.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The ecological monitoring plan lacks detail and only mentions that the NMFWRRI will do the monitoring. Some of the required CFRP five core indicators are not mentioned.
2. The budget does not include clear unit costs. (NREF 49 units @ \$200 of what?)

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal would be strengthened if the video production sought to demonstrate the treatment that is appropriate to the site.
2. The project could be strengthened by including use of the NM Forest Restoration Principles.
3. The proponent should work closely with the forest silviculturist to identify specific prescriptions.

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 33-09

ORGANIZATION:

Wild Earth Guardians

FOREST:

Santa Fe

PROJECT TITLE: Santa Fe Canyon Riparian Forest Restoration NEPA
Clearance
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$119,992
MATCHING FUNDS: \$30,000
TOTAL BUDGET: \$149,992
EVALUATION CATEGORY: 1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING: \$119,992

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES: N/A

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good plan for youth involvement.
8. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
9. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
10. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
11. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
12. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
13. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
14. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
15. The project will create new jobs.
16. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
17. This is an innovative collaboration submitted by a well known conservation organization to conduct cross-jurisdictional NEPA in a highly visible watershed.
18. The project thoughtfully adds to existing restoration efforts along the Santa Fe River.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided.
2. The letter from the school does not make specific commitments regarding student involvement.
3. There is no discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan.
4. The proposal does not include provisions for preserving old and large trees.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 34-09 Rev. 1
ORGANIZATION: Upper Pecos Watershed Association

FOREST:	Santa Fe
PROJECT TITLE:	Fire Protection Planning and NEPA Compliance in the Upper Pecos Watershed
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$157,558
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$39,440
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$196,998
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$157,558

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES: n/a

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project will potentially facilitate the reduction of the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
8. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
9. The project will potentially lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
10. The project will potentially increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
11. The proposal will potentially preserve old and large trees.
12. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
13. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
14. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
15. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
16. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
17. The applicant has adequately addressed most of the prior weaknesses & recommendations with the exception of the youth component.
18. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
19. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
20. Excellent budget detail.
21. Good responses to prior Panel concerns and recommendations.
22. The proposal demonstrates good use of the Firewise program to connect to community and homeowner associations, with commitment of County and Volunteer Fire Association to contact and distribute Firewise outreach and education materials.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The NEPA planning proposed lacks a youth component.

2. Letters of support from all partners were not included in the proposal. There is no letter of support from NM Game and Fish, and they are one of the current land managers per Executive Summary.
3. The project will not add significant capacity to restoration efforts.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. From the beginning of the development of a restoration project, general estimates of volume of byproduct to be generated should be made for the purpose of co-developing the utilization strategy.
2. While this planning project is not clearly cross-jurisdictional, there is good outreach to private land owners, and to the NM Parks Division; that outreach could be extended to consideration of cross-jurisdictional treatments in future phases.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 35-09
ORGANIZATION:	Southwest Wood Products and Thinning
FOREST:	Santa Fe
PROJECT TITLE:	Forest Restoration on Santa Fe National Forest
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	2
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES: N/A

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support. Examples include Mora High School and NM State University, and Citizen Wildlife Monitoring Team.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete, although it requires a Section 8 review.
6. The project includes a good youth component.
7. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List. (See Appendix.)
8. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
10. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
11. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
12. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
13. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
14. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts. (firewood)
15. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
16. The project will create new jobs.

17. Evidence of market for wood is described in the letters of support.
18. Specific curriculum for students is described in letters of support.
19. New business developed from Jicarita Project.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The youth component lacks detail in the narrative.
2. The project will not add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
3. The monitoring plan is vague. It is not clear in the narrative who will collect the ecological data. It is also not clear what will be collected in the socio-economic component.
4. The monitoring plan does not specifically indicate how the core indicators will be measured.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proponent should clarify that the match provided by State Forestry is actually a non-federal match.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 36-09
ORGANIZATION:	Santa Fe Watershed Association
FOREST:	Santa Fe
PROJECT TITLE:	Developing a Strategic Forest Restoration Plan for the Santa Fe Watershed
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$108,800
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$27,200
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$136,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	2
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES: N/A

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
9. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
10. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
11. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
12. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.

13. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
14. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
15. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
16. The project has the potential of protecting a high priority municipal watershed at risk of fire and the drinking water supply for a large city.
17. An important output of the project is creation of the Watershed Council.
18. The proposal builds on the work of previous CFRP project.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with forest restoration industry groups in design, implementation, and monitoring of the project.
2. The proposal does not include provisions for preserving old and large trees.
3. There is no discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan.
4. The distinction between this project and previously funded CFRP grants is unclear.
5. Piñon-juniper restoration objectives are not adequately addressed in the proposal.
6. Contractors are listed in personnel in the budget.
7. There is no socio-economic monitoring plan to measure outcomes related to the council.
8. There is no letter of support from the State Land Office.
9. It is unclear how each of the planning scales – the local planning effort and the watershed planning effort - addresses independently the monitoring requirements of CFRP.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The treatments resulting from the planning process should include the CFRP core ecological indicators.
2. The proponent should invite the State Land Office to participate as a partner.
3. If awarded, the proponents should consider outreach to the residents of the Hyde Park Community.
4. We strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised proposal next year with the recommendations and weaknesses addressed.
5. Collaborate with local forest industry groups to co-develop the proposed treatments.

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 37-09 Rev. 1

ORGANIZATION:

Santo Domingo Tribe

FOREST:

Santa Fe

PROJECT TITLE:

People, a Plan and P-J: Adaptive Landscape Management in the Fire, Insect and Disease-Prone Piñon-Juniper Woodlands of Santo Domingo Pueblo

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$90,000

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$450,000

EVALUATION CATEGORY:

1

RECOMMENDED FUNDING:

\$360,000

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. SF424, Section C: Should only show (1) grant program.

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List.
9. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
10. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
11. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
12. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
13. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
14. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
15. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
16. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
17. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
18. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
19. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
20. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
21. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
22. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
23. The proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
24. The proposal seeks to evaluate alternative treatment prescriptions by utilizing an experimental design that includes replication and experimental controls and tracks the cost of those treatments.
25. This project has the potential to provide valuable information for future CFRP projects.
26. The narrative shows evidence that the proponent is leveraging other funds to assist in producing this plan.

WEAKNESSES: N/A

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proponent should clarify that the match does not include federal funds. (NMFWR). The proponent is encouraged to retain an all age structure.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 38-09
ORGANIZATION:	Griegos Logging, Inc.
FOREST:	Santa Fe
PROJECT TITLE:	The Coyote Creek State Park Thinning Project and Restoration
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	2
RECOMMENDED FUNDING:	\$0

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. NEPA not done yet, but letter assures timely completion.

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support, including specifically the support from Isleta Pueblo.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration and will be finished in a timely fashion.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
10. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts. The proponent is adding capacity with capital investment in equipment that will allow for value added processing.
11. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
12. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
13. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
14. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
15. The proponent integrates treatments with existing flooring and firewood utilization industries in the project area.
16. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.

17. The proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
18. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
19. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
20. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
21. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
22. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
23. The project will create new jobs.
24. Map was excellent – section, township and range.
25. The proposal includes both thinning and follow-up prescribed fire.
26. WEAKNESSES:
27. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
28. The proposal does not state that safety of operators / operations will be assured.
29. NEPA is not complete on proposed treatment acres, and NEPA compliance is not part of the proposal.
30. The project lacks detail in the socio-economic component in the existing conditions and the monitoring plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The proposal would be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups in project design, implementation and monitoring, some special consideration should be given to the bird populations and those groups concerned (i.e. Audubon Society).
2. The proposal should refine the treatment prescriptions in collaboration with conservation groups, and silviculturalists utilizing the NM Forest Restoration Principles.
3. The proponent should collaborate with adjacent tribal forestry personnel.
4. This project offers an opportunity to monitor and report on costs; this would be useful to other CFRP proponents.
5. The proponent should assure that the majority of material processed with CFRP funded equipment will be on public lands.
6. The proposal should incorporate socio-economic indicators in the monitoring plan (eg. recreation visitation counts, attitudes and perceptions etc.)
7. The purchase of equipment and supplies should occur after NEPA is completed.
8. The proponent is strongly encouraged to resubmit this project addressing the weaknesses and recommendations of the panel.

