

2010 Meeting Minutes

2010 Technical Advisory Panel Meeting

July 19-23, 2010

Hyatt Place Albuquerque/Uptown
6901 Arvada Avenue, NE
Albuquerque, NM

Purpose, Desired Outcomes and Agenda

Meeting Purpose(s)

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

Desired Outcomes

- A recommendation for the Southwestern Regional Forester on which CFRP grant applications best meet the program objectives. The total cost of the recommended grants shall not exceed the federal funding available for CFRP grants in 2010.
- A report on the Panel's recommendations regarding the strengths, weaknesses and suggested revisions for each 2010 CFRP grant application.
- Suggestions on how the panel can improve the project evaluation process for their next meeting.
- Suggestions on how to improve the CFRP Request for Applications for 2011.
- Suggestions on how to improve and expand program outreach activities to prospective grant applications.

Time: July 19 – 23, 2010 beginning at 10:00 a.m. on Monday, July 19.

Place: Hyatt Place Albuquerque/Uptown, 6901 Arvada Avenue, NE
Albuquerque, NM 87110, (505) 872-9000

Chairman and Designated Federal Official: Walter Dunn

Facilitator: Melissa Marosy

Panel Staff and Recorders: Jerry Payne, Alicia San Gil, Carmen Melendez

Meeting Minutes: Allison Lundin

Contacts for Further Information:

Walter Dunn
Chairman and Designated Federal

Alicia San Gil, Contractor
U.S. Forest Service

Purpose, Desired Outcomes and Agenda

Official
U.S. Forest Service
Southwest Region
Cooperative and International
Forestry
(505) 842-3425
wdunn@fs.fed.us

Southwest Region
Cooperative and International Forestry
(505) 842-3289
agsangil@fs.fed.us

Application Review Process

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

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

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

Categories

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

The Panel will reexamine specific applications as necessary in response to issues raised during the Public Comment periods. The Panel will then evaluate the number of applications in category (1) to determine if there is sufficient funding to award grants to all of them. If the number of applications in Category 1 exceeds the available funding, or if there is sufficient funding to provide grants in Category 2, the Panel will use the following criteria to determine which of the remaining applications to recommend:

1. Is the project part of a longer term and/or landscape level comprehensive collaborative forest restoration effort?
2. Does the project include an activity that is new and adds value to CFRP?
3. Will the project generate benefits after the grant period?
4. Are there diverse partners with clearly defined contributions?

Would the project add significant capacity for forest restoration?

Agenda

Monday, July 10

When	What	Who
10:00 AM	Welcome and Introductions	Walter Dunn, Chairman
10:15 - 10:30 AM	Meeting Logistics	Facilitator
10:30 - 10:45 AM	Opening Remarks and Presentation of Certificates to Panel Member	Corbin Newman, Regional Forester
10:45 - 11:00 AM	Review of Purposes, Desired Outcomes, and Agenda	Facilitator
11:00 - 11:30 AM	Presentation: CFRP Accomplishments	Walter Dunn
11:30 - 11:45 AM	What It Means To Be A Federal Advisory Committee	Walter Dunn
11:45 – 12:30 PM	Review/Revise Panel Bylaws	Facilitator & Panel
<i>12:30 – 2:00 PM</i>	<i>LUNCH</i>	
2:00 – 3:00 PM	Review Application Evaluation Process	Panel
3:00 – 4:00 PM	Review Application CFRP 01-10	Sub Committee Members
<i>4:00 – 4:15 PM</i>	<i>BREAK</i>	
4:15 – 5:15 PM	Review Application CFRP 02-10	Panel
5:15 – 5:30 PM	Public Comment Period	Members of the Public who submitted written comment
5:30 – 5:45 PM	Review of Day's Work and Agenda for Tuesday, Day Two	Facilitator
<i>5:45 PM</i>	<i>Adjourn</i>	

Purpose, Desired Outcomes and Agenda

Tuesday, July 20

When	What	Who
8:30 – 8:45 AM	Review Agenda for the Day	Facilitator
8:45 – 10:15 AM	Review applications: CFRP 03-10, 04-10	All Panel Members
<i>10:15 – 10:30 AM</i>	<i>BREAK</i>	
10:30 – 11:30 AM	Review applications: CFRP 05-10 and 06-10	All Panel Members
11:30 – 11:45 PM	Public Comment Period	Members of the Public who submitted written comment
<i>11:45 – 1:15 PM</i>	<i>LUNCH</i>	
1:15 – 3:15 PM	Review applications: CFRP 07-10, 08-10, 09-10, and 10-10.	All Panel Members
<i>3:15 – 3:30 PM</i>	<i>BREAK</i>	
3:30 – 5:30 PM	Review applications CFRP 11-10, 12-10, 13-10, and 14-10.	All Panel Members
5:30 – 5:45 PM	Public Comment Period	Members of the Public who submitted written comment
6:00 - 6:30 PM	Review of the Day's work and Agenda for Wednesday, Day 3	Facilitator
<i>6:30 PM</i>	<i>Adjourn</i>	

Wednesday, July 21

When	What	Who
8:30 - 8:45 AM	Review Agenda for the Day	Facilitator
8:45 – 10:45 AM	Review applications: CFRP 15-10, 16-10, 17-10, and 18-10	All Panel Members
<i>10:45 – 11:00 AM</i>	<i>BREAK</i>	
11:00 – 11:30 AM	Review application CFRP 19-10	All Panel Members
11:30 – 11:45 AM	Public Comment Period	Members of the Public who submitted written comment
<i>11:45 – 1:15 PM</i>	<i>LUNCH</i>	
1:15 – 3:45 PM	Review applications: CFRP 20-10, 21-10, 22-10, 23-10, and 24-10.	All Panel Members
<i>3:45 – 4:00 PM</i>	<i>BREAK</i>	
4:00 – 6:00 PM	Review applications: CFRP 25-10, 27-10, and 28-10. (CFRP 26-10 withdrawn by applicant)	All Panel Members
6:00 – 6:15 PM	Public Comment Period	Members of the Public who submitted written comment
6:15 - 6:30 PM	Review of the Day's work and Agenda for Thursday, Day 4	Facilitator
<i>6:30 PM</i>	<i>Adjourn</i>	

Purpose, Desired Outcomes and Agenda

Thursday, July 22

When	What	Who
8:30 - 8:45 AM	Review Agenda for the Day	Facilitator
8:45 – 10:45 AM	Review applications: CFRP 29-10, 30-10, 31-10, and 32-10.	All Panel Members
10:45 – 11:00 AM	BREAK	
11:00 – 11:30 AM	Review applications: CFRP 33-10.	All Panel Members
11:30 – 11:45 AM	Public Comment Period	Members of the Public who submitted written comment
11:45 – 1:15 PM	LUNCH	
1:15 – 2:15 PM	Review applications: CFRP 34-10, and 36-10. (CFRP 35-10 withdrawn by applicant)	All Panel Members
2:15 – 2:30 PM	BREAK	
2:30 – 3:00 PM	Public Comment Period	Members of the Public who submitted written comment
3:00 – 4:00 PM	Review Applications if Necessary in Response to Public Comment	All Panel Members
4:00 – 4:15 PM	Review of Agenda for Friday, Day 5	Facilitator
4:15 PM	Adjourn	

Friday, July 23

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

Minutes

Monday, July 19, 2010

Panel:

Mike Matush
Timothy Pohlman
Danny Gomez
Ann Watson
Robert Berrens, PhD
Bryan Bird
John Olivas
Martha S. Cooper
Dick Cooke
Shaun Criston Fisher
Candido Arturo Archuleta
Coleman Burnett
Walter Dunn – Chairman

USFS Staff:

Walter Dunn
Melissa Marosy
Alicia San Gil
Jerry Payne
Carmen Melendez
Monica Martinez

Facilitator: Melissa Marosy

Meeting Minutes: Allison Lundin

Members of the Public and Others in Attendance:

Darren Grego
Sue Ellen Strale
Christy Van Buren
Ignacio Peralta
Tammy Malone
Don Bright
David Cordova
Rachel Henderson

Meeting Called to Order

10:00 a.m. Walter Dunn calls the meeting to order

Walter Dunn, the Designated Federal Official for the Technical Advisory Panel calls the meeting to order and makes brief opening remarks. The Panel then introduced themselves.

NAME	ORGANIZATION	INTEREST GROUP
Mike Matush	NM Environment Dept. Surface Water Quality Bureau	Federal Land Management Agency
Timothy Pohlman	USDA,FS, Shawnee NF	Federal Land Management Agency
Danny Gomez	USDI,BIA	Federal Land Management Agency
Ann Watson	Santo Domingo Tribe	Tribal or Pueblo Rep.
Robert Berrens, PhD	University of New Mexico, Dept. of Economics	Independent Scientist
Bryan Bird	Wild Earth Guardians	Conservation Interests
John Olivas	Jaco Outfitters, LLC	Conservation Interests
Martha S. Cooper	The Nature Conservancy	Conservation Interests
Dick Cooke	Village of Ruidoso	Local Communities
Shaun Criston Fisher	New Mexico Legislature	Local Communities
Candido Arturo Archuleta	North Central New Mexico Economic Development District	Local Communities
Coleman Burnett	SWCA Environmental Consultants	Commodity Interests

Opening Remarks and Presentation of Certificates to Panel Members

10: 24 a.m. Southwest Regional Forester Corbin Newman welcomed the Panel members and gave opening remarks. He thanked the Panel for the time they have given to the CFRP and told them how important this work was to the economy and the communities. Corbin presented certificates and tokens of appreciation to the Panel Members.

Meeting Logistics

Melissa Marosy covered the logistics of the meeting.

Review of Purposes, Desired Outcomes and Agenda

10:40 a.m. Melissa Marosy reviewed the purpose, desired outcomes, and agenda for the meeting. If there are suggestions for improvement of the evaluation process, improvement of the CFRP Request for Applications for 2011 or suggestions for improvement and expansion of program outreach activities please be sure and bring these forward. Melissa reminded the Panel that at the end of each morning and afternoon session the Panel will turn to the public for comment.

Reviewed the New Mexico Collaborative Forest Restoration Program Technical Advisory Panel meeting announcement as it was published in the Federal Register. The meeting is open to the public but Panel discussion is limited to the

Forest Service staff and Panel members. Proponents may respond to questions of clarification from Panel members or Forest Service staff.

Presentation: CFRP Accomplishments

11:07 a.m. Walter Dunn reviewed some of the CFRP's accomplishments and the evolution of the CFRP. The youth component of the CFRP is one of the items that distinguish this program from others. The intent of the youth component is that by involving young people directly they will become more informed citizens on debating the topic of natural resources.

One of the largest successes of the CFRP has been lowering the Workman's Compensation hourly rates for sawyers.

Each CFRP project must include a multi-party project assessment. At the program level we monitor to see cumulative accomplishments or adverse impacts.

Each 2010 RFA requires projects to include core ecological indicators.

19 CFRP Projects have been selected for 15 year monitoring. They are a cross section of forest types and geographic locations.

From 2001-2009 there have been 318 proposals submitted with 130 projects funded. The yearly average of submitted proposals is 35 with 14 per year funded.

Currently there have been 20,674 acres treated and approximately 500 jobs created.

From 2005-2009 the CFRP has involved 409 different partners.

Some of the greatest challenges for the CFRP have been: Coordinating Forest Service work planning timelines with CFRP project development and implementation, encouraging landscape level cross jurisdictional planning and project implementation, implementing long term monitoring and dealing with an unstable timber market.

Burnett: Concerning utilization grants, where do you draw the line for businesses that are just starting up and businesses that are already established and want to expand their business?

Dunn: It comes down to the utilization of the material, the intent and the criteria. The point from the public land management is that anything we can do to create the capacity for utilization of small diameter trees is what we want to do. The purpose of the program is to improve the utilization of small diameter trees. This is not a small business economic development program.

What it Means to be a Federal Advisory Committee

11:54 a.m. Walter Dunn reviews what it means to be a FACA Committee. He states that this is an open FACA meeting; any documents discussed in this panel are open to the public upon request. Per Forest Service Policy, no FACA Committee meetings can be closed. Your names are all on public websites. You are not paid or compensated for your time but are covered for your travel. You may contact the grant applicants directly to ask those questions. Any notes you may have taken

during your evaluation process are not public information. The CFRP Panel member appointments are for two years. This generally means two meetings but may be three meetings. The Panel members may re-apply to serve for up to six years. The responsibilities of the Panel members are to review and evaluate each proposal, take the concerns of the other panel members as seriously as their own and support the recommendations of the Panel.

Review/Revise Panel Bylaws

11:57 a.m.

Bylaws
Collaborative Forest Restoration Program
Technical Advisory Panel
July 19, 2010

Section I: Purpose:

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

Section II: Authority:

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

Section III: Membership Selection and Appointment:

The Secretary of Agriculture, or his delegate acting through 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 Secretary of Agriculture 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 Southwestern Region Website at: www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/community.

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

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

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

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

Members of the public may attend any meeting or portion of a meeting and, at the determination of the Chairman, offer written comment at such meeting. Public comment periods will be

scheduled. The panel will not consider new information that was required by the RFP if it constitutes a substantial change to the original proposal. The panel may consider information provided in response to a request for clarification or if it is a factual correction.

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, develop the agenda, 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 the Panel Report and the Meeting 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 evaluate 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 Secretary of Agriculture will make the final decision on which proposals receive funding.

Section VI: Expenses and Reimbursement

Member 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.

Walter Dunn proposed that the Bylaws be accepted. All were in agreement.

Review Application Evaluation Process

2:15 p.m. Melissa Marosy reviewed the proposal evaluation process. A member of the Panel will introduce the proposal and members may then propose strengths and weaknesses. Other panel members may propose to change, add or delete text. Once there is agreement on the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, it will then be assigned to one of the following four categories.

Category 1- The application is an excellent match with the purposes and objectives of the Act, and the Panel recommends funding. **The application may have minor administrative observations.**

Category 2 –The application is an excellent match with the purpose and objectives of the Act. **The application has some substantive weaknesses but it is eligible for funding.**

Category 3 – The application is a good fit to the purposes and objectives of the Act, but the weaknesses identified in the work plan, budget and/or monitoring plan **must be addressed before the project can be recommended for funding.**

Category 4 – The application **does not clearly address the objectives** of the Act and/or successful implementation is doubtful.

Five minutes will be given for the initial presentation, 20 minutes for strengths and weaknesses, and five minutes to assign the category.

Dunn - In the event that there is not enough money to cover all of the proposals, we will need to go through another level and then a matrix. Does everyone have a clear understanding of what this involves? Yes

Fisher – If someone already has a current on-going CFRP project do we allow them to be awarded another CFRP Grant?

Dunn – Yes, as long as it is a totally different project.

Does everyone have a clear understanding of what a Conservation Organization is? They need to meet the following four criteria. The four criteria are:

- Nongovernment
- Non-Commodity
- Forest/watershed restoration, biodiversity and/or habitat conservation as objectives in Mission Statement
- Education and Outreach included in organization's activities.

Cooper – I propose to change the wording from “Education and Outreach is included in the organization’s mission statement” to “Education and Outreach is included in the organization’s activities”. The group agreed.

CFRP 01-10 – Cemetery Pines Forest Restoration

Archuleta introduced the proposal.

The purpose of this Project is to do thinning, hazardous fuel removal and forest restoration. Small diameter, pinon and juniper trees will be reduced to decrease the threat of wildfires. Six positions will be created, including four sawyers. There are eight partners. The small diameter trees will be processed into charcoal. Larger trees will be processed into firewood. The BIA confirmed that the NEPA has been done.

Strengths: 1,2,3,4,6,7,8,10,11,17,18,19,20,21,22,33

Weaknesses:

- Existing conditions are not adequately described. Since NEPA is complete on this project the NEPA document would be a source to find some information.
- There is no definitive estimate of volumes to be removed or products to be developed.
- Proposal does not state the expected amount of charcoal produced per acre from this thinning project and associated sales revenue, given 2007 CFRP experience and business plan. It is not clear if the 33,000 lbs/year is an estimate from only this proposal.
- Proponent did not demonstrate collaboration with a conservation group.
- The monitoring plan is not multi-party.
- The Forest Development Program on page 2 is not described in detail.
- Soil sampling is not justified based on the objectives described in the project.
- The social and economic information does not describe impact or benefits to local community.
- The letters of support do not describe the partner's role in multi-party monitoring.

Recommendations:

- Show prior and future proposed project areas in the area on maps.
- Include a copy of the business plan.
- Provide greater detail on youth component.

Administrative Observations:

- No NEPA decision attached.
- 424 incorrect, page 2 is incomplete.
- Budget unit costs lack detail.
- Move sawyers to Contracts if appropriate.
- Latest indirect rate info should be provided and clarified in the budget.

Discussion

- Cooper – Challenging #6, not sure that field trips are a meaningful way to involve youth in the project.
- Watson – What quantifies a “good” youth component? I feel we need to re-word #6. “This project includes field trips for students and training for teachers”.
- Burnett – Would propose deleting this if it is something the group does not feel is a good youth component.
- Archuleta – Has concern with taking #6 out of strength and making it a weakness. Feels they have met the requirement for a youth component. How can you differentiate between what is a good/bad youth component? The proposal has met the intent.
- Dunn – The proposal could be strengthened by a greater number of youth involved in monitoring projects.
- Watson – The fact that the tribe has a business plan with the Forest Service approved by their Council.
- Gomez – Page 2 and 3 identifies the roles of the partners and their collaborators.
- Pohlman – The proposal creates jobs.
- Cooper – The project does not have a restoration design or scientific justification.
- Archuleta – They do have a utilization plan in place.
- Fisher – Thinks the Pueblo does a good job in the utilization.
- Payne – Proposes to remove #9.
- Pohlman – What constitutes a large diameter tree? Where are they monitoring from?
- Cooper – Not comfortable with the wording saying that” this project incorporates current scientific restoration information”. Would like to propose the wording say “the project incorporates science in the monitoring plan”.
- Berrens – Thinks we should open the discussion up for both strengths and weaknesses.
- Burnett – Would like to suggest a weakness wording “Existing conditions are not adequately described. Since NEPA is complete on this project, the NEPA document would be a source to find such information.
- Archuleta – The majority of this Proposal is mainly for the utilization of the material being removed.

- Bird – The proposal leverages other funding sources.
- Dunn – Can only evaluate a Proposal on what the applicant is proposing to do.
- Matush – Why do you need \$1700 for soil sampling? We will be testing the soils. We will utilize the slash, mulch it and scatter it on the ground to retain the moisture and help with erosion.
- Matush – Something else mentioned was the encroachment of non-native plant species. Which non-natives are you taking out? Proponent - Two different types of juniper and mistletoe. Goal is to try to regenerate the soils.
- Cooper – There is no definitive explanation of volumes to be removed or product developed. It would be nice to have an estimate of volumes.
- Wilson – In the time-line (year one) you are going to do pre-monitoring. Then the next month you are going to start thinning. Is that correct? Proponent - Yes this is correct.
- Cooper – The idea is that charcoal will generate revenue in the future. Why is grant funding critical to do this project? Proponent – This grant will kick start our process so that we will be able to sustain and generate revenue in the future.
- Dunn – Page 1 it says six positions will be created, including four sawyers. What are the other two positions? Proponent – Charcoal technician and a forestry director.
- Melendez – The charcoal technician job and the forestry director are existing positions but the grant will provide funding for these positions.
- Matush – The monitoring plan does not clarify how the transects will be laid out and I do not think the soil sampling will cost \$1700.
- Archuleta – Would like to recommend this Project for a Category 1.
- Burnett – Would like to recommend this Project for a Category 3. Berrens concurs. Cooke concurs.
- Gomez – Would like to recommend this Project for a Category 2 – Some weaknesses, but overall strengths are greater.
- Olivas – Would like to recommend this Project for a Category 3 – The lack of business plan in the proposal is generating a lot of the questions.
- Watson – Would like to recommend this Project for a Category 3.
- Cooper – Would like to recommend this Project for a Category 3.

Evaluation Category: 3

CFRP 02-10 – Chimayo Conservation Corps Training Local Young Adults in Three Forest Types

4:34 p.m. Burnett recuses herself and leaves the room.