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 39-09 Rev. 1

ORGANIZATION:	North Eastern Contractors Limited Liability Company
FOREST:	Santa Fe
PROJECT TITLE:	Barbero Grazing Allotment Collaboration and Restoration Project
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000

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

ADMINISTRATIVE WEAKNESSES:

1. SF424A, Section B: Should only be (1) column for CFRP grant project.

STRENGTHS:

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
10. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
11. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
12. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
13. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
14. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
15. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
16. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
17. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
18. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
19. The project leverages funds from the EQIP Program.
20. The project leverages 2,500 in additional acres treated by permittees of the Barbero Grazing Allotment.
21. The project proponent has worked for the past two years to collaborate with the FS District, stakeholders from the environmental community, and traditional agricultural producers.
22. This proposal includes both thinning and follow-up prescribed burning.
23. With NEPA not complete, the project includes a contingency plan for cleared acres.
24. The proposal addresses the three basic PJ structural types in their prescriptions.
25. The NEPA costs per acre are very reasonable, approximately \$30/acre that capitalizes on economies of scale.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The proposal does not clearly indicate that the majority of material processed with CFRP purchased equipment will come from public lands.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Evaluation Matrix

Proposal #	Lead Organization	Part of a longer term comprehensive CFR	Innovative approach that adds value to CFRP	Will the project generate benefits after the grant period?	Quality of the collaboration	Adds significant capacity to conduct forest restoration	Total
CFRP 05-09	Pueblo of Santa Ana	X	X	X			3
CFRP 06-09	Claunch Pinto Soil and Water Conservation District	X	X	X	X	X	5
CFRP 07-09	La Merced del Manzano c/o Claunch Pinto Soil and Water Conservation District	X	X	X	X	X	5
CFRP 10-09	Andy Chacon Forest Restoration Company	X			X	X	3
CFRP 12-09	Jaramillo & Sons Forest Products	X			X	X	3
CFRP 14-09, Rev. 1	Urban Interface Solutions	X	X	X	X	X	5
CFRP 21-09, Rev. 1	Northern NM College	X	X	X			3
CFRP 27-09	Restoration Technologies, Inc		X	X	X		3
CFRP 30-09	Santa Fe County Fire Department	X	X	X			3
CFRP 31-09	Biophilia Foundation	X		X			2
CFRP 32-09, Rev. 1	Northridge Forest Products	X	X	X	X	X	5
CFRP 33-09	WildEarth Guardians	X	X	X	X		4

Recommendations and Suggestions

Panel Feedback on the 2007 CFRP TAP Review Process

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

Strengths

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

Opportunities for Change

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

Review of 2009 RFP

Panel members made the following suggestions regarding the RFP:

- NEPA – make it clear the proponent needs to describe treatment in proposal narrative not just rely on the NEPA documentation
- Highlight the Core Indicators
- Separate NEPA/Planning from Implementation
- Update checklist
- Include bibliographic reference on current scientific information as a resource
- Develop riparian monitoring indicators
- Develop socioeconomic monitoring indicators
- Clarify re-submittal process and determination

Suggestions for Annual CFRP Workshop

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

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

Appendix A. Technical Advisory Panel Bylaws

April 27, 2009

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, U.S. Forest Service.

Section II: Authority:

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

Section III: Membership Selection and Appointment:

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

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

At the end of each 2-year term, the Regional Forester will solicit applications for new membership on the panel. Notices will be sent to tribal, county and local governments, conservation organizations, and appropriate Colleges and Universities. A notice describing the purpose of the Panel and the application procedure will be published in local newspapers and a news release will be sent to television stations, radio stations, and their local translators in New Mexico soliciting nominations for Panel membership. Letters will also be mailed to individuals who have expressed an interest in the program or are involved in the forest restoration issue in New Mexico. Information on the Act and how to submit an application for membership on the Panel will also be posted on the Forest Service Southwest Regional Internet Website at: www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/cfrp.