4:35 p.m. John Olivas introduced the proposal.

This project was submitted last year, it is a resubmitted. The CCC proposes to treat 434 acres within three predominant forest types and jurisdictions in northern

New Mexico. The project concentrates on several WUI areas. Approximately 650 cords of firewood will be made available to the community. 16 young adults will be hired and trained to conduct forestry restoration.

Strengths:

- Berrens – Engages youth for a period of time that it could actually have an impact on their lives.
- Matush – NEPA has been completed by the Forest Service and BLM and there is a strong commitment from the Pueblo to complete NEPA on the 34 tribal land acres. The BA is in process and will be completed in 3-6 months.
- Gomez – Provides training and employment to use.
- Bird – The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
- Bird – The proposal will complete cross-jurisdictional restoration across BLM, Forest Service and Pueblo land.
- Bird – There was a strong collaboration prior to project proposal.
- Archuleta – The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort. The proponent also has extensive expertise in the proposed activities. They have submitted a good budget detail and work plan. The proposal is clear, concise and well organized. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses and recommendations (since this is a resubmittal). The proposal includes collaborator interest forms. The project also implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan.
- Cooper – The project incorporates current scientific restoration information. The youth component exposes Corps Members to treatments.
- Olivas – The project will reduce fire risk in a community. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts. The project will lead to re-establishment of nature fire regimes.
- Cooke – The cost per acre is one of the lowest compared to the other proposals. Excellent utilization of the material harvested. Project describes the definitive conditions for both pre and post treatment.
- Gomez – Includes a diverse and balanced group of partners. The project will create new jobs, including 16 young people.
- Berrens – As part of a utilization plan, the project stores, splits and distributes firewood to elderly and disabled residents of nearby communities.
- Bird – The proposal discusses wildlife and their habitat requirements as well as management history (fire suppression). They have a commitment from the Forest Service to follow up with the prescribed burning in the treatment areas within a reasonable timeframe.
- Archuleta – Provides localized forestry based employment and skills training opportunities for youth in a rural, economically depressed area of the state that has a high concentration of federal public lands.

-Matush – The proposal and the monitoring plan discuss wildlife and their habitat requirements. The project will also lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.

-Pohlman – The proposal treats and monitors non-native species in the Bosque salt cedar and Russian Olive.

-Cooper – The scope of work, including treatment and education, is well defined and achievable.

-Dunn – The Executive Summary follows the example in the Request for Applications (RFA).

Weaknesses:

None.

Recommendations:

-Cooke- On the map include township and range.

-Bird – References for scientific assertions regarding p-j fire ecology would be helpful.

-Matush – Unless they are managing the grasses, they will not re-establish natural fire regimes.

-Cooper – The project could lead to re-establish natural fire regimes. If we can't include this here, then we can't include it in any proposal. Change the wording to "could" lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.

Administrative Observations:

-424, Section 3, 3rd year incorrect.

-Local Forest should request proponent documents on indirect costs.

-Fringe benefits vary and should be consistent.

-Determine whether personnel are sub-recipients or contracts.

Bird – Recommend Category 1, Matush concurs.

Evaluation Category: 1

5:20 p.m. Colman Burnett returns to the meeting.

5:21 p.m. **Public Comment Period**

David Cordova

Technical aspect. Process has become extremely difficult for most in the smaller communities that helped develop the program to begin with.

Proposals that have been funded and not completed should not be funded until the completion of current CFRP funding. This process is not fair to those who are wishing to get funded.

This program, at its inception, came from the years of collaboration of working with numerous entities. It was originally meant to primarily sustainably restore the forest, create jobs and opportunities, and to create value-added products.

David Cordova

Tuesday, July 20, 2010

Panel:

Mike Matush
Timothy Pohlman
Danny Gomez
Ann Watson
Robert Berrens, PhD
Bryan Bird
John Olivas
Martha S. Cooper
Dick Cooke
Shaun Criston Fisher
Candido Arturo Archuleta
Coleman Burnett
Walter Dunn – Chairman

USFS Staff:

Walter Dunn
Melissa Marossy
Alicia San Gil
Jerry Payne
Carmen Melendez
Monica Martinez

Facilitator: Melissa Marosy

Meeting Minutes: Allison Lundin

Members of the Public in Attendance:

Febian Montano
Dave Warnack
Bruce Kelly
Dave Wallace
Don Schrieber
Eytan Krasilovsky
Max Cordova
Mary Passaglia
Ben Thomas
Herman Vigil
Dennis Trujillo
Walt Strain
Kurt & Julianna Albershardt
Gilbert Vigil
Gary Hathorn
Rudy Jaramillo
Jessi Ouzts
Dan Campbell
Karen Montano

G. Matthew Allen
Gordon West
Brian Bader
Mariana Padilla
Suzanne Probart
Amy Ewing
Daniel B. Stephens
Ignacio Peralta
Reuben Montes
William Ferranti
Gail Campbell
Dennis Aldridge
Zomulaus Charles
Matt Schrader
Linda Middleton

CFRP 03-10 –Planning to Reduce Wildfire Risk in Taos Ski Valley and the Upper Rio Hondo Watershed.

8:30 a.m. Burnett recuses herself and leaves the room.

8:48 a.m. Berrens introduced the proposal.

This is a revision from a previous proposal.

The Village of Taos Ski Valley is proposing to complete a planning project in the Rio Hondo Watershed. The project will include a Community Wildfire Protection Plan on 4, 100 acres of public and private land. The proposal also includes the NEPA compliance process on approximately 1000 acres of public land managed by the Carson National Forest, Questa Ranger District. The Village expects to involve more than 100 people in this project over a two-year period. It is estimated that eight youth will be hired for a three-week period during this project to collect ecological data and conduct the Firewise presentation.

Strengths:

-Berrens – Proposal incorporates the use of Firewise community wildfire risk assessment and mitigation information and education.

-Berrens – Proposal incorporates planning for protection of a community water source.

-Gomez – Strong collaboration prior to submission of the application. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.

-Cooper – Youth will assist in collecting monitoring data and doing Firewise education.

-Berrens –This project will identify fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List.

-Berrens – Good budget detail and/or work plan.

-Dunn – The proposal includes strong letters of support. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles

and responsibilities. The proponent has extensive experience in the activities. The application is clear, concise and well organized. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses and recommendations. The project will complete a CWPP.

-Cooper – Amigos Bravos letter of commitment to participate in the project is commendable.

-Dunn – SWCA and RMYC have extensive expertise in the proposed activities.

-Dunn – Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.

Weaknesses:

None.

Recommendations:

-Berrens – Given that identifying specific treatment areas on private lands is listed as a primary benefit, for Patterson Trust and Taos Holdings, (2 large landowners in the area), then proposal could be enhanced by more specific commitment to private mitigation efforts, matching efforts, etc.

-Berrens – Given 250,000 visits annually to the area, the project should fully consider the discussion of socio-economic issues in the CWPP. (eg. will socio-economics be included in the NEPA? Are there special evacuation concerns; Are there special human-caused ignition concerns? How does fire-risk information get distributed to the recreationists/visitors? Etc)

-Cooke – The above will addressed by the CWPP when it is completed. Propose that you remove the weakness.

-Archuleta – May want to consider inviting Arroyo Hondo Arriba Land Grant to participate in CWPP.

-Gomez – May want to consider inviting Taos Pueblo to participate in CWPP.

-Gomez – Identify the project area by identified townships, range and section on the map.

Olivas – May want to consider inviting the grazing permittees in the area.

Administrative Observations:

-424, Section D and E are incorrect, should be C.

-The relationship between the proponent and SWCA and RMYC needs to be clarified. They appear to be sub-recipient instead of a contractor. Review A-133.

Discussion

-Matush – You have two major land owners. Is that correct? Proponent – Yes

Do you have any WUI money active in the area? Proponent – No

-Olivas – Do the boundaries go into the National Forest? Proponent – Yes, part of the boundaries will be determined by the CWPP. It will depend on what are determined treatable areas. Does not go into the Wilderness Area.

-Watson – What does the Wild Urban Interface Code Entail? Proponent – They need to build defensible areas.

-Dunn – What biological qualifications does SWCA have? Proponent – It is listed on the table (page 23) of the proposal. There are 2 journeyman biologists and qualified archeologists. Matush – SWAC is approved by SHIPO to do archeological surveys.

-Pohlman – I question the balance of collaboration in the project. Proponent – In the previous proposal we had two different partners. Even if everyone does not agree, they are going to participate in the project.

-Matush – Is there a community water source/watershed. Proponent – Yes.
Matush – Is that your sole source? Proponent – Yes.

Berrens – Would like to propose a Category 1 recommendation.

Evaluation Category: 1

CFRP 04-10 – Cejita Restoration (Resubmission of 2009 20-09 Revision 2)

9:25 a.m. Burnett returns.

9:37 a.m. Fisher recuses herself and leaves the room.

9:39 a.m. Bird introduced the proposal.

This is a revised CFRP 20-09 proposal submission. El Greco will implement a fuels reduction treatment on 238 acres on the Cejita area of the Caminio Real Ranger District on the Carson National Forest. This project will reduce the threat of catastrophic wildfire, improve forest health, decrease susceptibility to further mistletoe and spruce bud worm damage, remove fuels and reduce the amount of ladder fuels. The proposal will also improve the effectiveness and safety in the reintroduction of prescribed burning to seed bed improvement. Forest health and vigor will be restored. This is a three-year project. The project will employ 15 people directly and 20 people indirectly. Youth from the University of New Mexico, Mountain View School, Montana de Truchas and Pojoaque Pueblo will participate in the monitoring and field studies. Wood, logs, and fencing poles will be produced.

Strengths:

-Bird – The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners. The proposal demonstrates strong collaborate prior to submission of proposal. NEPA is complete. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration. The project includes a good youth component. The project will reduce the fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.

-Bird – The project will create new jobs. The proposal will preserve old and large trees. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.

-Bird – The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities. The

applicant has adequately addressed the prior weakness and recommendations. The proponent has a history of successful completion of CFRP projects.

-Archuleta – Provides local forestry based employment and opportunities in a rural economically depressed area of the state that has a high concentration of federal public lands.

-Cook- Proponent has a history of successful completion of CFRP projects.

-Gomez – The application includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.

-Olivas – Application includes revegetation in the proposed area.

-Berrens – The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses and recommendations, especially with respect to volume and value of estimated by products.

Weaknesses:

-Melendez – The budget does not appear to adequately support the work plan. The detailed budget does not follow RFP budget format. Unit costs in the budget do not add correctly.

-Melendez – There are costs in the budget form that are not included in the detailed budget.

-Payne – The 424 budget includes construction costs which are not an allowable cost.

-Gomez – Some of the letters of support reference a different project name.

-Watson – Business Plan not submitted with the application.

-Cooper- The entity responsible for collection of monitoring data is not identified.

-Cooper – Advisors for monitoring are identified, a consultant is listed, but it is not clear what the roles of these partners will be.

-Dunn – There is a contractor for monitoring in the budget, but who that will be is not identified.

-Gomez – Some of the letters of support reference a different project name. Proponent – this was an administrative mistake, the letters referenced an old project name.

-Walters- What species would be replanted is not identified and where the planting would take place is not identified.

-Berrens – The federal portion of the budget exceeds the allowable \$360,000.

Recommendations:

-Cooke – Applicant is encouraged to include the grazing permittee as a partner in the application. The proposal could be strengthened if cattle grazing entity is committed to management to allow for controlled burns. If the site is going to carry a fire, then the grazing permittee would need to allow grass to grow high enough to carry a fire.

-Watson – Recommend to the applicant that they address land use of the project area such as grazing.

-Cooper – The project could have been strengthened by describing how the project supports the business plan.

-Bird – Pinon juniper restoration objectives could be better addressed in the proposal. Historic pinon juniper conditions could be better described and justified.

-Bird – In the letter of support from the community alliance, their mission statement should be clearly stated.

Administrative Observations:

-424A Section B (g) incorrect.

-Budget lacks detail on unit costs

-CFR info not provided on SF 424.

-Pojoaque Pueblo should be listed in the budget instead of Picuris Pueblo

-El Greco will provide the cost share match listed to Picuris and Santa Clara Pueblos.

Discussion:

-Matush – Is this primarily going to be done by hand? Proponent – We are known for going in and doing work without machinery. It is going to be a combination of both. The cedar has been bringing in substantial income. We do typically 450 cords of firewood per year.

-Archuleta – What is the role of the grazing permittee in the role of fire?

-Gomez – I do not see a support letter from the Picuris Pueblo. They are included in the budget. Proponent – They are not included in the project. It should be Pojoaque Pueblo. It was a typo and they should have been taken off the budget.

-Dunn – Each proposal that comes in needs to stand alone.

-Dunn – We cannot demand that a proposal follow our RFP budget format, it is only a suggestion.

-Cooper – The proposal needs to be really explicit as to who is going to collect the data.

-Melendez – The numbers in the budget package do not flow together and support each other. According to the RFP it needs to. As far as putting these in the weaknesses or administrative observations, if they are many, they need to be in the weaknesses. They took an old package and did not get all of the numbers, etc. changed. The budget and the work do not flow together.

-Burnett – What is the definition of a Conservation Group and do the applicants have guidance as to what constitutes a Conservation Group. I feel the weakness that addresses the letters of support from Conservation Groups should be removed. Bird – I agree this is a vague and should be removed from the list of weaknesses.

Berrens – I Propose a Category 2

-Cooper – Do the funding issues make this project available for funding?

-Dunn – Yes, Category 2 says there are some substantive weaknesses but it is available for funding.

Berrens – I Propose a Category 3

Evaluation Category: 3

CFRP 05-10 – Questa/Lama WUI Multi-Jurisdictional Forest Restoration Project

11:12 a.m. Fisher returns.

11:13 a.m. Burnett recues herself and leaves the room.

11:19 a.m. Tim Pohlman introduced the proposal.

Rocky Mountain Youth Corps in Taos New Mexico proposes to treat 100 acres of ponderosa pine and pinon juniper forest in the Questa/Lama WUI and complete the NEPA process on Red River Fish Hatchery property which is owned by NM Game and Fish. The treatment area is within the Carson National Forest. In the treatment area, small diameter trees up to 10” diameter at breast height will be removed, leaving suitable spacing among remaining trees. Wood produced from this project will be distributed to the elderly and disabled residents of Taos Country. The project will create a minimum of 27 jobs over a three-year period. Each year, RMYC will hire and train eight person youth crews and one crew supervisor.

Strengths:

-Pholman – Youth component of this application provides a meaningful and potentially life-changing experience for participants.

-Archuleta – The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.

-Archuleta – The proposal includes strong letters of support. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.

-Archuleta – The project will reduce the risk of high intensity wildfire. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities. Good budget detail and/or work plan. The proposal is clear, concise and well organized.

-Olivas – The proposal involves past NEPA collaborators.

-Cooper – The RMYC is trained to conduct monitoring

-Watson – The project builds on past CFRP Projects.

-Watson – The executive summary follows the example in the RFP.

-Cooper – Benefits for wildlife are described on the top of Page 5.

-Olivas – Utilization of the material to provide firewood for elderly in the community.

-Pohlman – The project helps to implement the Taos County Community Wildfire Protection Plan.

Weaknesses:

None.

Recommendations:

None.

Administrative Observations:

-Budget lacks detail on unit costs for benefits and travel.

-Indirect cost is off, should be \$40,500, which would change total amount for federal and non-federal. 10% was taken off project total rather than the direct costs.

Discussion:

-Matush – Paying for NEPA on this is tough for me. Looks like you are doing NEPA just on the Fish Hatchery. What is the advantage of paying for NEPA on the Fish Hatchery?

-Cooper – Does the Corps have employees who are qualified to train the Corps members to collect the data? Proponent – Yes.

-Matush – Who is going to supervise the data collection? Proponent – the RMYC have been trained by the Forest Service in stand exams.

-Cooke – Where did you come up with the 40-50 basal area to be retained for ground spacing? Proponent – this came out of a NEPA document. Cooke – It is recommended for pinon juniper to be 25 basal area.

Evaluation Category: 1

CFRP 06-10 – Forest Restoration, Capacity Building, and Community Sustainability in Black Lake

11:43 a.m. Burnett Returns.

11:43 a.m. Cooke introduced the proposal.

HR Vigil Small Products and its partners will treat 40 acres of ponderosa pine and mixed conifer on NEPA ready State Trust Land north of Black Lake, NM in preparation for prescribed fire. VSP and its partners will also complete NEPA compliance for an additional 5000 acres of State Trust Land, develop a burn plan for 340 acres and identify demonstration areas for restoration within ponderosa pine and mixed conifer forest types. An estimated 250 cords of firewood, post, poles and pellets will be removed from the area. The proposal will employ 4 workers from VSP and will provide education and training to 10 youth through the Forest Guild Youth Corps and New Mexico Forest and Watershed Restoration Institution interns.

Strengths:

-Archuleta – The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles and responsibilities as described in the proposal.

-Archuleta-Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration. The proposal will preserve old and large trees. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments and other treatment projects.

-Gomez – The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities. Good budget detail and/or work plan. The proposal is clear, concise and well organized.

-Cooper – The youth component will engage young people in collection of monitoring data and provide mentoring by university students

-Berrens – Project will donate 75 cords of firewood to the elderly in Mora.

-Dunn – The project has a strong letter of support from the Carson National Forest Supervisor. The support of collaborators is commended.

-Cooper – The project will build on partnerships with other local businesses.

-Dunn – Jim Norris’s letter clearly describes support from State Land Office.

-Melendez – Clear and concise budget was provided.

-Bird – The proposal includes a clear and concise discussion of past management, including fire suppression and overgrazing. The scientific basis is well referenced.

-Bird – The proposal has a clear commitment to prescribed burning.

-Olivas – The utilization plan encourages partnership.

-Olivas – The proposal addresses utilization, treatment, fire plan and NEPA compliance.

Olivas – The project maintains tree species diversity and removes dwarf mistletoe.

Weaknesses:

None.

Recommendations:

None.

Administrative Observations:

-Great Budget Package

- Program income listed should be moved to other.
- The sub-award costs provided to the Forest Guild should follow established rates.

Discussion:

- Burnett – You cannot treat any acres until you have surveyed them.
- Matush – Who is the leasee? I don't see any letters of support from leasee.
Proponent – Have verbal support but not written.
- Proponent – We do have a letter from the leasee who attended several of the field trips.
- Payne – In the proposal you detailed a need for a log truck. In the proposal I didn't see where you were using the log truck.
- Cooke – It says they will be using the truck in the log yard.
- Melendez – Talks about program income on 424, line 18, but didn't see where that was included in the narrative or budget justification. Did find that amount on page 3. Program listed should be moved to other.
- Cooke – Would like to propose a Category 1

Evaluation Category: 1

12:15 p.m.

Public Comment Period

7/11/2010

Ian R. Fox

Timber Management Officer

Cibola National Forest

Re: CFRP Proposal, Mt. Taylor Machine, LLC

Dear Mr. Fox:

Our CFRP was submitted with the explanation the funds requested were to be used to further our goal for additional production of wood pellets. Moreover, we elaborated upon our intent to build a new pellet facility right in the South Valley of Albuquerque where we own five acres of property zoned for industrial manufacturing. This plant will help our collaborative goal of forest restoration across the State of New Mexico. It will provide an outlet for harvested biomass for all collaborative partners.

While waiting for the CFRP process to begin we completed the purchase of this plant. We are currently working through the required planning, permitting, staging, licensing etc. required to build a business in Albuquerque. However, all entities involved, such as Bernalillo County Construction Industries Division, are being very helpful upon understanding the importance of our project not only for the protection of our state and national forests but also for creation of new jobs. We have been assured the new pellet factory will be approved. We plan on having it in production by late fall. We have also purchased a new grinder which will be able to process large and long length logs. These two purchases along with the required buildings, electrical additions and concrete work equate to

roughly \$500,000 invested by Mt. Taylor Machine in pursuit of both our future and the future of New Mexico Forest Restoration.

The new plant will provide a manufacturing and market outlet for materials harvested in the Jemez, Manzanos and Sandia Mountains. This will fit in nicely with our current pellet plant which can process material from both Zuni Mountains and Mt. Taylor.

The new project is proceeding nicely and we hope the CFRP panel understands our dedication to this project and collaborative forest restoration for New Mexico.

*Sincerely,
G. Matthew Allen
Mt. Taylor Machine, LLC*

July 13, 2010

*Walter Dunn, Cooperative & International Forestry
USDA Forest Service, and
Pane Members of the CFRP Panel*

Re: Update on 2010 CFRP grant submission

Dear Mr. Dunn and Members of the CFRP Panel,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit additional information about the progress of Tree New Mexico's (TNM) grant submission: Resource and Restoration Management in the Albuquerque Bosque: Building a Sustainable Ecological and Economic Wood Product Cycle.

Progress and developments on the grant concepts:

The small portable mill purchased by Open Space has been under operation for the past several months. Dave Mora (Open Space) has been milling and making cuts for boards and structural wood, and for more "boutique and custom" wood cuts. Boards have been taken off of milled logs and there are several stacks of milled elm and cottonwood boards that have banded and are drying.

Milling demonstrations have been made to a number of our new partner groups, i.e. architectural designers, retailers, wood artisans and others. The artisans and designers are experimenting with thick, live-edge pieces, burls, and even pulling our cuts from the waste pile!! At this time, the majority of the wood is cottonwood, with some elm and Russian olive in the mix. We look forward to acquiring a bigger mill so that we can fill the demand for larger cuts. (see photos below)

TNM, Rekow Designs, and Open Space Division continue to research markets and product, promote the program to interested parties, work on process and pricing issues, and continue to engage city officials and others in supporting the program. TNM and Rekow Designs are also continuing work on the business plan to include local, regional, national, and international markets.

The Native American Youth Academy (NACA) youth group working with us on the current CFRP, has been out to the mill for a demonstration and brainstorming session on wood products they can design, construct and market.

Respectfully submitted, Suzanne Probart, Tree New Mexico

Dick Cooke will be absent the afternoon of July 20, 2010.

CFRP 07-10 – Quality Environment and Economic Sustainability Proposal

1:51 pm. Cooper introduced the proposal.

Jaramillo and Sons Forest Products propose to restore forest structure in preparation for prescribed fire across 300 acres of the Ensenada area in the Vallecitos Federal Sustained Yield Unit of the Carson National Forest in Rio Arriba County. The proposal pursues methods of forest restoration with an extensive list of collaborators involved in the planning, development, implementation, and monitoring of the project. Jaramillo and Sons intends to treat all acres through manual and mechanical methods. Treatment will consist primarily of thinning, resulting in the cutting of approximately 50 to 200 small diameter trees per acres. The project will provide 6 seasonal jobs. Students from Mesa Vista High School and Mexico Highlands University will be trained in monitoring techniques with the help of Rachael Wood Consulting.

Strengths:

-Archuleta- The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal. NEPA is complete. The proposal contains strong letters of support from collaborators.

-Archuleta –Strengths # 9-22, 25, 29, 33

-Archuleta – The project will make road improvements to benefit the adjacent stream. The application is in the Vallecitos Sustained Yield Unit creates benefits to the local community and other industries within the unit.

-Archuleta – Provides local forestry based employment and opportunities in a rural economically depressed area of the state that has a high concentration of federal public lands.

-Burnett – The project includes a good youth component.

-Cooper – High school students will assist in collection of monitoring data and integrate project into curriculum

-Cooper – Letters of support are submitted by area grazing associations.

-Bird – The proposal clearly states that it will prepare 300 acres for prescribed fire and has the explicit support of the Forest District Ranger.

-Olivas – Encourages increased watershed capacity around the drinking water and high quality cold water fisheries.

Gomez – The map shows previous, proposed and current treatment areas on a landscape scale.

Weaknesses:

None.

Recommendations:

None.

Administrative Observations:

None.

Discussion:

-Dunn – In the budget, the forest worker safety training, I want to ensure that the proponent is paying for the workers to get the training, as opposed to the CFRP paying for the training. Proponent – Yes, proponent pays.

Cooper proposes Category 1.

Evaluation Category: 1

CFRP 08-10 – Multijurisdictional Water Supply Protection and Public Youth Education through Forest Restoration in the City of Raton Municipal Watershed.

2:05 p.m. Fisher introduced the proposal.

In order to reduce fuel loads and lower the risk of a crown fire, the City of Raton and its collaborative partners propose to treat approximately 360 acres of land in Sugarite Canyon. The treatment will involve thinning the small diameter trees while preserving the old and large trees. The project location within the Sugarite Canyon State Park will allow for wildlife habitat enhancement, resulting from the project being integrated with ongoing wildlife management within the Park. The project offers excellent opportunities for broad public and youth education components. The project's educational component will include the installation of exhibits along trails used by Park visitors, education of local government officials about the benefits of forest restoration and the successful use of prescribed fire. The project includes busing of school children to the watershed for onsite outdoor education and involvement of school children in monitoring activities. A part-time park intern will be hired to assist with the educational component.

Strengths:

-Fisher – Diverse and balanced group of partners. Demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal. NEPA is complete. The proposal includes strong letters of support. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration. The project includes a good youth component. Includes hands on monitoring of how forest thinning will affect squirrel habitat.

-Fisher – The project will reduce fire risk in the community on New Mexico Communities at Risk List. The proposal will preserve old and large trees. The project builds on past CFRP projects. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.

-Bird – Specific goals of the prescription show reintroduction of natural fire as well as provisions for returning the natural grass and forbes understory.

-Bird – The prescription accommodates wildlife travel corridors and addresses the needs of individual, vulnerable species. (NM Jumping Mouse)

-Dunn- The applicant has clearly addressed prior weaknesses and recommendations

-Gomez – Additional surveys will be completed for wildlife species beyond the initial BA.

-Watson – Hands-on activities for students in Raton about fire triangle is a plus.

Weaknesses:

None.

Recommendations:

-There should be a letter of commitment from Dr. Cartron.

-The proposal could be strengthened by reference to safety of forest workers who will implement project

-Burnett – The application references the need to reintroduce fire multiple times in the proposal however, there are no letters of commitment to conducting the prescribed fires referenced in the proposal are provided.

-Matush – Be clear and specific about water quality samples.

Administrative Observations:

-Budget lacks detail.

-Clarify that the city will provide administration cost a part of match not shown on grant.

-Consulting fees should be indirect costs of the sub recipient.

-No reference to safety of forest workers who will implement project.

Discussion:

-Melendez – The budget detail “F” for consultants, it shows the city is administering this but doesn’t show any costs associated with this. Proponent – the match is water trust money held by the city of Raton. The city is contributing money to administer the award.

-Fisher- Budget detail for consultants shows non-federal match of \$90,000 and the city is administering. The letter states that the State of NM has provided a non-federal match, but the Mayor states the city is providing the match. Proponent – clarify – the water trust board has money that they will be using to match.

-Gomez – There was a BA completed and more field surveys for wildlife will be done. Is that in support of the BA or additional work? Proponent – This is additional work that will be done before any thinning.

-Berrens – Is the Biologist John Cartron? Proponent – Yes

-Bird – I don’t see any mention of safety. Are all your contractors certified and trained? Proponent – Yes, multiple contractors may be used but they well ensure all are certified and trained in safety.

-Proponent – We have not yet burned in this watershed since the community is very fearful of losing the watershed. There are several partners that have a lot of

experience in burning. This is the first time we are actually considering this. We would do pile burning in the winter. This is supported by New Mexico State Forestry and the Nature Conservancy.

-Burnett – If you say you're going to burn you need to have someone who is qualified commit to doing the burning.

-Pohlman – In the proposal it talks about educating the city water board on the benefits of using fire. It looks like fire would be used as a long-term maintenance tool.

-Burnett – The application references the need to reintroduce fire multiple times in the proposal; however, there are no letters of commitment to conducting the prescribed fires referenced in the proposal are provided.

-Dunn – the application is from the land management entity. It's their land and they are in charge of it. They don't need the support of the landowner because they are the landowners. The proposal could be strengthened by showing the timeline for burning.

-Gomez – I think the State Forestry is committed to burning in the BA.

-Matush – What water quality sampling is being done? Proponent – We put together a list of parameters and have been conducting water quality sampling. It will be continuing and on-going.

Fisher proposes Category 1.

Evaluation Category: 1

CFRP 09-10 – Andy Chacon Forest Restoration Company

2:49 p.m. Gomez introduced the proposal.

3:00 p.m. Bird recuses himself and leaves the room.

The proposed project spans 253 acres of the El Ritito area located in the Ensenada Environmental Assessment of the El Rito Ranger District within the Vallecitos Federal Sustained Yield Unit of the Carson National Forest. The proposal addresses methods of forest restoration with an extensive list of collaborators involved in the planning, development, and implementation and monitoring of the project. The project will treat all acres through manual treatment methods. Small diameter trees will be processed as vigas and poles and other nearby CFRP grant recipients will use the trees to mill rough-cut timber. The project will provide five seasonal jobs. Students and youth from Mesa Vista High School and New Mexico Highlands University will provide hands on learning and application opportunities in monitoring and evaluation. The project will cover a three-year period. Education and outreach will be provided to approximately 500 local area residents and private landowners via a demonstration site, public presentations provided by project collaborators and participation in a Multiparty Monitoring Team.

Strengths:

-Gomez – Proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal. The

proposal includes strong letters of support. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles and responsibilities described in the proposal

-Gomez – NEPA is complete. The project includes a good youth component using Mesa Vista School students to gather and analyze data. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.

-Bird – The proposal includes grazing associations as collaborators and commits to working with those collaborators on coordinating grazing with fire return.

-Bird – The prescription specifically addresses the needs of a sensitive wildlife species that is associated with the forest type. (e.g. Aberts Squirrel).

-Berrens – Treatment fills in the gaps between isolated, previously blocks in the area, and may aid in the implementation of the prescribed broadcast burn by the Carson National Forest.

-Matush – Proponent referenced monitoring data from two previous CFRP projects to come up with their new prescription.

-Archuleta – The application will preserve old and large trees. The Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments. The application provides local forestry based employment and opportunities in a rural economically depressed area of the state that has a high concentration of federal public lands.

-Archuleta – The application in the treatment

-Cooper – The project implements a CWPP and incorporates modeling data.

-Gomez – Commitment letters for utilization of products from the CFRP project are included in the proposal.

Weaknesses:

None.

Recommendations:

-Verify that log trailer purchased is adequate for work to be performed.

Administrative Observations:

-Budget lacks details and some math errors.

-Fringe benefits show workers comp insurance as a separate line and should be shown as a separate cost.

-Forest Guild rates should be consistent with the established rates.

Discussion:

-Payne – The log trailer, have you used one and know which piece of equipment you are getting? How much material will this hold and will it significantly change your operation? This is not a very strong trailer.

Gomez proposes Category 1.

Evaluation Category: 1

CFRP 10-10 – Navajo Dam Multi-Jurisdictional Restoration Project

3:08 p.m. Bird returns.

3:09 p.m. Matush introduced the proposal.

This project will implement restoration treatments on the San Juan River near the town of Navajo Dam, NM. The main objective is to remove invasive, non-woody species from riparian habitat. Following the removal of non-native, woody species, treated areas will be restored using native species. This will enhance wildlife habitat, increase recreation activities, increase water quality, and insure economic stability for business and individuals. Have completed a Habitat Management Plan and NEPA. Project will create economic interests for local communities. It will restore and preserve Bosque riparian areas for recreational use by various enthusiasts, i.e. fly fishermen, picnickers, campers, hikers, etc. Improve the function of the riparian zone, as well as prevent the spread of exotic, invasive infestations.

Strengths:

-Pohlman – The proposal treats non-native invasive species along with hazardous fuels, improves TES habitat. Ensures the safe application of herbicides.

-Olivas – The proposal describes the restoration of the project area in great detail. The proposal also includes a youth component for project restoration (the Youth Conservation Corps).

-Matush – The proposal is clear, concise and well organized. The proposal included good budget detail and all costs were itemized. The BLM has extensive experience in the proposed activities.

-Berrens – Applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses and recommendations, especially with respect to the socio-economic monitoring.

-Matush – Post project monitoring to be done by the BLM, as described in the EA, exceeds program requirements.

Weaknesses:

-Gomez – The acreage figures in the proposal are inconsistent between the budget, the map, the text and the letters to the tribe. Specifically, the 25 letters to the tribes which listed the acreage of treatment as 100 acres.

Recommendations:

-Cooper – Return of hydrologic integrity or mimicking a natural hydrologic regime through management would be necessary for long term restoration.

-Berrens – Application should ensure that any surveys either 1) meet U.S. Office of Management and Budget guidelines or 2) do not use Federal dollars.

-Watson – The Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Bureau of Reclamation should consider including this s one of the long-term CFRP

monitoring sites after the grant period to determine success and eradication of non-native invasives.

Administrative Observations:

-Non-Federal match is over 20%

-Documentation that the outstanding Federal debt is being resolved needs to be provided to the agency.

Discussion:

-Burnett – In year two there is reference to a YCC crew. Have you applied or been approved for this funding? Proponent – yes, we have received funding. We will probably be able to use YCC kids every year but they can only commit to a one year funding.

-Burnett – If the non-federal match was not provided, how would this affect the project?

-Dunn – We will not award the grant if the non-federal match is not there.

-Proponent – If the YCC does not come through, we have additional match to cover this.

-Watson – How long are you going to be monitoring native species? Proponent – We have a base-line monitoring plan and will also be monitoring years 2, 3 and 4. Will do vegetative and bird surveys.

-Watson – Will you continue monitoring after the project ends? Proponent – it will be on-going. It is an ACEC project so it will be monitored by BLM for up to 20 years.

-Gomez – Coming up with different acres on the map, the proposal, the letters to the tribe and the budget. Proponent – It is 160 acres.

-Cooper – Is the outstanding Federal debt issue resolved? Proponent – It is being resolved and there is an agreement in place for resolving.

Matush proposes Category 1. Berrens concur.

Evaluation Category: 1

CFRP 11-10 – Increased Forest Restoration and Utilization in the Cibola

4:05 p.m. Olivas introduced the proposal.

By re-tooling their existing Milan, NM plan and outfitting their recently purchased plant in Albuquerque, Mt. Taylor Machine, LLC will be able to process and recycle a wide variety of small diameter timber, forest residuals, and commercial wood waste. Year one funding will be used for log handling equipment. An in-state market program will be developed in year two. Increased production and marketing mean that instead of purchasing pellets shipped long distance, NM consumers will be able to purchase pellets made from local sources, sold in local businesses. Unemployed area workers, high school students and conservation groups will be utilized to monitor progress and to promote an understanding among the general public of the need for forest restoration, its principles and practices.

Strengths:

- Archuleta – The project will substantially increase capacity for small diameter utilization in the Cibola National Forest as well as private lands.
- Archuleta – The focus on the marketing and advertising will increase the value of locally produced wood pellets.
- Archuleta – The application tries to address the issue of transportation as it relates to a cost impeding successful utilization efforts. It recognizes the distributed geography of the Cibola National Forest.
- Matush – The proposal would use CFRP funds as seed money to create a market to sustain viable utilization industries.
- Olivas – The proposal will put the infrastructure in place to support future restoration projects in the area
- Berrens – Unique opportunity of expansion of manufacturing capacity closer to a raw material source and a potentially large market.

Weaknesses:

- Cooper –Monitoring and Evaluation plan described on page 9 and 10 does not identify specifically who will collect the data.
- Cooper – The role of partners in multiparty monitoring is not explained in the text or in letters. The letters of support do not verify the role of the partner in multiparty monitoring.
- Cooper – The letter from Grants High School is very general and the youth described in the table and text lacks specifics.
- Cooper – Statements on page 1 and 8 regarding education outreach and monitoring are not supported elsewhere in the proposal or budget.

Recommendations:

- Burnett – The proponent should remove the ecological monitoring component since the project does not involve treatment. The applicant is encouraged to work with other projects to improve the socio-economic partners.
- Cooper – Distinguish between providers of data and multiparty review of data.
- Burnett – The Panel strongly encourages the applicant to address the Panels concerns and resubmit.

Administrative Observations:

- The total for personnel, fringe benefits, and equipment expense in the budget category has additional errors.
- Labor burden mention in travel per diem and should be in personnel costs.
- Federal and non-federal should be broken down.
- There were no indirect costs shown.

Discussion:

-Olivas – In page 5 and 6, what does this table indicate? Proponent – The Cibola NF 5-year plan and projects that are NEPA ready.

-Archuleta – There are three types of applications we see as a panel. Restoration projects, planning projects, projects that provide seed money to start up a business. The multiparty monitoring in a project like this is very different. The seed money could potentially mean that this business could go off and sustain on its own.

-Dunn – All projects are required to include a multiparty assessment. The multiparty assessment needs to focus on the objectives of the project. It also needs to report on the negative and positive impacts of the project. A multiparty assessment is an eligibility requirement.

-Proponent – It depends on what land and jurisdiction the product is coming off of as to who will monitor. There will be new partners coming in who will become part of the multiparty monitoring.

-Matush – How many people do you think you can employ? Proponent – Will hire seven new employees at the new mill. I have a mulcher on order and I'm not sure how big this portion of the business will be. If this is successful more people will be employed.

Burnett – Have you contacted the Department of Air Quality? Proponent – Yes and they have been very pleased with our approach.

Olivas proposes Category 1.

Dunn – You need to review the Categories and re-read the weaknesses.

Archuleta – I would argue that the weaknesses are not substantial weaknesses. They are minor administrative weaknesses. I would propose Category 1.

Cooper – I don't think that the monitoring component is described in such a way and needs to be strengthened. I think it needs to be Category 3.

Matush - I would go with Category 1.

Burnett – I don't think that it's fair that because this is a different type of proposal we can overlook the monitoring. It does need some work to set the standards we've set for the other proposals. I would go with Category 2.

Pohlman – It seems like it is all coming down to the socio-economics. Do we have what we think we need in the proposal? I would go with Category 1 or 2.

Cooper – Data collected by who and what manner is not described and I think this is a major weakness.

Matush – When you go into business, you can't describe it up front because you just don't know.

Archuleta – I don't think that when you look at a project like this, you're holding it to a different standard. I think it's in a whole different scope.

Berrens – I would recommend a Category 2. It is a unique utilization opportunity. I think the CFRP should fund unique projects. It still does not identify the multiparty monitoring.

Gomez – Recommends Category 2.

Watson – Because of the multiparty monitoring, I recommend Category 3.

Marosy – Can the Panel members all agree with a Category 2?

Evaluation Category: 2

CFRP 12-10 – San Antonio de Las Huertas Land Grant Collaborative Forest Restoration Planning Project.

5:09 p.m. Archuleta recuses himself and leaves the room.

5:09 p.m. Burnett introduced the proposal.

This project will complete the planning process necessary to implement forest restoration in the community land grant of San Antonio de las Huertas and Cibola National Forest. It will build a fire protection partnership between the Land Grant and surrounding areas. Planning efforts include NEPA clearance and development of an implementation plan for restoring and thinning a total of 305 acres. This project will offer an opportunity for youth from Bernalillo High School and community members to be involved as meaningful contributors during field data collection. Community members will be trained in best management practices for reducing hazardous fuels and in site characterization techniques to guide ecological restoration.

Strengths:

-Cooper – The multiparty monitoring participants are identified clearly in the text and letters.

-Gomez – Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a unique opportunity for collaboration. The text on page 2-4 shows clear roles and responsibilities of each coordinator/partner and what their duties are.

-Burnett – The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of approval. The proposal includes strong letters of support.

-Burnett – The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles and responsibilities as described in the proposal.

-Burnett – The project incorporates current scientific restoration information. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts. Parametrix, the sub recipient, has extensive expertise in the proposed activities. The proposal is clear, concise and well organized.

-Berrens – The project includes cross-jurisdiction activities.

-Gomez – Page 6 – The land grant expresses an interest to partner with outside entities and experts in the field of forestry to promote joint learning.