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 6 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 Panel will not consider new information that was required by the RFP during public comment periods. The Panel will consider information provided in response to a request for clarification or if it is a factual correction (added 04/27/09).*** 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. Federal Advisory Committee Charter

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

DEPARTMENTAL REGULATION		Number: 1042-138
SUBJECT: Collaborative Forest Restoration Program Technical Advisory Panel Federal Advisory Committee	DATE: September 4, 2007	
	OPI: Forest Service	

1. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

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

2. SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS

- a. This regulation will expire 2 years from the date of filing unless renewed by proper authority and appropriate action.
- b. The functions of the Panel cannot be accomplished in less than 2 years. In accordance with Departmental regulations, unless renewed, the Panel will terminate 2 years from the date of filing the charter.
- c. This department regulation replaces DR 1042-138, dated July 25, 2005.

3. OFFICERS AND MEMBERSHIP

- a. The Panel will consist of 12 to 15 members approved by the Regional Forester as follows:
 - (1) A State natural resources official from the State of New Mexico;
 - (2) At least two representatives from Federal land management agencies;
 - (3) At least one tribal or pueblo representative;
 - (4) At least two independent scientists with experience in forest ecosystem restoration; and
 - (5) Equal representation from—
 - (a) Conservation interests,
 - (b) Local communities, and
 - (c) Commodity interests.
- b. Each Panel member shall serve as a representative of one of the interest groups described in section 606 (b) of the Act. Appointment to the Panel does not make Panel members Federal government employees.
- c. A vacancy on the Panel will be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his/her predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. A replacement shall fill the vacancy as soon as practicable after the vacancy occurs.
- d. Members of the Panel shall be appointed for terms of 2 years, but may be reappointed.
- e. The Regional Forester, in selecting Panel members, shall seek to ensure the membership of the Panel is balanced and represents and includes a broad range of diverse views and interests.
- f. The Regional Forester shall appoint a Designated Federal Official (DFO) under sections 10 (e) and (f) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act who may also serve as Chair of the Panel. The DFO (or a designated substitute) shall approve the proposed agenda for each meeting, attend each meeting, ensure that adequate facilities are provided for meetings, ensure detailed minutes are taken at the meeting, ensure the minutes and other Panel records are provided for meetings and other needs, and make such reports about the operation of the Panel as may be required or desirable.

- g. The Panel may create and operate subcommittees or working groups recommended by its members and approved by the Regional Forester or Designated Federal Officer. If appropriate, these working groups or subcommittees may include representatives of nongovernmental organizations that have an interest in the implementation of the Act.
- h. Equal opportunity practices, in line with USDA policies, will be followed in all appointments to the Panel. To ensure that the recommendations of the Panel have taken into account the needs of the diverse groups served by the Department, membership should include, to the extent practicable, individuals with demonstrated ability to represent minorities, women, and persons with disabilities.

4. DUTIES

- a. The Panel shall provide recommendations to the Regional Forester on a schedule to be established by the Chair of the Panel.
- b. The Panel's recommendations shall consider the proposed projects' effects on long-term management and provide recommendations regarding which proposals best meet the following objectives pursuant to section 605 of the Act:
 - (1) Reduce the threat of large, high-intensity wildfires and the negative effects of excessive competition between trees by restoring ecosystem functions, structures, and species composition, including the reduction of nonnative species populations;
 - (2) Reestablish fire regimes approximating those that shaped forest ecosystems prior to fire suppression;
 - (3) Preserve old and large trees;
 - (4) Replant trees in deforested areas if they exist in the proposed project area;
 - (5) Improve the use of, or add value to, small diameter trees;
 - (6) Comply with all Federal and State environmental laws;
 - (7) Include a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders as well as appropriate Federal, State, tribal, county, and municipal government representatives in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the project;
 - (8) Incorporate current scientific forest restoration information;