-Berrens – Planning focus includes consideration of community drinking water supply.

-Bird – The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses and recommendations.

-Olivas – The project would lead to a potentially reduced risk of high-intensity wildfire.

-Cooper – The NEPA compliance costs are well described in the Parametrix budget provided.

-Fisher – This project has potential in that it bridges the gap within the land grant community to acquire technical information to manage their land.

Weaknesses:

-Cooper – The socio-economic monitoring plan on page does not address the specific objectives shown on pages 4 and 5. The monitoring plan appears to be designed to measure the eventual implementation of treatments and utilization in the future

-Cooper – There is no letter of support from Bernalillo High School.

Recommendations:

-Cooper – The work plan could break out the tasks of NEPA compliance such as timing of biological and resource surveys, completion of Draft EA, public scoping period, response to comments, Final EA, etc.

Administrative Observations:

-No DUNS number in process.

Discussion:

-Melendez – For the NEPA work, is the approval for the contract to do the NEPA done? Proponent – Yes.

-Coleman – This is a one-year proposal. Do you think the NEPA is doable in this timeframe? Proponent – Yes, the Forest Service is totally committed to get the NEPA done.

-Matush – Are they charging this grant any direct or indirect costs? Burnett – Yes, I checked it myself.

Burnett proposes Category 2

Cooper proposes Category 2

Fisher proposes Category 1

Evaluation Category: 2

CFRP 13-10 – Alamo Navajo School Board, Inc. Multi-jurisdictional Collaborative Landscape Analysis

6:15 p.m. Burnett recues herself and leaves the room.

6:17 p.m. Melissa Marosy reviews the wording of Categories 1-4.

6: 18 p.m. Archuleta returns.

6:18 p.m. Pohlman introduced the proposal.

The Alamo Navajo School Board, Inc. is requesting funds from the CFRP to complete NEPA analysis for 19,190 acres of pinon juniper forest across USFS, BLM and New Mexico State Land Office Lands. This proposal would augment 36,916 acres of USFS land and 2,700 acres of BLM land where NEPA proposal

would augment 36,916 acres of USFS land and 2,700 acres of BLM land where NEPA compliance has been completed or is in progress. The ANSBI, USFS, and FWRI will provide workforce and youth training and complete vegetation stand exams and threatened and endangered species surveys. The ANSBI, with assistance from FWRI and SWCA will also complete a multiparty monitoring plan to guide multiparty assessments for future CFRP proposals.

Strengths:

- Cooper – The community work force will be trained in biological and stand exam surveys.
- Pohlman – The Magdalena Ranger District will be training the community youth workforce in biological stand exam surveys. The initial analysis and monitoring will include TES as an important piece of the youth involvement.
- Dunn – The project includes cross-jurisdictional landscape activities including Forest Service, BLM and State Land Office lands.
- Dunn – The Appendix describes outreach to private landowners to facilitate a larger landscape scale approach.
- Cooper – There is strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal. The youth component is described in the letter from the Alamo Navajo School Board. Table 3 timeline outlines the scope of work clearly.
- Dunn – The project incorporates current scientific information outlined on page 5.
- Pohlman – Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration. The project will reduce the risk of high intensity wildfire. The proposal will preserve old and large trees. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort. The project implements a CWPP. The application monitoring goes beyond the core CFRP ecological indicators.
- Gomez – The application includes strong letters of support. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles and responsibilities described in the proposal.
- Fisher – The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
- Watson – The proposal is clear, concise and organized. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
- Bird – The proposal mentions the use of prescribed fire as a fuel reduction treatment and is supported by the BLM letter.
- Berrens – The applicant is only charging indirect costs at the 10% rate on their part of the grant.
- Dunn – Strong collaboration occurred beginning in 2006 well in advance of the submission of the application.
- Dunn – The project includes an adaptive approach to restoration in an annual evaluation of monitoring data which is used to collaboratively refine prescriptions.

Weaknesses:

None.

Recommendations:

None.

Administrative Observations:

-SWCA is really a sub recipient and subject to Cost Principles and Uniform Requirements.

-Indirect cots rate should be updated with the most current rate.

Discussion:

-Matush – What constitutes a community? I am not aware of any community off of Highway 52. Proponent – That is how it is classified in the county CWPP.

-Bird – Is all of the Environmental Analysis meant to be completed in one year? Proponent – No, it will be a two year project. Will do the surveys the first year. It is actually written as a three year project.

-Fisher – There are a large amount of letters to the land owners attached. Did any of them respond? Proponent – No.

-Matush – Are you going to have time to get all of the surveys done? Proponent – Yes.

Pohlman proposes Category 1

Evaluation Category: 1

CFRP 14-10 – Resource and Restoration Management in the Albuquerque Bosque: Building a Sustainable Ecological and Economic Wood Product Cycle.

6:47 p.m. Burnett returns.

6:47 p.m. Gomez introduced the proposal.

The project continues a comprehensive management plan for the 2,500 wooded acres of the Albuquerque Bosque. It will include thinning, treatment, replanting and on-going monitoring of the Albuquerque Bosque. The proposal includes harvesting of waste wood from the trees that have been damaged from fire and natural causes, areas that will be thinned and invasive trees that have potential for value added sales. Proceeds from these sales will be deposited into the established Woodward Nursery Fund. The project provides a minimum of 30 local youth with part-time jobs and training opportunities in planting and maintaining trees and shrubs. It offers volunteer opportunities that encourage public understanding of the health of the Bosque ecosystem.

Strengths:

-Gomez – Includes a diverse and balanced group of partners. The proposal includes strong letters of support. The NEPA is complete. The project includes a good youth component. The project will create new jobs.

-Berrens – Proposal creates a partnership fund managed by Tree New Mexico and Albuquerque Open Space Division with proceeds from the sale of harvest wood to go directly to operating the nursery and restoring the Bosque.

-Dunn – The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.

Weaknesses:

-Matush- Ground water monitoring to show static level would be nice to see prior to planting. Such as the information included by the BEMP program.

-Burnett – It is unclear what types of treatments will take place within the project areas. The areas are mapped, however, specific restoration design is not provided.

-Cooper – It is not clear why acres included in the 2007 CFRP are being treated.

-Fisher – The RFA format was not followed e.g. information on project history is included in the executive summary

-Cooper – The project was difficult to read due to organization.

-Burnett - The NEPA Decision document is not attached to the Proposal.

-Gomez – Maps lack specificity of treatment do not include township, range, section.

Recommendations:

-Gomez – On Page 11, seven areas are identified and the type of treatment should have been included for each area.

-Watson – Proponents should follow RFP format for project narrative.

-Cooper – Return of hydrological integrity or mimicking natural hydrologic regime through management would be necessary for long-term restoration.

-Berrens – The proposal should specify which of the specific 513 acres will have treatment, harvesting, monitoring and restoration activities.

Administrative Observations:

-Some of the costs – Appendix E – accounting under personnel are in the wrong category.

-Rico Designs is described as personnel – either they are employees or contractors.

-Travel CGFRP workshops - \$4500 – for three people is excessive.

Discussion:

-Matush – What kind of software costs \$4,000? Proponent – It is GIS/Arc View software 9.4.

-Gomez – It identifies 30 local youth will be employed, but it is not in the budget. Proponent – The youth will be funded either through the YCC program or other grant money.

-Dunn – On page 5 it says the primary trees species is cottonwood, salt cedar and Russian olive. Are you going to be able to find a market for these species?
Proponent – Yes, in boutique markets. This is a non-traditional wood sale.

-Berrens – Have you sold any yet? Proponent – Yes, we have.

-Matush – Are you selling this to the city? Proponent – No, the city is doing the transportation and cutting. We are working with other local businesses and furniture stores.

-Matush – Were you able to get a letter of support from the local business?
Proponent – No. We have one from Ricco.

-Fisher – Do you currently have a CFRP grant? Proponent – Yes.

-Fisher – How is this different from your current grant? Proponent – The current grant got us started and this grant will sustain us, funds monitoring.

-Burnett – How many acres will actually be treated? Proponent – Of the 513 acres, all have different sites that will be treated.

-Burnett – Who is actually going to be doing the thinning? Proponent – Open Space will be doing the thinning.

Gomez proposes Category 3.

Evaluation Category: 3

7:32 p.m.

Public Comment Period

*Silver City Ranger District
3005 E. Camino del Bosque
Silver City, NM 88061-7863*

February 22, 2010

*Kurt Albershardt
Murray Hotel*

I have reviewed your 2010 CFRP project proposal. This proposal was received on February 21, 2010. Although this proposal may have merit, your request for collaboration with my office was not timely. I suggest you submit the proposal next year, after you and I have had a chance to collaborate, meet, and discuss the merits of the proposal.

Sincerely,

*RUSSELL WARD
District Ranger*

7:33 p.m.

Melissa Marosy reviewed the agenda for Wednesday, July 21st.

7:34 p.m.

Meeting adjourned.

Wednesday, July 21, 2010

Panel:

Mike Matush
Timothy Pohlman
Danny Gomez
Ann Watson
Robert Berrens, PhD
Bryan Bird
John Olivas
Martha S. Cooper
Dick Cooke
Shaun Criston Fisher
Candido Arturo Archuleta
Coleman Burnett
Walter Dunn – Chairman

USFS Staff:

Walter Dunn
Melissa Marossy
Alicia San Gil
Jerry Payne
Carmen Melendez
Monica Martinez

Facilitator: Melissa Marosy

Meeting Minutes: Allison Lundin

Members of the Public in Attendance:

John Stokely
Ray Vicente
Dave Warnack
John Pierson
Russ Ward
Jim Kellar
Walt Strain
Gordon West
Zeecha Brook
Cody Cummings
Merry Jo Fahl
Kurt Alberhurst
Connie Zipperer
Ian Fox
Fabian Montano
Gabriel Partido
Dennis Truillo
The Wellness Coalition
Clarence Montoya

Anne Bradley

8:37 a.m. Melissa Marosy reviews the agenda for the day.

CFRP 15-10 –The Cebolita Mesa Forest Restoration Project

8:46 a.m. Watson introduced the proposal.

The proposal is intended to conduct timber stand improvement in conjunction with hazardous fuels reduction within ponderosa pine and pinon juniper pine stands in order to reduce hazardous fuels, produce healthier trees and improve range conditions. The work will be performed at three project locations on Cebolita Mesa on the Pueblo of Acoma Indian Reservation. It is planned that a combined total of approximately 100 acres will be treated within the identified units. The identified project area will employ a four man Acoma work crew.

Strengths:

- Bird – Project will increase the use of natural fire regime. Project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
- Watson – The project will create new jobs; will hire 4 tribal members as crew to do the thinning. Project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
- Gomez – The budget is very detailed, unit costs are clear.

Weaknesses:

- Cooper – Did not see a letter to the tribes. Dunn – I would modify to say there is no documentation of letters to adjacent tribes.
- Cooper – The prescription does not reflect scientific restoration. Proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups or area businesses in design, implementation and monitoring. The youth component lacks detail. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided. Archuleta – I know that there are requirements to work with conservation groups; does it include working with working business? Dunn – Particularly with the tribes, they have their own tribal businesses. Archuleta – Would propose taking out the collaboration with area businesses. Payne – Suggested language – Project would be improved by consultation or recommendation with area businesses.
- Matush – The monitoring plan lacks detail. Burnett – Would like to add that the monitoring plan also does not include the core CFRP ecological indicators.
- Burnett – The executive summary is not consistent with the body of the proposal. The executive summary states that 100 acres will be treated but later references 120 acres. It also references 100 cords of removal to be estimated and then later 400 cords is estimated in the text. Matush – The acres throughout the proposal are not clear.
- Olivas – The work plan does not flow with the project details and there is a lot of redundancy in the proposal.
- Watson – To understand proposal effectiveness, more information is needed on the site specific existing conditions and proposed activities. There is no multiparty monitoring.

-Cooke – Spacing of trees in the project area precludes some wildlife needs such as overlapping clumps for squirrel habitat. Dunn – 30x30 or 9x9 spacing is not a restoration treatment which would normally include clumpiness for wildlife.

-Dunn – Timber stand improvement, range improvement, and enhancing forage for livestock are not CFRP program objectives. Payne – If those are outcomes from forest restoration I agree, but they are not objectives. Dunn – It's not in the objectives on page 3. Archuleta – I see that as a primary benefit, an outcome of an objective.

-Watson – The educational component is vague.

-Matush – Costs for lop and scatter are too high. Cooke – They are just lopping and scattering the slash. Matush - \$3000/acre is exorbitant.

-Dunn – There was no mention of attending CFRP workshops.

Recommendations:

None.

Administrative Observations:

-No NEPA attached, but it is referenced in BIA letter.

-Program income must be used to further the projects objects or be used as non-federal match.

Discussion:

Watson proposes Category 4

Evaluation Category: 4

CFRP 16-10 – Gavilan Ridge Conservation and Forest Restoration

9:13 a.m. Archuleta introduced the proposal.

The proposal will implement restoration and harvest on 337 acres on the Lincoln NF, Smokey Bear Ranger District in Ruidoso, NM. Material harvested will be utilized as wood resources for fencing and bird/bat houses and also as value-added product by SBS Wood Shavings. Several local groups will be involved in both conservation and monitoring activities. Fourteen collaborators are involved in this project. Jobs will be provided for three commercial contractors and two conservation organizations. Training opportunities will be provided to high school and college students. Educational opportunities include wildlife surveys and socio-economic surveys annually for high school students. It is expected at least 57 individuals will be involved in this project.

Strengths:

-Burnett – 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16

-Bird – The project may lead to the use of prescribed fire, in particular, broadcast burn.

-Bird – The proposal discusses grazing in relation to restoration and wildlife. The application monitoring goes beyond the core CFRP ecological indicators. The proposal looks at elk as well as deer populations.

-Cooke – The proposal is supported by the Greater Ruidoso CWPP and is part of a greater landscape plan.

-Gomez – 21, 22, 24. In the Lincoln National Forest Supervisor’s letter it allows all material to be hauled off site at no cost to the contractor.

-Cooper – The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments and collaboration in the area.

-Archuleta – The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.

Weaknesses:

-Dunn – Program income reported in the SF-424 is not reflected in the total budget detail or the project narrative.

-Dunn – The application does not follow the format in Appendix E of the RFP for the narrative total budget detail.

-Cooper – The panel’s prior weaknesses and recommendations were not addressed.

-Archuleta – No documentation of letter to Pueblo of Isleta and Ysleta del Sur Pueblo.

-Burnett – A letter of collaboration from Eco Servants verifies the non-federal match in the budget is not included.

Recommendations:

-Burnett – The maps could be enhanced by identification of the interpretive trail and checked dam locations.

Administrative Observations:

-Provide more description of Project Coordinator cost, indirect costs and benefits.

-Validate program income.

Discussion:

-Cooper – This is a revision; do the prior strengths and weaknesses need to be addressed? They are not discussed. Does this need to be part of this? Yes

-Cooper – I didn’t see documentation of letter sent to tribe. Dunn – There is a letter from the tribe saying, “thanks for asking”.

-Gomez – I did not see a letter of support from the City of Ruidoso? Were they contacted? Proponent – Yes, they do have the support of the city. There is not a letter specifically but we have been working with them.

-Discussion on program income. It appears not everyone fully understands. San Gil – Any income generated off projects, that income has to either go back into the project or can be negotiated to be used for a non-federal match.

-Archuleta proposes Category 3

Evaluation Category: 3

CFRP 17-10 – Restoration Strategy and Payments for Ecosystem Services in the Rio Ruidoso Watershed

9:43 a.m. Watson introduced the proposal.

This project will develop a watershed restoration strategy and Payments for Ecosystem Services plan for the Rio Ruidoso watershed within the jurisdiction of the Mescaero Apache Tribe, the Lincoln National Forest and the Village of Ruidoso. The project will document fire hazard in a 30,000 acre portion of the Rio Ruidoso watershed, quantify the post-fire flood risk potential to the Village of Ruidoso and utilize LANDFIRE data and wildland fire models to prioritize silvicultural treatment locations and evaluate watershed treatment options to restore historic fire regimes. Community outreach efforts will focus specifically on educating the public about the potential impacts of a severe wildfire on post-fire flooding.

Strengths:

-Dunn – Collaboration for the proposal began more than a year prior to project submission.

-Berrens – Unique attempt to sustain watershed restoration efforts through a collaborative design for payment for ecosystem services funding mechanism.

-Cooper – Innovative approach to building support for watershed restoration. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles and responsibilities as described in the proposal. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.

-Matush – The Village of Ruidoso put up \$30,000 cash match which demonstrates confidence.

-Bird – Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for additional collaboration.

-Gomez – The results of the technical approach listed in the proposal have a long term benefits to various entities.

-Gomez – The project implements a CWPP.

-Berrens – Proposal has potential for sustaining restoration efforts post project within the watershed. It incorporates current environmental economic information, e.g. calibrating the willingness to pay function with varying ecosystem service levels.

-Dunn – The proponent has extensive experience in the proposed activities. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities on Forest Service, tribal and municipal forest land.

Weaknesses:

None.

Recommendations:

-Cooper – The connection between the project and ENMU Natural Resources Program could be better described.

-Berrens – Proponent should ensure that surveys either 1) meet the US Office of Management and Budget Guidelines or 2) do not use Federal dollars.

Administrative Observations:

-Budget does not show calculations for travel or supplies.

-Parametric should be identified as lead technical collaborator.

Discussion:

-Dunn – This project has developed a lot of interest from the Governor’s Office.

-Dunn – Given the nature of this proposal, it is hard for me to see what the youth component would be. San Gil – There is a trend for funding projects that have a youth component. There is language in the Act, but it does not hold every proposal to a standard of having a youth component. It is obviously good to have a youth component but it is not a requirement. If it is not there, it does not mean it is not eligible for funding. The wording says, “Where appropriate”. We may need to go back and look at the others for consistency.

-Archuleta – Have concerns about consistency. Some have had a youth component but we determined it to be vague and a weakness. We may need to re-evaluate since it is not a requirement.

-Dunn – The language says “including summer youth jobs, programs such as YCC where appropriate”.

-Marosy – Rather than noting it as a weakness, maybe where the youth component is there, it should be a strength.

-Burnett – If there is a proposal that does not have a well thought out youth component, and then maybe that should be a weakness.

-Dunn – If there is a youth component, then it should be clearly defined and have detail.

-Watson – Says the Project will build on the excellent work that was done for the City of Santa Fe. What was this work? Proponent – This project is similar to the watershed project we did for the City of Santa Fe.

Watson proposes Category 1

Evaluation Category: 1

CFRP 18-10 – Integrating Woody Biomass with Solar Thermal and Photovoltaic Energy Systems

10:14 a.m. Berrens introduced the proposal.

This proposal seeks to design, purchase, install and evaluate the performance of solid wood boiler systems integrated with solar thermal photovoltaic in heat and

power systems for institutional and residential scale applications, improve the utilization of pinon pine as a fuel wood, establish a trained crew of biomass/solar energy technicians to support increasing the use of “alternative” energy in small sale commercial and residential applications. An estimated three jobs will be directly supported by this project. Education and outreach will include field trips for local high school students, the SW New Mexico Homebuilder’s Association, and the general public with a focus on demonstrating the “green” process of acquiring local raw material from restoration projects and integration with solar systems for use in institutional and residential settings.

Strengths:

-Berrens – Creative plan to evaluate feasibility of available technology on boiler mass boilers to commercial and residential scales.

-Berrens- Advance focus of BTU content of firewood (as opposed to volume or weight) for extending market demand.

Weaknesses:

-Berrens – The breadth of collaboration and feasibility/monitoring component could be strengthened. Entities such as Forest Products Lab, town of Silver City, and SW New Mexico Home Builders Association have been discussed but have not been actively incorporated into the collaboration. Berrens – They have not gone out and built the collaboration prior.

-Dunn-There was not letter of endorsement from the relevant land management agency. Bird – Reading the RFA, it does say that a letter of endorsement needs to be included. The letter must indicate that the land manager collaborated and does support the project.

-Bird – The letter from the District Ranger, that was read as public comment yesterday, does not demonstrate collaboration with the Agency.

-Cooper – The wood supply is not described in the proposal.

-Melendez – There is a clear conflict of interest included in the proposal in that Gila Woodnet is a non-profit and Gordon West is on the board of Gila Woodnet and the boiler would be installed in Mr. West’s private residence.

-Melendez – The benefit to the public of installing a boiler in a for-profit hotel and a private residence is questionable.

-Gomez – No indication in the proposal that there were letters sent to the tribe.

Recommendations:

-Berrens – Monitoring plan should include consideration of demonstration of proposed product.

-Berrens – Strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised application next year.

Administrative Observations:

-Non-Federal Match over 20%.

-No explanation of costs for “fully loaded with taxes, benefits and workers compensation.

- Provide explanation of “technology exchange travel” costs.
- Several items in equipment should be supplies,
- No explanation why boiler is best type for project.
- New hydronic heating system is placed in collaborator’s private residence.

Discussion:

-Cooke – This project asks for putting CFRP money into private property, with the boiler. Is that appropriate? Dunn – We have never seen a proposal like this. We have done something similar to this on tribal land and in public schools. You can’t do treatments on private land but you can put processing equipment on private land. The boiler would be similar to processing equipment.

-Matush – Residential re-fit appears to be about \$20,000. Is there anything that you can do to make this type of technology more affordable for private residents? Proponent – That is the goal of this project. Plenty of people sell wood stoves, but nothing similar to this. We will have this set up and will be open to the public for touring.

-Matush – Does any portion of the projects occur on forest land? Proponent – No, there is no collaboration directly with the Forest Service. There are 3 forest sources identified.

-San Gil – There appears to be a conflict of interest with Mr. Gordon West. Under 7 CFR 3019.42 Codes of Conduct that address a Conflict of Interest.

-Melendez – To install a boiler in a private residence, the agency will not enter into any relationship if there is a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest. It must be avoided at ALL times. It does not appear that this will benefit the public.

-Payne – We have put out demonstration projects to private entities to show that it can be done. I do not think this is a conflict of interest.

-Melendez – Maybe this should be funded under a different program. This is not for the public good.

-Berrens proposes Category 3 Need to build more collaboration. Matush – Need to drop this Proposal because of Conflict of Interest. Burnett – Proposes 4. Berrens – I could live with a 4 but I would hope they would work on the Proposal and re-submit. Pohlman – Propose Category 3 because of no endorsement from the Forest Service Line Officer. If we cleared up the subject of ethics and conduct, I don’t think there are things that would make the project fail. I can support a Category 4.

Evaluation Category: 4

CFRP 19-10 – The Wellness Coalition’s/Youth Conservation Corps’s Forest Restoration, Community Education, Member Development and the Forest as a “Learning Laboratory” Project.

11:14 p.m. Cooper recues herself and leaves the room.

11:15 a.m. Bird introduced the proposal.

The Wellness Coalition will lead a community collaboration to manage and monitor a YCC engaged in forest restoration, community outreach and member development. The project will reduce fuel loads by hand thinning 200 acres of mixed conifer in the Signal Peak area of Silver City Ranger District. YCC will engage in significant community education and outreach programming each year with 200 elementary and middle school students in the Silver City and Cobre Consolidated School Districts. Over a three-year period, it will hire, train and certify 15-25 YCC members.

Strengths:

- Pohlman – 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 13, 17, 19
- Bird – The project includes a good youth component including fire training and certification.
- Olivas – The project builds on past CFRP projects. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
- Dunn – There is a comprehensive description of the training for Corps Members on Page 6. The description of project challenges on page 5 is insightful.
- Gomez – Budget specifies detail unit costs. The project will create new jobs.
- Watson – The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.

Weaknesses:

- Archuleta – The monitoring plan does not measure indicators related to utilization and value of small diameter, productivity of the woodshop.
- Gomez – The proposal and budget do not address anticipated program income, page 6 of the narrative states that the proponent will be selling firewood.
- Burnett – The application does not answer all of the questions proposed in the RFA related to monitoring. E.g. existing and desired conditions are not adequately described.
- Cooke – There is a conflict between the utilization and the monitored project objectives. (Leaving 70% of the material on the ground does not reduce the hazardous fuels.)

Recommendations:

- Cooke – Use size classes instead of description terms like small, medium and large trees.
- Olivas – Add names of species identified as threatened and endangered.
- Matush – The proponent should ensure that trained individuals will do the actual measurements in the field.
- Matush – Define the monitoring protocol used to identify the existing ecological condition.
- Cooke – Project area does not have definitive description of densities or volumes.
- Burnett – The proponent is encouraged to use a table to clearly describe the existing condition, desired conditions and the indicator to be measured.

-Olivas – If the Low Income Heating and Assistance Program generates income that should be addressed.

Administrative Observations:

- No cost comparison between the purchases of used vehicle and rental vehicle.
- Costs of monitoring and classroom supplies seem excessive.
- Donna Stevens daily rate is confusing - \$240 or \$320?
- There is not a letter from NM State Forestry.
- Other category includes items that should be moved to supplies and personnel.
- Construction amount in 424 – move to item “h” other.
- Verify that any corrective actions as a result of recent OIG audit are addressed.
- Clarify program income. Page 6 of narrative states that the proponent will be selling firewood. If Low Income Heating and Generating Assistance Program generates income, that should be addressed.

Discussion:

- Bird – In the form 424-A Budget Information, there is an entry for construction that is not allowed by this program. Proponent – Should not be there, should actually be below in “other” Item H.
- Bird – Could not locate a letter of commitment from the volunteerism group. Proponent – They manage our AmeriCorps Grant so they are inter-woven into our daily activities.
- Olivas – Did anyone see a listing of the TES species in the proposal? Pohlman – it is listed in the NEPA documentation in the back of the proposal.
- Dunn – In past Panels we have struggled with how much information we need/have on existing current conditions.
- Matush – There is no indication as to who will do the actual measurements in the field. Burnett – On page 8 it says it will be done by Donna Stevens. Matush – If Donna is the expert, she needs to be doing the measurements. The kids need to be properly trained to measure and record the data. Matush – I guess the wording should be, “it’s not clear that trained individuals” will be doing the actual measurements in the field and collecting the data. Dunn – There is a letter from Donna Stevens in the appendix where she describes her qualifications.
- Pohlman – I feel it clearly shows who is going to be doing the measurement and data collection. It clearly shows how the Corps will be trained.
- Gomez – If you are going to be selling firewood, do you have to estimate the anticipated income? Yes
- Cooke – The proponent discusses ponderosa pine and mixed conifer but they are not consistent throughout the document and the monitoring plan. They also talk about reducing fire hazard but are planning on leaving 70% of the material on the ground.
- Burnett – On page 8, there is a list of parties who would be involved in training, but I did not see a letter of support from New Mexico State Forestry.

-Fisher – The proponent has several existing agreements, verify no stockpiling of supplies. Proponent – Many of the items on the agreements are consumable items (eg. gloves). That is why you see them on many of the agreements. Several of the existing agreements are coming to a close. The date is 9/2011 but the work will be completed prior to that.

-Olivas – On the utilization on page 6, it says in addition, they will distribute firewood to low income families. Will this generate income? Proponent – Yes, it does, but it is not significant.

Bird proposes category 1, Burnett proposes category 2 because of the monitoring. Matush – proposes category 2

Evaluation Category: 2

12:19 p.m. **Public Comment Period**

No comments received.

CFRP 20-10 – Zerosion – An Engineered Composite Biomass Erosion Control Material “Demonstration Site Development of Zerosion Using Low Value Biomass”

1:33 p.m. Cooper returns.

1:33 p.m. Matush recuses himself and leaves the room.

1:34 p.m. Burnett introduced the proposal.

Restoration Technologies has developed a cement bound erosion control material, called Zerosion, which creates a permeable protective barrier against wind and water erosion. Zerosion is formulated with low value biomass generated from restoration thinning practices. The project will use restoration thinning residuals to complete seven demonstration erosion control site applications using Zerosion. The project will employ the aggregated equivalent of four full-time jobs. Education and outreach will be done using the trunk presentations by local educators. The Zerosion project combines fuels reduction with soil and water quality improvement.

Strengths:

-Bird – 3, 4, 7, 12, 17, 25

-Dunn – Leverages a Small Business Innovation Research Grant. The proposed project would be an activity this is new and adds value to CFRP.

-Burnett – The proposal has a detailed monitoring plan with indicators and how they will be measured.

-Cooper – Detail on treatment is provided in the letter from Summit Technical. The proponent partners with local businesses.

-Gomez – 1

Weaknesses:

-Burnett – The budget narrative does not clearly justify costs such as personnel and travel and treatment. Federal \$117,000 for personnel costs. This seems

excessive for the explanation provided. Cooper – It is unclear that the costs for the total project are justified.

-Cooper – The application does not fully explain the treatment design. Dunn – Really what they are doing is testing a product, like a research product. Cooper – I don't see any comparison between competitive products.

Recommendations:

-Burnett – Maps could provide more detail about treatment of demonstration sites.

-Cooper – It would be useful to determine how Zerosion will compare to other soil erosion reduction technologies.

-Cooper – The demonstration treatment site plan is not provided.

Administrative Observations:

-No explanation of costs for “fully loaded with taxes, benefits, and workers benefits” compensation.

-Provide explanation of “Technology Exchange Travel” costs.

-No cost comparison between the purchases of used vehicle and rental vehicle.

-No explanation of condition of material transfer trailer. Is \$53,000 current market value?

-Need more description of unit costs (Soil moisture Units).

-GCEC amount in budget does not match amount in Commitment Letter.

-Lack of computations for travel, how many days at Santa Fe Hotel.

-Truck maintenance is other, not supplies.

-7 CFR 3019.2 a subcontract under an award is not allowed if there is a conflict of interest involved.

-Label of Year 1 budget is identified twice.

-Personnel year 3 budget computations are off for Gordon West and Z. Brooks.

-Gomez --Personnel year 3 budget computations are off for Gordon West and Z. Brooks. Bird – If it is just these few items, which are actually bringing them under budget, is this really a weakness. San Gil – More appropriate for it to be in administrative observations. Berrens – Descriptions of the computations do not match the budget figures.

Discussion:

-Olivas – On page 3, why is the NM Dept. of Transportation not a partner in this proposal? Proponent – Have had discussions with the Department of Transportation. Our access through the Dept. of Transportation would be with contractors.

-Burnett – They plan to buy a trailer but rent a truck over the life of the project. Under the budget, supplies, there is a line item at the bottom, parts for truck and trailer modification, that is over \$5,000 total, should that go under equipment?

Melendez – No, it is correct. Burnett – Is there an issue that they are buying parts to upgrade a truck that they don't own, but are renting?

-Burnett – What is Technology Exchange Travel? Proponent – It is for bringing this item to other areas.

-Cooper – Leasing or renting equipment from Santa Clara Woodworks is alright, is that correct? Proponent – There is match and charge from the grant proposal that describes this. Cooper – Was this equipment purchased with CFRP funds in the past? Proponent – No.

-Archuleta – The NEPA will be done, but is not clear. The activities will occur on Forest Land, won't this hold up the project? Proponent – Status of NEPA - will hopefully be a Cat Ex. Which will not be appealable. Archuleta – Why has this not been done yet? Proponent – just have not signed a decision yet because of timeframes and other projects.

Burnett proposes category 3 because the weaknesses would need to be addressed before the project can be recommended for funding, e.g. existing vegetation, application depth of Zerosion, area of application. Berrens – I was a Category 3 on this because it is very hard to figure costs. Bird – Category 2.

Evaluation Category: 3

CFRP 21-10 – Collaborative Landscape NEPA Analysis for Forest Restoration in the Upper Mimbres Watershed.

2:30 p.m. Cooper recues herself and leaves the room.

2:31 p.m. Matush returns.

2:34 p.m. Dick Cooke introduced the proposal.

The Nature Conservancy is requesting funds to complete NEPA analysis for 68,000 acres of forest restoration activities in the Upper Mimbres Watershed. A completed EA under the HFRA would enable prescribed burning and thinning projects that would create stand structures that could support an appropriate fire regime and improve wildlife habitat on public lands managed by the USFS. A minimum of four jobs will be created for contractors. Aldo Leopold Charger High School students (14) will collect monitoring data and elementary school students (60) will be taught ecological concepts. Grant County Wellness Coalition forest restoration and trial crew members (30) and Aldo Leopold students (30) will be introduced to careers in natural resources through a diverse panel of professionals.

Strengths:

-Bird - 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 22, 24, 32

Weaknesses:

-Fisher -- Grant County, National Turkey Federation and the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation were listed as collaborators on Page 5 but did not provide letters of support.

Recommendations:

-Cooke – Given the number of sensitive and wildlife species, time allocated by the Resource Biologist seems inadequate.

-Archuleta – Identify deliverables that will be accomplished with the 70 hours listed in the budget as Biologist. 70 hours appears inadequate for both surveys and the completion of the report.

Administrative Observations:

-Match wrong on 424.

-Clarify the basis for the \$200/day stipend for 7 people.

-Cost for Cliff High School students (20) students not allowable field trip.

-Aldo Leopold High School – no justification for students being paid \$1,200.

-Budget calculations are incorrect on Page 2, Ecologist.

-Conservation by Design lacks detail – there is not a breakdown either in the letter of support.

Discussion:

-Cooke - In this proposal, there is a monitoring over-flight over the NEPA area. This is a contributed cost of \$2,500. Is this a legitimate expense? Melendez – It is their non-federal match. Matush – Can they meet their match without this flight? Berrens – Yes, they could. Proponent – A lot of this is in a Wilderness Area where we have had fires and we would like to get current conditions to help with the NEPA process. The Nature Conservancy is paying for the flights, not the Agency.

-Olivas – Should NEPA be done on a Wilderness Area? Proponent – In this area there are a lot of acres that have not burned. Doing treatments in strategic areas, the goal is to save certain areas. While analyzing, they would prefer to analyze a larger area. No NEPA will be done in the Wilderness.

-Archuleta – There is no mention of the existing socioeconomic conditions or proposals to address the socioeconomic conditions in the monitoring and evaluation plan. Dunn – I don't know how you would measure this. Archuleta – I understand that argument but I feel socioeconomic conditions need to be at the forefront.

-Burnett – The endorsement letter from the District Ranger does not specifically state they will endorse the commitments outlined on Page 4. Proponent – The District will participate in and does endorse those commitments.

Matush – I feel it is excessive for the Aldo Leopold Students to go across the state to look at another CFRP project. Why can't they look at a CFRP project in this area? Dunn – It is reasonable for them to look at any CFRP project they wish to.

-Cooke – Given the number of sensitive species in the project, 70 hours of allocated time by a Biologist does not seem adequate. Proponent – All of the packs of Spotted Owl have been identified, they are just going in to verify. I feel 70 hours is reasonable. Burnett – I agree with Cooke, it takes time just to coordinate the data. Will a BA be written as part of this grant? Proponent – I

think the 70 hours was to write the BA and coordinate with the Fish & Wildlife. Watson – There are other collaborators who will be obtaining some of the information. Bird – It states that wildlife information will be collected by several partners. It looks to me like Conservation by Design could be doing the BA. Cooke – In the context of what the District says, it says in the document that priorities changed and that's why the BA was not done. Dunn – The Forest Supervisor's Representative has given strong support.

Cooke proposes category 2

Evaluation Category: 2

CFRP 22-10 – Non-Native Phreatophyte Gasification Feasibility

4:02 p.m. Cooper returns.

4:02 p.m. Cooper introduced the proposal.

This project will continue the work done through the 2003 CFRP grand and reduce the threat of high intensity wildfires and the negative effects of excessive competition between trees in an urban interface area by removing invasive, non-native Phreatophyte and then planting native vegetation along a 3 mile stretch of the Rio Grande Corridor. Five tons of harvested material (mainly salt cedar) will be chipped and sent to Community Power Corporation. This will be the world's first conversion of an invasive species to electricity in a distributed generation biopower system. There will be 8-10 jobs created.

Strengths:

- Gomez – 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26
- Cooper – 33
- Pohlman – 28

Weaknesses:

- Cooper – The letter from Hot Springs High School does not commit to the specific in-kind contribution.
- Berrens – A letter from CPC does not commit to the contracted feasibility analysis as described in the text and commit to the distribution of the information to the public.

Recommendations:

- Cooper – Would like more detail about the specifics of the methods, source of the planting stock in the narrative.
- Burnett – CFRP core indicators are not included in the monitoring plan.

Archuleta – Are we consistent when we are talking about the core indicators? Does it make sense in a riparian restoration? Dunn – The RFA is pretty specific that they have to have the core indicators. Archuleta – Suggestion to have separate indicators for riparian restoration. Dunn – On page 9 of the Work Plan it shows they established protocol using the monitor handbook to develop goals and the core indicators are described in that handbook. Burnett – They should monitor all core indicators referenced in the RFA, including the mortality and

survival of all species planted. This can be found in the referenced monitoring handbook.

-Cooper – The proposal would be strengthened by removal of the value of the firewood from the text because it is confusing.

Administrative Observations:

-Applicant used outdated version of SF-424.

-Budget states 30 acres to be treated, on page 7 it states 35 acres of proposed acres are NEPA ready.

-One of the cost items are in the wrong category, e.g. the project coordinator will be hired as a contractor.

-If you are including fringe benefits they should be listed separately in Part B of the budget, not lumped together with salary rates.

-In other costs, there is office space.

Discussion:

-Matush – Can you tell me about the gas clean-up system? Jerry – The system they have is passing all of the gas clean-up requirements.

Olivas – There is a difference in acres. Proponent – We have 35 NEPA ready acres.

-Melendez – Should the office space be under indirect? Proponent – Yes.

-Walters – What kind of herbicides are you using in your treatments? Proponents – It will be Habitat. Walters – What type of mechanical treatment are you doing? Proponent – Just a chainsaw.

Cooper proposes category 2.

Evaluation Category: 2

CFRP 23-10 – Creating and Expanding Markets for Traditionally Non-commercial Material Sustainably Harvested from a Forest Restoration Project.

4:45 p.m. Fisher introduced the proposal.

This project will treat approximately 217 acres in the area of the Burro Mountain Homestead, Silver City Ranger District. BMH is an historic lodge built in 1914 by Colonel Robert Munro-Ferguson. The property has been converted to an R.V. Park. Strain Firewood will hire up to 5 new employees to hand-thin small diameter trees to meet the fuel reduction prescription. Employees will receive safety training and certification on an annual basis from New Mexico Forest Industry Association. Eight students from Aldo Leopold High School will be trained in the development and implementation of a monitoring plan specific to this project. The Wellness Coalition YCC member will dedicate a six person crew for 2 weeks each year to this project.

Strengths:

-Berrens – Project donates 10% of the firewood to low income families.

-Cooper – 1, 6, 10, 17

-Dunn – 22

-Fisher – 3, 4, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 29, 31, 33

-Cooke – Proposal identifies new potential products that could add value to small diameter trees.

-Gomez – Project history sequence of events as written is informative.

Weaknesses:

-Cooper – The permittees are listed as collaborators in the table, but there is no letter from them.

Recommendations:

-Matush – The proponent should ensure that trained individuals will do the actual measurements in the field and specify what the budget for monitoring supplies will include.

Administrative Observations:

-The CPA and Gila Tree Thinners are listed as other costs and should be contractors.

-The budget summary did not have computations, but the yearly budget has them.

-Verify the salary rate for Donna Stevens, a teacher at Aldo Leopold.

-If program income is generated, it should be identified in the budget.

Discussion:

-Fisher – How many days a week do you plan to work? Proponent – 3-4 days per week

-Matush – What is the \$500/\$700 items listed for Aldo Leopold High School? Proponent – Monitoring supplies.

-Fisher – What will the Gila Tree Thinners be doing exactly? Proponent – Their role will be doing the mulching. They will be using their own people to do the mulching. We are collaborating with them.

Fisher proposes category 2.

Evaluation Category: 2

CFRP 24-10 – Sheep Basin Revisited: Demonstrating the Benefits of Government Investment in Infrastructure

5:15 p.m. Gomez introduced the Proposal.