- (9) Include a multiparty assessment to identify both the existing ecological condition of the proposed project area and the desired future condition;
 - (10) Contain a plan for reporting, upon project completion, on the positive or negative impact and effectiveness of the project including improvements in local management skills and on-the-ground results;
 - (11) Create local employment or training opportunities within the context of accomplishing restoration objectives including summer youth jobs programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps where appropriate;
 - (12) Not exceed 4 years in length;
 - (13) Not exceed a total annual cost of \$150,000 per project, with the Federal portion not exceeding \$120,000 annually per project nor exceed a total cost of \$450,000 for each project, with the Federal portion of the total cost not exceeding \$360,000 per project;
 - (14) Leverage Federal funding through in-kind or matching contributions; and
 - (15) Include an agreement by program grantees to attend an annual workshop with other stakeholders for the purpose of discussing the cooperative forest restoration program and projects implemented under the program.
- c. In developing their recommendations, the Panel shall seek to use a consensus-based decision-making process.
 - d. Consistent with applicable laws and Departmental regulations, the Panel may adopt such by-laws or rules of operation, as it deems advisable.
 - e. The Forest Service Southwestern Regional Forester shall select the proposals that will receive funding through the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program.

5. ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATIONS COSTS

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

6. NUMBER AND FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS

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

7. REPORTS/SUPPORT

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

-END-

Appendix C. Technical Advisory Panel Members (2008-2009)

Table 1. 2006-2007 Technical Advisory Panel Members	
Interest	Name, Organization
State land management	Jim Norwick, NM State Land Office
Federal land Management	Dave Borland, USDI Bureau of Land Management
Fed land management	Tammy Randall-Parker, U.S. Forest Service
Tribal	Ann Watson, Santo Domingo Apache Tribe
Independent scientist	Robert Berrens, University of New Mexico
Independent scientist	Esteban Muldavin, University of New Mexico
Independent scientist	David Huffman, Northern Arizona University
Conservation	Thomas Jervis, NM Audubon Society
Conservation	Ann Bradley, The Nature Conservancy
Community	Patrick DeIaco, Village of Ruidoso
Community	Candido Archuleta, North Central NM Economic Development Council
Commodity	Matthew Silva, Silva Ranch
Commodity	Brent Racher, Restoration Solutions, LLC.
Designated Federal Official	Walter Dunn, U.S. Forest Service, Southwestern Region (Chairman)

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

Strengths:

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

31. The project includes an adaptive approach to restoration in an annual evaluation of monitoring data which is used to collaboratively refine prescriptions.
32. The proposal offers an opportunity to address the interaction between grazing and the re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
33. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.

Weaknesses:

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

28. The distinction between this project and previously funded CFRP grants is unclear.
29. The panel's prior weaknesses and recommendations not adequately addressed.
30. Piñon-juniper restoration objectives are not adequately addressed in the proposal.
31. NEPA is not complete on proposed treatment acres, with NEPA not part of the proposal.
32. The project does not include a socio-economic component in either the goals or the monitoring plan.
33. The proposal and budget do not address anticipated program income.
34. The proposal does not include the core CFRP ecological indicators.

Recommendations:

1. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with _____ groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.
2. The proposal would be strengthened by incorporation of a youth component.
3. A letter from the Forest that would administer the grant should be included.
4. Documentation of letters sent to potentially affected tribes should be included in the project proposal.
5. From the beginning of the development of a restoration project, general estimates of volume of byproduct to be generated should be made for the purpose of co-developing the utilization strategy.
6. Before a grant award is made, more specific milestones need to be identified.
7. The purchase of equipment and supplies should occur after NEPA is completed.
8. The proponent should clarify that the match does not include federal funds.
9. The proponent should verify that there are not direct costs covered in the indirect budget line item.
10. The proponent should ensure that any surveys either 1) meet US Office of Management and Budget guidelines, or 2) do not use Federal dollars.
11. We strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised proposal next year with the recommendations and weaknesses addressed.
12. The proponent should ensure that any socio-economic surveys either 1) meet US Office of Management and Budget guidelines, or 2) do not use Federal dollars.
13. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).
14. The proponent should ensure that any estimated program income is accounted for in the budget.
15. The proposal could be strengthened by including a description of the current conditions and desired future conditions.
16. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g. to protect nesting bird habitat)