The Sheep Basin Forest Restoration project will demonstrate the benefits of prior Federal government investment in infrastructure at the Reserve Sawmill in Catron County, NM. Kellar Logging, Inc. will implement forest restoration and harvest on approximately 732 acres of primarily ponderosa pine on the Sheep Basin Project Area of the Reserve Ranger District. Benefits will include reduction of cost of treatment per acre by a minimum of 40%, made possible by

the increased capacity of the sawmill to process greater volume and smaller diameter. This will retain an estimated 11 new equipment operation jobs at the mill, introduction of skills appropriate to forestry related careers at Reserve High School through a special curriculum developed for this purpose. Students will also work with the Catron County Citizens Group in the monitoring and evaluation of this project and related, prior Sheep Basin projects delivered to the Reserve Sawmill.

Strengths:

- Pohlman – 1, 2, 3, 6, 10, 16, 17, 18
- Gomez – 4, 7, 8, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 33
- Bird - #4 – Revised – The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to roles and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
- Cooke – The proponent has a track record of successful completion of CFRP projects.
- Berrens – Project represents significant per acre reduction in forest treatment costs.

Weaknesses:

None.

Recommendations:

- Burnett – Proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activities to account for wildlife needs.
- Archuleta – The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.
- Gomez – To better identify the location of project area, should include a map with township and range and section.
- Gomez – Identify the 732 acres to be treated on the map.
- Gomez – In the body of the proposal, explain what the maps are identifying.

Administrative Observations:

- Verify formula used to calculate fringe benefits costs.
- Move equipment to supplies or other.
- \$4500 unit per year cost needs a calculation.
- Contracting costs should be moved to personnel.
- Equipment mobilization needs detail.

Discussion:

- Burnett – In the work plan it looks like you are only planning to treat 3 months out of the year. Proponent – With our equipment we can complete it in that amount of time.

-Olivas – Under the RFA we are looking at protecting large and old trees. Looks like you are planning to remove large trees. Proponent – The reason is that under the prescription it is to meet Goshawk openings. Pohlman – It does talk about this in the NEPA and looks like it is a minimum amount.

-Melendez – Who is doing the work? Proponent – Employees. Melendez – Employees should be listed in labor costs.

Gomez proposes category 1.

Evaluation Category: 1

CFRP 25-10 – Advanced Manufacturing of Flooring from Small Diameter Timber

5:51 p.m.

Matush introduced the proposal.

Building on a successful outcome from our 2007 CFRP grant, Old Wood LLC seeks to capture and expand markets for flooring from small diameter timber. The introduction of faster raw material handling coupled with advances in mechanized transfer, handling, and treatment of our various products; will allow us to grow at a pace appropriate to forest conditions and material availability. The requested funding will help guard ecosystems, save large trees, and maintain and create as many as 20 new jobs.

Strengths:

-Polhman – 2, 3, 12, 15, 20, 22, 29, 33

-Gomez – 23, 24

-Gomez – Change #23 – Good work plan.

-Cooper – Safety program is strong and on-going.

Weaknesses:

-Burnett – The proposal presents a vague monitoring plan. Ecological monitoring is mentioned but does not seem applicable to this proposal. Watson – Three institutes are listed who will assist in monitoring. (NFWFRI, Forest Guild, Lloyd Irland, Las Vegas Peace and Justice Center) are mentioned to monitor social and ecological impacts but they do not say what they are going to measure or how they will coordinate activities.

-Berrens – The letter of support from Dr. Irland does not confirm the role for himself and the Yale students as described in the work plan.

Recommendations:

-Berrens – The proponent may want to add New Mexico installers in future collaborations.

-Cooper – Monitoring methods and multiparty monitoring component could be better described. Burnett – I feel this is vague and should be a weakness.

-Burnett – The proposal would be strengthened by commitment or support letter from each area identified in the map similar to the Alamo Navajo commitment letter.

Administrative Observations:

- Computations (unit costs) not shown in budget.
- Who will administer the agreement?
- Provide detail for travel for Dr. Irland.
- Forest Guild should be listed as a sub-recipient
- Where Yale University is mentioned in the budget it should be Irland Consulting Group.

Discussion:

- Berrens – Do you work with certified installers? Proponent – Yes. We are just a manufacturer and do not do installs.
 - Proponent – Three students, one from Yale are actually at the mill site now.
- Matush proposes category 2

Evaluation Category: 2

CFRP 27-10 – Developing Reference Conditions for Jemez Mixed conifer Forests and habitat for the Jemez Mountain Salamander.

6:23 p.m. Cooper recuses herself and leaves the room.

6:23 p.m. Pohlman introduced the proposal.

This project is located on lands of the Santa Fe National Forest and the Valles Caldera Trust in the Jemez Mountains. The project objectives are to develop fire histories and stand reconstructions that will inform mixed conifer forest reference conditions for restoration in the Jemez Mountains, relate fire histories and stand reconstructions specifically to historic Jemez Mountain Salamander habitat, survey a variety of historic Jemez Mountain Salamander sites, including burned, and if available thinned areas to determine salamander persistence and environmental tolerances. Seven Jemez Pueblo crew, 3 NMFWRP technicians, 1 UA research associate and 3 UA student technicians will be employed part time during the project.

Strengths:

- Bird -1, 3, 7, 12, 16
- Bird – The proposal monitoring considers novel indicator species that will be absolutely crucial to the reintroduction of fire to the Jemez Mountains.
- Pohlman – The project includes a good youth component in that it trains youth to perform some fairly intricate surveys.
- Burnett – 21, 22, 24, 26
- Burnett – Good budget detail and work plan. There is a very good description of the need for this project described on page 2.
- Gomez – 4, 29
- Cooke – The project may lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.

-Dunn – As highlighted in the Forest Service letter of endorsement, this project would be an important element of the successful implementation of the current collaborative forest landscape restoration program application.

-Berrens – With respect to an endangered and sensitive species issue and the reintroduction of fire, the project represents a unique collaboration between multiple land management agencies, land regulatory agencies, state agencies, Pueblo and an academic institute. -Berrens – This is not research but collaboration to enhance restoration and makes it an appropriate fit for the CFRP.

Weaknesses:

None.

Recommendations:

-Gomez – The map should include the various neighboring landowners that might benefit from the data collected.

-Gomez – The letter to the tribes is outlined, but no list of tribes is provided.

Administrative Observations:

-Non-federal match exceeds 20%.

-Travel costs for crews – if they are contractual move to contractual.

-Copy of letter to affected tribes does not include list of which tribes were sent the letter.

-RO needs to verify the authority of appropriated dollars to support activities described.

-Provide a list of tribes in addition to Jemez who received the letter.

Discussion:

-Matush – Where else does the Jemez Mountain Salamander live? Proponent – Nowhere but the Jemez Mountain. Burnett – This is a very large, contiguous area that is in desperate need of treatment. Matush – This seems more applicable to a Fish & Wildlife grant. Dunn – It is more of a research project. You are asking is this project a good match with the CFRP? Matush – Right. Pohlman – The research is critical to be making decisions that allow prescriptions to be written for prescribed fire. The information gained will be helpful all over the state. Bird – There is a large effort underway to do restoration in the Jemez Mountains. It has a significant investment from many partners to do work in the area. This project is a part of that work. Payne – I don't think it is a research project, in my opinion it is gather data that will move the treatment of restoration efforts forward.

Pohlman proposes category 1.

Evaluation Category: 1

CFRP 28-10 – Las Vegas (Gillinas) Municipal Watershed WUI Fuels Reduction Project

7:02 p.m. Cooper returns

7:00 p.m. Fisher introduced the proposal.

Griegos Logging LLC proposes a project in El Porvenir area of the Gallinas Watershed that seeks to ecologically restore 270 acres of ponderosa pine and mixed conifer overstocked dense forested land over a three year period. These treatments will be accomplished through the use of hand crews on slopes in excess of 30 percent and mechanically using a Hydroaxe and Valment in areas with slopes of less than 30 percent. This project will create a market for vigas, latillas, flooring and firewood from materials harvested resulting from the planned treatments. Natural resources related education, specialty equipment demonstrations and outreach will be provided to approximately 15 local forest product and forest restoration businesses and forest managers, 60 High School students and 45 College students during the three year grant period.

Strengths:

- Fisher – 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 17, 18, 22, 20, 27, 29
- Olivas – 8, 15
- Cooper – 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 28
- Cooper – The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the New Mexico Communities at Risk List and with a critical municipal water source.
- Bird – The scientific basis in the proposal is well supported and referenced.
- Cooke – The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments and other grant accomplishments and partnerships with business.
- Olivas – In the proposal there will be a training demonstration of purchased equipment to partners and interested parties. Dunn – This is new and adds value to CFPR.
- Fisher – Have a letter from the Santa Fe National forest stating they will participate in multiparty monitoring
- Gomez – Project history sequence of events as written is informative.
- Dunn – The monitoring plan table clearly describes future conditions, targets, and sample measurements.
- Dunn – A business plan is in place and describes plans for a revision with assistance from Luna Community College.
- Cooke – The proposal has a chart that crosswalks RFA purposes and objectives to proposal objectives.
- Fisher – Proposal includes yearly attendance of forest worker safety certification.
- Watson – In the monitoring and evaluation plan on page 9, it states that specific wildlife mitigation will be adhered to and monitored for this proposal.

Weaknesses:

None.

Recommendations:

-Cooper – The program income mentioned on Page 6 should be clarified.

Administrative Observations:

-Inconsistencies in the project acres. Page 1 states 270 acres, the map shows 271 and the letter to the tribes shows 300 acres.

-Page 2 of the budget, under telephone, says the total is \$469 but the computation shows \$704.

-Adalente RC&D should be listed as a sub-recipient instead of a contractor.

Discussion:

-Fisher – Do you currently have a CFRP grant? Proponent – No. Fisher – There are areas in the proposal that talk about your prescription. You will not complete this until all of the collaborators get together to put together a monitoring plan. Is that correct? Proponent - Yes

Fisher proposes category 1.

Evaluation Category: 1

7:23 p.m. **Public Comment Period**

None.

7:23 p.m. Melissa Marosy reviews the agenda for Thursday, July 22, 2010.

7:28 p.m. Meeting adjourned.

Thursday, July 22, 2010

Panel:

Mike Matush
Timothy Pohlman
Danny Gomez
Ann Watson
Robert Berrens, PhD
Bryan Bird
John Olivas
Martha S. Cooper
Dick Cooke
Shaun Criston Fisher
Candido Arturo Archuleta
Coleman Burnett
Walter Dunn – Chairman

USFS Staff:

Walter Dunn
Melissa Marossy
Alicia San Gil
Jerry Payne
Carmen Melendez
Monica Martinez

Facilitator: Melissa Marosy

Meeting Minutes: Allison Lundin

Members of the Public in Attendance:

Walt Strain
Dave Warnack
Gabriel Partido
Greg Gallegos
Dennis Truillo
Mariana Padilla
Ellis Margolis
Bill Armstrong
Gilbert Vigil
Carmen Austin
Fabian Montano

8:30 a.m. Melissa Marosy reviews the agenda for the day.

CFRP 29-10 – Box Canyon Grassland and Wildlife Restoration

8:33 a.m. Matush introduced the Proposal.

The proposed project will restore 200 acres of desert grassland with trees and reduce the risk of intense wildfire on the 419 acre Box Canyon site. Existing

high density pinon juniper woodland will be restored to desert grassland with less than 5% tree canopy coverage and a mosaic of native grasses, forbs and shrubs. Two grassland wildlife species important to the Tesuque tribe, greater roadrunner and scaled quail will be enhanced or reintroduced. Tribal and local residents will be employed and trained to implement the proposed work plan and achieve proposed activities. Education and outreach efforts will be targeted at diverse stakeholder groups from grade school age children to local residents to natural resources professionals.

Strengths:

- Gomez – 3, 4, 7, 8, 12, 13, 15, 17, 21, 22, 24, 33
- Gomez – The project includes a good youth component. Tesuque Pueblo students, Santo Fe Indian School and NMSU students are included in monitoring and evaluation.
- Cooper – 28
- Watson – Project is addresses improving habitat for important tribal hunting species for the tribe.
- Bird – The proposal monitoring goes beyond the cored CFRP ecological indicators to include culturally and biologically important wildlife.
- Berrens – Project includes Firewise outreach efforts to adjacent efforts.
- Berrens – Project distributes firewood for winter heating to tribal communities.
- Burnett – The project demonstrates a strong collaboration among three Pueblos which will share lessons learned related to wildlife reintroductions and forest restoration treatments.
- Melendez – Good budget detail and/or work plan.
- Cooke – Commitment to the proposal is supported by the acquisition of additional funds to expand the proposal.

Weaknesses:

- Cooper – Letters of support from all partners are not included in the proposal (Santa Clara Pueblo)
- Burnett – Despite significant outreach, education and training objectives, the project does not include a socio-economic component in either the goals or the monitoring plan.
- Dunn – The project title does not adequately describe what will be accomplished.

Recommendations:

- Archuleta – Include letter from Tesuque Education Department.
- Gomez – Better identify the location of the project area, include township, range and section.
- Dunn - -The proponent should clarify that the object is forest restoration rather than restoring desert grasslands.

(Dunn -This is not a CFRP objective. Cooke – It says they’re going to plant shrubs to restore the habitat. Dunn – The thing that got my attention was the strong reference towards enhancing native greater roadrunner populations. Do not think of this as a CFRP object. The core of the CFRP is restoration for the purpose of reducing catastrophic fire to communities. Jerry – This is land management in both aspects. They are saying desert instead of forest. Archuleta – I think that you have projects that cross multiple areas and if the project meets some of the objectives in their proposal, how can you judge the project if it has anything else. Dunn – How does this directly address the core objectives? Archuleta – It talks about restoring ecosystems. It hits all of the topics and it talks about them. There are only 4 clear objectives in the CFRP. Dunn – Is the core of the project really to support core objectives of the CFRP? Cooper – Existing and desired conditions are confusing. Recommendation: Pinon juniper restoration objectives could be better addressed in the proposal and historical pinon juniper conditions could be better described and justified. Watson – I do know there are specific objectives for the program. Maybe we should recommend to proponents that the objectives first and foremost need to address the objectives of the CFRP. It says “grasslands” right in the title of the proposal. Gomez – I think this proposal hits on reducing wildland fire threat. Pohlman – Have they addressed Task 6 on Page 6? This addresses tree reduction. I think the primary objectives are confusing but I think their intent does speak to CFRP. I would prefer their primary objectives include more of what they have listed on Page 6.)

-Payne – Collaboration Forest Restoration objectives should be better addressed.

-Burnett – We strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised proposal next year with the recommendations and weaknesses addressed.

Administrative Observations:

-NEPA compliance is not complete, but is planned to be completed in Year 1.

-Indirect cost rate expired so need to verify current rate.

-Proposed start and end date needs to be filled out in 424.

Discussion:

Dunn – Clarification on the NEPA. Proponent – We have an existing EA that we plan to do a Cat Ex off of.

-Gomez – Is this in a riparian area? Proponent – No.

-Gomez – I think the Biologist has the BA on his list to work on, is this priority? Proponent – Yes. Proponent – we don’t expect anything from the BA or cultural to hold this project up.

-Melendez – The proposed start and end date on the 424 needs to be filled out. The indirect cost rate is 2007 so this needs to be updated. Proponent - OK

-Archuleta – Do you think your project meets the objectives of the CFRP? Proponent –Yes, we do involve the community in a CWPP. We are knocking back the p-j. This will decrease probability of severe wildfire.

Matush proposes category 3. Archuleta – I think it should be category 2. Cooper – I think we need to think about the amount of time spent on the review of the proposal and we spent considerable time on this one trying to figure it out. Matush – I agree with Archuleta and would like to change my proposal to category 2. Watson – I would propose 3. Cooper – I would propose 3. Berrens – I would propose 2. Bird – Proposes category 2. Cooke – Proposes category 3. Olivias – Proposes category 2. Gomez proposes category 2. Burnett – Proposes category 3.

Evaluation Category: 3

CFRP 30-10 – Engaging Communities in Wildfire Prevention (E-CWP) – Reducing Fire Risk & Improving Forest Health in the Santa Fe County Wildland Urban Interface

9:32 a.m. Bird recuses himself and leaves the room.

9:39 a.m. Burnett introduced the proposal.

Engaging communities in Wildfire Prevention (E-CWP) is a collaboration of Santa Fe County Fire Department, San Ildefonso Pueblo, Santa Fe County Open Space and Trails and the New Mexico State Land Office. The collaborators have selected communities at extreme or very high risk of catastrophic fire that will significantly benefit from the project. The project will treat a total of 140 acres that encompass diverse forest ecotypes of the upper Rio Grande corridor. They will recruit, hire and train wildland fire crews at Santa Fe County Fire Department and San Ildefonso Pueblo. This is a three-year project.

Strengths:

-Pohlman – 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 28, 33

-Cooper – The proposal includes many strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles and responsibilities as described in the proposal.

-Burnett – 22, 24, 25, 26

-Burnett – Good work plan.

-Berrens – Proposal includes Firewise education and outreach in combination with WUI risk assessment.

-Berrens – Proposal includes detail socio-economic assessment and monitoring that is integrated with ecological monitoring.

-Gomez – Current forest type conditions of each area and statement of work and outcomes are well written and easy to follow.

Weaknesses:

None.

Recommendations:

-Cooper – Proponent should seek letters of support from NM State Forestry and the other four homeowners associations clarifying their interest. (Burnett – When I read the proposal I think that NM State Forestry is a passive supporter;

they are not a collaborator and are not providing a match. Dunn – NM State Forestry’s job is to implement a CWPP. When we have discussed this topic in other proposals, we have said if they have specific roles, then the letter of support is important. The difference here is the role described here is what they would do anyway. Cooke – Yesterday we had a project that included two tribes that were 200 miles away from the project because those two tribes did not include letters of support we made it a weakness. Burnett – No, there was no documentation of consultation from those tribes. Dunn – If an organization is listed with a role for them described that is critical for the project to move forward, then a letter of support describing those activities needs to be present. Watson – I agree with Walter. I feel it should be a weakness. Berrens – I don’t think this should be a weakness; it should be a recommendation because it shows the role and commitment to the project by the NM State Forestry, even though they are not collaborators. They do not play a key role in the project.)

Administrative Observations:

- Non-federal match exceeds 20%.
- Section B, 424A is incorrectly filled out, doesn’t match total.
- Renegotiate start and end date.
- \$6000 for truck each year should include depreciation/move out of equipment.
- All costs need to be analyzed and renegotiated. (PPE, etc.)
- Should use monthly use rates and mileage.

Discussion:

- Burnett – Are the 120 cords of firewood free or will you be selling it?
Proponent – It will be free.
- Dunn – We need more specifics on the budget to make this a weakness.
Melendez – Equipment, no depreciation, no monthly use rates, show actual use, PPE is shown in two different line items for each crew member, maintenance and insurance on the truck. There were line items that were already paid for under another line item. It was hard for me to follow.
- Fisher – In this particular proposal, some of the administrative observations that concern budget may be a weakness. I think in previous reviews of proposals they may have been put in as a weakness.
- Gomez – Is the Arroyo Salado site clear for NEPA? Proponent – Everything but this site. The state land office will do this.

Burnett proposes category 1

Evaluation Category: 1

CFRP 31-10 – Walker Flats Watershed Improvement – Final Phase

- 10:41 a.m. Olivas and Bird recues themselves and leave the room.
- 10:44 a.m. Archuleta introduced the proposal.

This proposal is a resubmission from the 2009 CFRP, currently being submitted under 2010 CFRP-FRP. The project is designed to address both ecological issues facing the headwaters of the Mora River and the related socio-economic issues of nearby communities by building upon previous restoration efforts in the area. Specifically, the project's ecological goals are to improve watershed function, overall forest health, preserve old and large trees and restore forest structure to permit the return of historic fire regimes by reducing excessive stocking levels in approximately 200 acres of land administered by the Santa Fe National Forest. Total of 17 project partners with 37 letters of support.

Strengths:

- Archuleta – 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 21, 22, 25, 33
- Archuleta – Provides local forestry based employment and opportunities in a rural economically depressed area of the state that has a high concentration of federal public lands.
- Berrens – The proposal has a strong socio-economic component including description of current and future desired conditions.
- Cooke – The proposal connects two previous treatments.

Weaknesses:

None.

Recommendations:

- Gomez – Include an estimate of the amount of forest products to be removed.
- Gomez – Include a better description of treatment activities.

Administrative Observations:

- Budget does not follow sample format.
- Mora County lists in letter \$25,000, 1st year budget says \$23,000.
- Corporate liability insurance under “other” and NMGR tax appropriate to pay taxes with federal funds. Allowable for property purchase but generally not allowable for business.

Discussion:

- Gomez – Will any forest products be removed? Proponent – An insignificant amount.
- Archuleta proposes category 1

Evaluation Category: 1

CFRP 32-10 –Borrogo Mesa Restoration and Video Documentary

- 10:59 a.m. Fisher recues herself and leaves the room.
- 11:00 a.m. Bird returns.
- 11:02 a.m. Cooper introduced the proposal.

Aspen Forest Products and partners will conduct sustainable restoration treatments on 400 acres of southwestern mixed conifer forest in the Borrego

Mesa of the Santa Fe National Forest. The goals are to restore the cultural integrity to the area ecosystem functions, re-establish natural fire regimes and improve stand structure and species composition. It is estimated that approximately 160,000 to 280,000 cubic feet of material will be removed from the area. At least 100 people from surrounding communities will be involved through schools, conferences, and workshops. The project will create fourteen temporary jobs in film production and nine seasonal yearly jobs in forest restoration and wood processing.

Strengths:

- Gomez – 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 29
- Bird – 10, 22, 33
- Cooke – Outreach with videos is innovative.

Weaknesses:

None.

Recommendations:

- Watson – The maps should include acreage figures.

Administrative Observations:

- NEPA not complete, anticipated in July, 2010.
- Computation of program coordinator incorrect.
- Costs of contractors or sub-awardees unit costs are not detailed in the budget or budget narrative.

Discussion:

-Cooper – What is the status of the NEPA document? Proponent – I contacted the District Ranger last week and he said the scoping letter has been mailed and the CE should be signed by the 30th of July.

-Cooke – In the District Ranger's letter, he doesn't mention anything other than firewood. Does the District Ranger concur with you taking some of the sawlogs as opposed to leaving them? Proponent – Yes.

Cooper – Is this in a previously burned area? Proponent – This area is unburned.

Cooper – I don't see where this project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area. Bird – The way I see this is the family has been involved in this type of activity for years. Pohlman – I think he mentions he is purchasing a sawmill to augment an already ongoing business.

Cooper proposes category 1.

Evaluation Category: 1

CFRP 33-10 – Merced del Pueblo Abiquiu Collaborative Forest Restoration Planning Project

11:11 a.m. Archuleta recuses himself and leaves the room.

- 11:20 a.m. Fisher returns.
- 11:20 a.m. Bird introduced the proposal.
- 11:22 a.m. Olivas recuses himself and leaves the room.

This is revision. The purpose of the Project is to properly plan and prepare for a restoration project located on common lands of the community land grant. The planning will include conducting necessary steps for NEPA clearances, and for the development of restoration prescriptions including ecological monitoring and evaluation plans. These plans will include a youth component for the collection of baseline data and for conducting ecological monitoring.

Strengths:

- Bird – 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 30

Weaknesses:

- Burnett – The proposal does not include a letter from the Forest Service describing their role in the NEPA process. The use of CFRP funds for this planning grant is the federal nexus that triggers NEPA.
- Cooper – The ecological and socio-economic monitoring plans do not address specific objects of the project. The monitoring and evaluation plan was not updated since the previous submittal. The plan includes old partners such as Bernalillo High School and the San Antonio De Las Huertas Land Grant.

Recommendations:

- Bird – The proposal would have been strengthened by including more detail regarding the youth component.
- Bird – The proposal would have been strengthened by including a discussion on safety.
- Cooper – The multiparty monitoring process should be described in the text.

Administrative Observations:

- Contractor unit costs are not detailed in the budget or budget narrative.
- Budget includes federal funding that is questionably, specifically food and drinks. Prior approval would be required before the costs would be allowed.

Discussion:

- Coleman – I am assuming that they will be doing NEPA because they want to use federal funds to do treatment.
- Coleman – Is the Forest Service going to be involved in the NEPA process?
- Reuben – I'm not sure since there is no letter from them.
- Proponent – The Forest Service District Office will oversee and review, however, they will not certify.
- Dunn – CFRP are developing precedence for doing NEPA on Land Grant projects. When they receive federal funding, NEPA has to be done. The Forest Service has to sign the decision memo but it doesn't mean the NEPA has to be done in entirely the same process as the Forest Service would do.
- Bird – They do have a letter of endorsement from the Land Grant.
- Dunn – The Forest Service is

responsible to ensure the document is accurate. They don't have to follow Forest Service NEPA but they do have to follow the NEPA regulations.

-Fisher – I think it's important to take into account the relationship between the Land Grant and the Forest Service. There is money set aside to work collaboratively with the Forest Service. This is important to bridge the gap between the two groups to help them work together.

-Dunn – The Forest Service is a key player in this endeavor. We are not sure how much they are willing to engage. It is true, however, that there is not a letter from the Forest Service.

-Pohlman – I feel this is a pretty important letter and needs to be in the proposal.

-Bird – I think there is an area of confusion that we haven't entered yet. I think you can find other federal agencies to take the responsibility for the NEPA. DOD could sign the decision memo. It could also be a joint NEPA EA. It would include two separate decision memos. This particular Ranger District seems very over-burdened from my past experience with them. I would like to see other agencies take larger roles. Unfortunately, they refer to the Forest Service as the NEPA action agency.

-Payne – Before the proposal was submitted, they should have gone to the agencies to ensure the NEPA could be done. It looks like this was a critical step that was missed.

-Gomez – They went to the Corps of Engineers.

-Proponent – We would consult with both agencies before we start NEPA. Since this is a Land Grant, this is new territory and it is being dealt with on a case-by-case basis. We are still trying to determine what the process will be. It is not typical that we will get approval from an agency prior to receiving funding. These things are based on funding, land ownerships, permitting. These come out as the scope of a project is being determined. Please take into consideration that this is a new process and it is still being figured out.

-Pohlman – Why is there not a letter from the Forest? I feel the letter was attainable and should be included.

Berrens – This is not on Forest Service land, so there is no incentive for them to participate. This may be a deterrent for the collaboration. The responsibility does not kick in until the funding is awarded. I view this as an exception since it is not on Forest land.

-Dunn – The core of CFRP is collaboration. We need to build diplomatic bridges that have not existed before. We cannot use the same rule every time.

-Burnett – There have been other CFRP grants awarded to cross-jurisdictional projects that include Land Grants. These projects did get letters from the Land Grant and the Forest Service to work together. So, it is common for the Forest Service to write a letter prior to receiving funding.

-Fisher – Just a reminder to the panel that this is a revision and it does not appear the NEPA was a weakness last year.

Pohlman – Did the District receive a request for a letter? Reuben – No. The proponent contacted Reuben through e-mail and was going to draft a letter to send to the District but he did not receive it. This project has been out there and in the works for many years so the District is aware of it.

Bird proposes category 2.

Evaluation Category: 2

12:19 p.m. **Public Comment Period**

None.

CFRP 34-10 – Rowe Mesa Landscape-Scale Assessment: Planning for Fire-Focused Forest Restoration

1:21 p.m. Bird and Cooper recuse themselves and leave the room.

1:22 p.m. Olivas and Archuleta return.

1:23 p.m. Berrens introduced the proposal.

This proposal outlines aggressive fire-focused restoration planning on Rowe Mesa at three spatial scales, including a landscape assessment of 72,527 acres, NEPA clearance on 17,000 acres and objective selection of a strategically located, large future implementation site (3,000 acres). In year one of this two-year planning grant it will complete the landscape assessment of the ponderosa pine/pinon juniper forests on Rowe Mesa. At the project's end, it will complete NEPA clearance for 17,000 acres. It will provide local jobs through thinning and provide fuel wood to local users from the thinned material, based upon the successful model developed through prior CFRP projects on Rowe Mesa. We will build upon prior CFRP funded youth education programs in the greater Rowe Mesa region through expansion of restoration and fire ecology curriculums (10-20 students) and field based experiential learning (5-10 students). Adult outreach will build on prior efforts to reinforce restoration ideas, and to expand on the value of landscape planning (40 adults). This is a planning grant.

Strengths:

-Berrens – Excellent example of use of landscape scale assessment and planning efforts to strategically target cost effective restoration efforts and move toward natural fire regimes.

-Burnett – 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 12

-Melendez – Good budget detail and/or work plan.

-Gomez – 16, 31, 32

-Dunn – 15, 22, 24, 33

Weaknesses:

-None.

Recommendations:

-Berrens – When the difference between allowed IDC rate and organization rate is used as Cost Share match, a copy or link to the organizations audited. IDC rate should be included. Please provide.

-Gomez – Identify the tribes that the letter was sent to.

Administrative Observations:

-None.

Discussion:

-Burnett – Did anyone see a letter from Blue Earth Ecological Consultants? In their budget they reference an attached letter. Panel – Their specification of cost is before the Executive Summary.

-Burnett – I didn't see any letters from the schools or Pueblos where the outreach would take place. In the past we have allowed the relationship from the instructor to be sufficient. Berrens – There are two letters that say they currently have working relationships with these schools.

Berrens proposes category 1.

Evaluation Category: 1

CFRP 36-10 – Caja del Rio Majada Cooperative Santa Fe River Area Restoration

1:42 p.m. Watson recuses herself and leaves the room.

1:43 p.m. Bird and Cooper return.

1:44 p.m. Cooke introduced the proposal.

The project is located in the lower Santa Fe River watershed on the Caja del Rio Grazing Allotment Espanola Ranger District. Partners will collaboratively implement the restoration of the Santa Fe River by reconstructing trailhead closures and fencing to keep wild horses and cattle out of the riparian area during the three year project. Pre and post monitoring by partners and the Cochiti Middle School students will include monitoring a stream flow study ongoing by New Mexico. Project will remove the non-native Russian olive and salt cedar on 30 acres. The NEPA analysis will be completed mid-year 2010 by WildEarth Guardians.

Strengths:

-Burnett – The project replants trees in deforested areas.

-Bird – The proposal attempts to offer an opportunity to address the inter-action between grazing and the re-establishment of natural fire regimes.

-Gomez – The legend on the map identifies the location of treatments.

Weaknesses:

-Dunn – NEPA is not complete on proposed treatment acres, with NEPA not part of the proposal. The proposal includes a letter from the BLM that states: non-support due to absence of NEPA and higher priorities for BLM resources than the proposed project.

- Dunn – Trailhead closures and prevention of the erosion of hazardous materials are not CFRP objectives
- Cooper – Thinning to increase water quantity is not a CFRP objective and it is not based upon best available science.
- Cooper – A socio-economic monitoring plan is not included.
- Burnett – Proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with a conservation group in design, implementation and monitoring. Audubon Society is referenced on page 3, but no letter is included.
- Gomez – The work plan lacks detail and is confusing.
- Gomez – Placing slash in a gulley tends to increase rather than decrease erosion.

Recommendations:

- Cooke – The proposal should display land ownerships on the map to increase clarity of the proposal.
- Dunn -The letter of support from the Santa Domingo tribe is in reference to a previous WildEarth Guardians proposal from 2009, not CFRP 36-10.
- Berrens – The applicant should seek committed collaboration with the Museum of Natural History UNM (Dr. Este Muldavin), WildEarth Guardians and BLM.

Administrative Observations:

- The Federal portion of year one, totals \$123,399 and the total is shown as \$120,000.

Discussion:

- Fisher – There is an amended piece that goes with this.
- Burnett – What is the status of your NEPA analysis? Not complete.

Cooke proposes category 3. Pohlman, Cooper, Burnett propose 4.

Evaluation Category: 4

2:12 p.m. **Public Comment Period**

None.

2:13 p.m. Watson returns.

2:13 p.m. **Review Applications for Consistency**

- Dunn – I would recommend that we focus on the projects in Category 1 and Category 2. Ensure that they are properly categorized.
- Burnett – You could have changes between Category 1 and Category 2 for the proposals. Is that correct? Dunn – Yes
- Dunn – We will go down through the Category 1 Proposals first. If you have a conflict of interest, you need to leave the room.
- Dunn – The issues on Letters of Support is an important issue. If a letter of commitment from partners or collaborators is missing, is the letter from a partner

with an active role, such as a non-federal match? Can the project go forward as written without the consent/contribution of this partner?

-Dunn – Criteria for administrative observations would be a missing letter of support from a potential project participant who is not critical to project implementation.

-Dunn – Check to see if administrative observations are not actually weaknesses.

-Dunn – Look at NEPA documentation for consistency. Weakness: The NEPA Decision document is not attached for an implementation project that depends on that NEPA document.

-Coleman – Some panel members think the youth component could be a weakness and a strength.

-Dunn – The language in the act in regards to youth was intended for something like a Youth Corps type of involvement in going out and directly doing the work and being trained in natural resources. This would train them so there would be a pool of candidates to do natural resource work. The original intent was not to be an environmental education program.

-Archuleta – There can be an issue where an application does not include a youth component. If there is a youth component and they describe it, then there is an issue of consistency. If there is a youth component and it is described well then it should be a strength.

-Dunn – Weakness: The youth component is proposed as an objective but it is not clearly described and monitored. Note – Proposals without youth component should not be penalized.

-Dunn – What if the proposal doesn't contain any training?

-Pohlman – I have a concern that a proposal might be penalized because it is more of a planning or utilization project that may not include youth.

-Dunn – Strength: Training/youth component is included and clearly explained.

-Coleman – If this is a weakness, it is a disincentive to include the youth component in a proposal.

-Archuleta – What if the youth is a component, but not an objective. How are you going to monitor? For example, a field trip. How are you going to monitor that?

-Berrens – If it is an objective, then it needs to be adequately described and monitored.

-Cooke – How do you know which tribes need to be addressed? Dunn – You would need to address the tribes that have traditional tribal lands. That list would be so encompassing so we have narrowed it down to the ones to be considered on the Forest.

-Fisher – I don't feel that this is followed consistently in every proposal.

-Archuleta – I think this is an issue of consistency. This is part of the RFP and is a requirement because of collaboration. We have to judge when it is a weakness

or strength. Some include all of the letters; some just enclose a list of the tribes the letter was sent to.

-Cooper – The RFP needs to improve the documentation that is needed.

-Burnett – I would think we could make this a recommendation. Dunn – There is a legal requirement for tribal consultation.

-Jerry – In the past, if they did not show evidence of tribal consultation, then that was a weakness. If they had letters, sample letters or a list then that was strength.

-Dunn – If they have no such letter from the tribe, then at least they should have a letter showing they contacted the tribe but did not hear back from them.

-Watson – I think it should be a weakness if it's not done because it is a federal requirement.

-Watson – Weakness: For proposed projects on traditional tribal lands, a letter of support to/from the affected tribes or pueblos should be included. The list of affected tribes is presented on Page 29 of the RFP. It is acceptable to include a sample letter with a list of the tribes or pueblos who it was sent to.

-Payne – Check to see if administrative observations or recommendations are not actually weaknesses.

-San Gil – When a budget was tied to a work plan and it was not clear it was put into a weakness.

-Cooper – Not sure we looked at all proposals consistently for Project Coordinator Costs. Dunn – We have been trying to come up with some range of reasonable costs for this. San Gil – There was only one proposal that this came up in. Cooper – After clarification, it doesn't sound like we were inconsistent on this issue.

(Panel developed written consistency check items for consistency review – see Appendix 5)

3:31 p.m.

Public Comment Period

7/22/2010

I read this statement to respectfully protest the CFRP Panel rating of the Mt.

Taylor Machine, LLC CFRP proposal as a grade “2”. The issue in question is whether or not MTM adequately addressed the socio-economic multiparty monitoring as required in the CFRP guidelines.

Our application addresses the socio-economic data throughout the Monitoring and Evaluation guidelines provided on page 9. I quote, “Socio-economic monitoring and evaluation will be provided by MTM working in conjunction with all collaborative partners.” The argument provided against our proposal is that MTM will be the only entity tabulating the socio-economic data. The CFRP regulations do not require the data be tabulated by multiple parties. It only requires it be obtained by multiple parties. Moreover, if the data needs tabulation by more than one collaborative partner, this could easily be accomplished with a phone call requesting help (please read the CFRP category

description number one which states the application can have minor administrative weaknesses. Is a phone call a minor administrative issue?).

MTM also provides, as an appendix item, a form entitled the "Forest Restoration Success Log". This form is to be used by any and all companies transporting harvested biomass into either of our pellet plants. This form WILL be used by virtue of refusal to pay any firm not providing a filled out copy for each load delivered. The argument provided during the panel review was there were no letters of support from the companies who will use the form. This was explained. We do not know who those companies will be. However, while only two letters of support directly mention socio-economic collaborative monitoring, there are phrases in many letters such as "Ramah Navajo Tribe fully supports and commits to participating...", "We are committed to assist you in any way we can" (Kellar Logging, Inc.), and "it would provide an opportunity for students to gain insight into careers and business opportunities related to products and better understand how local business can be impacted...", and from the Forest Guild, "The goal of this collaboration is to create efficiencies in thinning and hauling operation and MULTIPARTY MONITORING that we expect to lead to increased acres treated", and from The City of Grants, "we welcome the opportunity to provide educational outreach to our local community as well as participation in the MULTIPARTY MONITORING process as are outlined in your grant application".

Our application was criticized by one panel member for not having letters of support which speak specifically to multi-party monitoring. However, two letters of support do directly mention multi-party monitoring and moreover, the only method any applicant has of providing letters of support which say EXACTLY what might be deemed perfect is for the applicant to literally write the letter ourselves for signature by our collaborative supports, an act which would seem to undermine the validity of the process.

A final criticism was launched that the proposal does not state what is to be done with the compiled data provided by our collaborative partners and transportation firms that will be required to use the "Restoration Success Log". However, this point is not valid as we are REQUIRED by grant guidelines to submit the harvest data which transpires as a result of our grant. This may not be specifically spelled out but should be UNDERSTOOD by any person who read the CFRP requirements acting as an applicant judge.

Our company is a member of the Cibola County Wood Industries Network. We are also members of the New Mexico Forest Industries Association which is mentioned on page 4 of our application. Rather than downgrading our application to a 2, would the panel please consider simply making a recommendation the socio-economic data be provided to both these organizations for distribution to members and interested parties. This simple administrative task will ensure the data is used to help establish a new socio-economic standard methodology which will result in the current CFRP panel being an important intrinsic part of future forest restoration success in the great state of New Mexico. Without this sort of data, both socio-economic and to some degree, ecological monitoring will remain weak at best.

The question comes down to one simple thing: Can MTM's CFRP application be corrected with administrative input, i.e., it has "minor administrative weaknesses", or is there no monitoring plan in effect at all, in spite of a full 20% of the application dedicated to this subject along with one attachment showing how our many collaborative partners, either known or unknown, will help us with the required multi-party monitoring?

Thank you for your reconsideration of our application.

/S/ G. Matthew Allen

CEO

Mt. Taylor Machine, LLC

Wood You Recycle!

- 3:54 p.m. Review Applications in Categories 1 and 2 for Consistency
- 3:55 p.m. CFRP 01-10 – Current Category 3
- 3:55 p.m. CFRP 02-10 – Current Category 1
- Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? Yes.
- Burnett recuses herself and leaves the room.
- Gomez – We indicated a strength on this that NEPA has been done on the FS and BLM, and there is strong commitment from the pueblo to complete NEPA on the 34 tribal land acres. The NEPA has not been completed, so should this be a strength?
- Archuleta - The NEPA has been completed on part of the lands, just not all of it. Work can be done on the portion that the NEPA has been completed on.
- 4:02 p.m. CFRP 03-10 – Current Category 1
- Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? Yes.
- Pohlman – Under Recommendations, #1, I question if that should be moved to a weakness?
- Berrens – No, this is standard in a CWPP.
- 4: 05 p.m. CFRP 04-10 – Current Category 3
- 4:07 p.m. CFRP 05-10 – Current Category 1
- Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? Yes.
- Bird – Inconsistency is this....NEPA is not complete or NEPA is complete?
- Archuleta – It is done on a portion of the project.
- 4:08 p.m. CFRP 06-10 – Current Category 1
- 4:09 p.m. Burnett returns.
- Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? Yes.
- Archuleta – The NEPA is complete on 40 acres but not on the entire project.
- 4:13 p.m. CFRP 07-10 – Current Category 1
- Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? No.

4:14 p.m. CFRP 08-10 – Current Category 1

Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? Yes.

-Berrens – In the budget it asks for the Biological Assessment and the Biological Opinion. It says it is going to contract out for this but it doesn't specify who. I asked if it was going to be Dr. Catron. They said, yes, that's who they intend to use.

-Burnett – There is no letter.

-San Gil – Is he listed in the budget?

-Burnett - Yes on page 3 of the budget narrative.

Weakness: -There should be a letter of commitment from Dr. Catron because he is listed as an active collaborator, because he has a described role in project implementation.

-Fisher – Would like to clarify that the city of Raton would provide matching funds. It says state and city but it does not specify this.

Burnett – They have a state grant and have control of this.

MOVE FROM CATEGORY 1 TO CATEGORY 2

4:19 p.m. CFRP 09-10 – Current Category 1

Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? Yes.

4:20 p.m. Bird recuses himself and leaves the room.

Dunn – Administrative Observation: Clarify non-federal match related to student travel.

Burnett – I think NMFWRI is providing a non-federal match for transportation of the students.

4:28 p.m. CFRP 10-10 – Current Category 1

Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? Yes.

4:28 p.m. Bird returns.

This proposal has a weakness: The acreage figures in the proposal are inconsistent between the budget, the map, the text and the letter to the tribes.

-Bird – I suggest everyone look closely at this weakness because it might not belong there.

-Cooper – I actually think this is a weakness because of clarity.

-Gomez – Recommendation: The proponent should resend letters to the tribes with the correct number of acres.

-Dunn – The issue here is not the 25 letters but the actual acres and if they can complete the work.

-Burnett – The point of this is to notify the tribes and if the acres are not included, there may be work that they are not aware of.

-Matush – I have been dealing with tribes for years and I can tell you they would all be excited about a project like this.

-Bird – Is this a weakness that if we decide to fund it, can it be fixed?

-Watson – I think it is something that can be corrected.

-Payne – If NEPA is done, does this mean they don't have to send letters?

Burnett – I agree. This is a rule and we cannot change it. Fisher – I agree. It needs to be reported accurately.

-Watson – NEPA was done according to the law. It is very important that we be consistent and even if NEPA is done, a letter should be sent to the tribes.

MOVE FROM CATEGORY 1 TO CATEGORY 2

4:39 p.m.

CFRP 11-10 – Current Category 2

Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? Yes.

Public comment was received on this.

-Archuleta – On the work timeline on page 7, it does show participants who will participate in the multiparty monitoring.

-Archuleta – The monitoring sheet actually shows the data that will be collected and who the contractors would be.

-Bird – Not every party of the multiparty monitoring will go out and collect data.

-Archuleta – Anyone who fills out the forest restoration logs he provides will also be providing data so they will also be involved in the multiparty monitoring.

-Olivas – If we are going to move from a Category 2 to a Category 1, we need to go through each weakness.

-Archuleta – I would propose to take out the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd weaknesses.

-Bird – I think the 2nd weakness should be a recommendation.

-Burnett – I reviewed the proposal and I do not see youth as an objective of their proposal. So the youth component should be removed from the weakness.

-Burnett – Remove the weakness concerning statements on page 1 and page 8 regarding education and outreach to a Recommendation.

MOVE FROM CATEGORY 2 to CATEGORY 1

4:43 p.m.

CFRP 12-10 – Current Category 2

Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? Yes.

4:47 p.m.

Archuleta recuses himself and leaves the room.

-San Gil – Is Bernalillo High School in fact a collaborator?

-Bird – It says Bernalillo High School will assist in the collection of the baseline data.

4:49 p.m.

CFRP 13-10 – Current Category 1

Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? No.

- 4:49 p.m. Archuleta returns
- 4:49 p.m. **CFRP 14-10 – Current Category 3**
- 4:49 p.m. **CFRP 15-10 – Current Category 4**
- 4:49 p.m. **CFRP 16-10 – Current Category 3**
- 4:51 p.m. **CFRP 17-10 – Current Category 1**
- Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? No.
- 4:51 p.m. **CFRP 18-10 – Current Category 4**
- 4:53 p.m. **CFRP 19-10 – Current Category 2**
- Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? Yes.
- 4:53 p.m. Cooper recuses herself and leaves the room.
- Burnett – No letter from NM State Forestry that they mentioned in the proposal. Is this an active role? Can the project go forward without the consent?
- 4:56 p.m. Cooper returns.
- 4:58 p.m. **CFRP 20-10 – Current Category 3**
- 4:56 p.m. **CFRP 21-10 – Current Category 2**
- Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? Yes.
- 4:57 p.m. Cooper recuses herself and leaves the room.
- 4:58 p.m. Burnett – No letters of support from Grant County, National Wild Turkey Federal and the RMEF. They were listed as collaborators though. Are they collaborators and did they provide letters of support? Should this stay as a weakness since it is not in the narrative or on the work plan? They are on the collaborator list.
- Burnett – Can the project go forward without the consent of them? Burnett – Yes, Bird – Yes
- Burnett – Can this be moved to an Administrative Observation? Yes.
- MOVE FROM CATEGORY 2 to CATEGORY 1**
- 5:03 p.m. Coleman returns.
- 5:03 p.m. **CFRP 22-10 – Current Category 2**
- Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? Yes.
- San Gil – What is the contribution from the high school?
- Payne – They are listed in the budget.
- Archuleta – Can the contractor cover the cost? Could the Soil and Conservation District cover that amount?
- Cooper – It needs to be in the letter.
- Berrens – We need to look at this on a case-by-case basis.

-Bird – If we go back to the rules, this doesn't fit any of them. The letter commits them to doing the monitoring; it just doesn't say they are going to do the match.

5:12 p.m. Bird recuses himself and leaves the room.

-Archuleta – It doesn't ever say Hot Springs High School is going to pay this amount. It is just an in-kind match of their time.

-Archuleta – Move weakness #1 and make it an Administrative Observation.

5:15 p.m. Bird returns.

5:16 p.m. **CFRP 23-10 – Current Category 2**

Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? Yes.

-Cooper – This is an example of the permittees having a minor role in the project.

-Payne – The permittees are going to receive, not pay for material.

-Matush – Seems like the permittees need to be involved right from the beginning of the project.

-Cooper – The proponent knows the permittees and has a working relationship with them.

-Bird – The weakness could move to Administrative Observation.

-Archuleta – The Forest Service has endorsed the project and so they will deal with the permittees.

The treatment area is part of an area that has already received treatment and is part of a continuous project. The permittees supported the previous project and NEPA.

-Dunn – Move the weakness to a Recommendation.

-Gomez – Add Recommendation: The acreage figures are not consistent.

-Bird – This is a NEPA cleared document so it has been cleared by SHIPO.

-Dunn – Were the tribes consulted on the NEPA? F.S. Rep. - There were no sites. Is there traditional use in this area? There has been no record in previous projects of traditional use in the area.

MOVE FROM CATEGORY 2 TO CATEGORY 1

5:43 p.m. **CFRP 24-10 – Current Category 1**

Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? No.

5:45 p.m. **CFRP 25-10 – Current Category 2**

Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? Yes.

-San Gil – Have received public comment on this from Lloyd Irland.

July 22, 2010

Dear Mr. Montes,

David Old asked me to assist in his proposal to this program on the monitoring side because I have familiarity with the forests and industry of the northern New Mexico regions, and a history of workings in FSC certification as an on the ground auditor. I also from time to time have been involved in sustainability monitoring efforts. I am familiar in general with the monitoring process in use on the Stewardship Contract in the White Mountains. I am also midway through a project in the Sapello watershed that is developing a management plan for a large private property, emphasizing restoration and wood market development. Apparently there was no time to clarify.

From what I hear secondhand, there was confusion as to my employment base and my role.

I serve on the faculty of the Yale School of F&ES as Lecturer and Research Scientist in fall terms only. The rest of the year I am a consultant in my own firm, The Irland Group. Because this was a small engagement, it made no sense to involve Yale's bureaucracy and overhead costs. It seemed a logical move to contract out the monitoring piece of work and I was happy to be involved. Part of the assignment, as I understood it, was to develop a simple, workable set of metrics for monitoring important project impacts. For a proposal this size it was not possible to develop all of that in advance, as I am sure anyone can understand.

If we had learned of a standard USFS methodology, preferred for this purpose, we could have applied it.

In any case I am not aware of the full list of proposals considered and have no comments one way or the other on the relative merits; I just regret that it seems my role in this project has been a cause of confusion for the evaluation panel.

Thanks for your time and attention.

Best, LCI

*Lloyd C. Irland
The Irland Group
174 Lord Road
Wayne, ME 04284
207-685-9613*

-Burnett – Feels weaknesses should state that the letter from Dr. Irland actually addressed the weakness. Bird – I agree.

5:50 p.m. **CFRP 27-10 – Current Category 1**

Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? Yes.

5:50 p.m. Cooper recuses herself and leaves the room.

-Pohlman – There is a Recommendation that says the letter to the tribes is outlined, but no list of tribes is provided. This could possibly be a weakness.

-Watson – This should be a weakness.

-Burnett – Could we get clarification from the CFRP coordinator on this?

-Bird to Reuben – Do you have any record of a letter being sent to the tribes?
Reuben – No.

MOVE FROM CATEGORY 1 TO CATEGORY 2

5:55 p.m. **CFRP 28-10 – Current Category 1**

Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? No.

5:55 p.m. Cooper returns.

5:57 p.m. **CFRP 29-10 – Current Category 3**

5:58 p.m. **CFRP 30-10 – Current Category 1**

Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? No.

5:58 p.m. Bird recuses himself and leaves the room.

5:59 p.m. **CFRP 31-10 – Current Category 1**

Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? No.

5:59 p.m. Bird returns.

6: 00 p.m. **CFRP 32-10 – Current Category 1**

Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? Yes.

6:00 p.m. Fisher recuses herself and leaves the room.

- Burnett – Have a question about the NEPA not being complete. It is on the Consistency Check List. There is no decision document to attach.

- San Gil –The NEPA is supposed to be signed this week. This will not affect the timeline of the proposal.

-Archuleta – Is the NEPA not complete on the entire project or is it just a portion?

-Dunn – This is different when you have a document waiting to be signed than if you have not even started NEPA.

6:06 p.m. **CFRP 33-10 – Current Category 2**

Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? Yes.

6:07 p.m. Archuleta and Olivas recuse themselves and leave the room.

6:07 p.m. Fisher returns.

-San Gil – Weakness #1, Cooper – I feel we talked about this at length and their role was significant.

-Fisher – Would like to add a strength: This proposal could be a cost-effective way to bridge the gap between forest service and land grant issues.

6:12 p.m. **CFRP 34-10 – Current Category 1**

Does the Panel wish to review this proposal for consistency? Yes.

6:12 p.m. Cooper and Bird recuse themselves and leave the room.

6:12 p.m. Archuleta returns.

6:14 p.m. **CFRP 36-10 – Current Category 4**

Minutes, Thursday, July 22, 2010

6:14 p.m. Melissa Marosy reviewed the agenda for Friday, July 23, 2010.

6:20 p.m. Meeting adjourned.

Friday, July 23, 2010

Panel:

Mike Matush
Timothy Pohlman
Danny Gomez
Ann Watson
Robert Berrens, PhD
Bryan Bird
John Olivas
Martha S. Cooper
Dick Cooke
Shaun Criston Fisher
Candido Arturo Archuleta
Coleman Burnett
Walter Dunn – Chairman

USFS Staff:

Walter Dunn
Melissa Marossy
Alicia San Gil
Jerry Payne
Carmen Melendez
Monica Martinez

Facilitator: Melissa Marosy

Meeting Minutes: Allison Lundin

Members of the Public and Others in Attendance:

Gilbert Vigil
Sue Ellen Strale
Walt Strain
Ian Fox
Greg Gallegos
Fabian Montano
Dave Warnack
Rudy Jaramillo
Amy Ewing
William Fennalti
Denis Trujillo
Patrick Griego
Connie Zipperer
Gary Hawthorn

8:34 a.m. Melissa Marosy reviews the agenda for the day.

8:39 a.m. **Public Comment**

July 23, 2010

Dear Panel Members,

Let this letter serve as public comment on proposal 10-10 Navajo Dam Multijurisdictional Restoration Project. We were informed by phone last night that our proposal had been moved from a one ranking to a two ranking during a session some time yesterday afternoon and was only told it was because our acreage on the project was not correct. Not having the opportunity to be there we are at a disadvantage to know any other reason for the lowering of the ranking. This letter serves as a clarification to you on the acreage. Each acreage mentioned in the proposal, budget, and attached map is correct and we stand by all statements.

In the budget it clearly states and lists that in year one 125.74 acres will be treated and firebreaks will be treated in the 15.29 acre firebreak area. In the proposal it states on page 3 "The 15.29 acre tract at the Texas Hole site is inundated with water during high releases from the dam typically during the spring. Fifty foot fire breaks will be cut in this area every 100 yards." The proponent based their budget for this area on number of hours to chainsaw eight firebreaks. Animas Exterminating based their treatment of the firebreaks on 48 hours labor that Cedar Valley estimated to cut the firebreaks plus chemical and is stated as 6 days in the budget for one year. In turn they bid in year two's budget on a per firebreak treatment (8 firebreaks x \$50 per firebreak). The removal of salt cedar and Russian olive for firebreaks in this area was not calculated for acreage since it was an oblong area that would have to be permanently staked and each firebreak would have to be measured individually for acreage therefore, for simplicity sake it was done on an hourly basis for the removal.

In year two, 28 acres will be treated due to the \$120,000 cap of Federal Funds in year one.

When we add up the total acreage in the project 125.74, 15.29 acres in the firebreak area and the 28 acres to be done in year two it totals 169.03 acres. These acres are consistent throughout the proposal and budget. The map in the appendix adds up to 168 only because the acreage is reflected in whole numbers that were rounded down to the next whole number.

The other question on acreage was with the approximately 160 acres that is on page 3 of the proposal under the heading of Russian Olive and Salt Cedar Removal and control that states "The project will remove invasive tress from approximately 160 acres near the town of Navajo Dam." We stand by that acreage figure since we will be removing 125.74 acres in year one plus the firebreaks on the 15.29 acre parcel and 28 acres in year two. $125.74 + 28 = 153.74$ plus the 8 firebreaks to be cut and removed.

During our review on Tuesday we admitted to the mistake made in the letter sent to the tribes stating removal of approximately 100 acres. We can re-send a corrected letter to potentially affected tribes for comment. We had no responses previously on the letter sent.

We left on Tuesday with a one rating with no disagreement from the panel members. We also left with the understanding that we needed to be represented here today for the second review of those proposals receiving a one rating. This

is in accordance with the RFP. There is no provision in the RFP for an additional review that happened yesterday afternoon and further we were not notified of such a review leaving us at a disadvantage to make public comments on any review from the panel since we were not here to hear them.

It is our request that the panel reinstates Proposal 10-10 to its original rating of a 1 and the panel proceeds as described in the RFP. We further request that the RFP for selection be followed as stated and any deviation from the RFP that has occurred be allowed.

*Respectively submitted,
/s/ Gary Hathorn
Project Coordinator*

8:46 a.m.

Public Comment

CFRP Technical Advisory Panel meeting

Public comment on behalf of the City of Raton (CFRP 08-10)

July 23, 2010

My name is Amy Ewing, and I'd like to enter public comment on behalf of the City of Raton. Our application was reviewed by the panel on Tuesday, and was given a criteria assessment of 1. We understand that the initial ratings were reviewed and revised yesterday, and that our application's rating was downgraded to a 2, indicating that our application is eligible for funding but that it has "some substantive weaknesses". No weaknesses had been identified when the panel finished discussing our application on Tuesday, and as we were not here during yesterday's deliberations, we are unsure of what these "substantive weaknesses" are.

Colfax County was awarded a CFRP grant in 2006 for approximately \$100,000, to prepare the Sugarite Stewardship Plan and to obtain NEPA clearance on the area that is discussed in our collaborative group's current proposal. We completed that planning, and our project is ready for implementation. We feel that our proposal is a good one and in fact, Walter Dunn made a comment during our proposal's review on Tuesday, stating that our proposal had "clearly addressed the weaknesses and recommendations" that the panel made on our application last year.

We understand that our application has a chance to be funded even with a criteria rating of 2, and hope that the CFRP panel will consider our strong proposal along with the project planning that has already taken place, before making their funding recommendations for 2010.

Thank you,

Amy Ewing

Also attached to Amy Ewing's letter was the following letter:

Mr. Walter Dunn, CFRP Program Manager

And CFRP Technical Advisory Panel

U.S. Forest Service

333 Broadway SE
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

Re: Letter of commitment for Jean-Luc Cartron, Ph.D.

Dear Mr. Dunn and CFRP Technical Advisory Panel:

Jean-Luc Cartron, Ph.D. has performed numerous biological surveys for the Sugarite projects over the last few years, including performing surveys of the areas that the City of Raton and its collaborative partners have since received NEPA clearance (which encompass the proposed project area for the City of Raton's current CFRP grant application (CFRP 08-10).

Dr. Cartron's role of performing both pre- and post-treatment biological monitoring is defined in the City of Raton's grant application (Table 1 on page 5), but a letter of commitment from Dr. Carton was not included with the application. Dr. Cartron is currently in France, and we were unable to get a letter of commitment from him today, although per my conversations with Dr. Cartron, I am willing to vouch for him being committed to performing this work. I am attaching an email that Dr. Cartron sent to Amy Ewing, the Daniel B Stephens & Associates project manager for the Sugarite projects to this letter stating that he "is available to do surveys for DB Stephens whenever you need me to".

Dr. Cartron has done a terrific job for us on these projects and we look forward to his continued involvement in the Sugarite watershed projects. Please feel free to contact me with any questions at 505-822-9400.

Sincerely,

DANIEL B. STEPHENS & ASSOCATES, INC.

/S/ John Burkstaller, P.E.
Vice-President, Water Resources

Also attached to Amy Ewing's letter was the following letter:

From: jlec@unm.edu

Sent: Monday, May 03, 2010 4:26 PM

To: Ewing, Amy

Subject: Sugarite

Hi Amy,

Dominique just told me that you are going to Sugarite tomorrow. I only work part time for the SAIC and I am still available to do surveys for DB Stephens whenever you need me to. Hope all's well!

Jean-Luc

8:49 a.m.

Public Comment

07/22/2010

For Public Comment to the CFRP Grant Panel:

To prepare our proposal we referred to the table of affected tribes for each national forest that appears in Appendix D of the 2010 request for proposals. We sent letters and a complete copy of our proposal to each affected tribe listed for the Santa Fe National Forest.

Anne Bradley

*Fire and Forests Program Manager
The Nature Conservancy in New Mexico*

8:50 a.m. Public Comment

From: Ruben D. Montes

Subject: Re: CFRP application

Date: February 23, 2010 3:09:08 PM MST

To: mlect@comcast.net

Hey Arturo,

No need for letter of endorsement from us if there are no treatments on FS lands. However, you will need a letter of endorsement from the land grant board or similar. A letter of support from us might be nice to have (though not required).

If you send me a draft letter of support I might be able to get it signed by our acting forest supervisor in time for you to include in your proposal before Monday.

8:52 a.m. Review of Proposals that were Introduced during the Public Comment Period.

Proposal CFRP 10-10

-Dunn – The weakness was the acreage figures in the proposal were inconsistent.

No comments from Panel.

Proposal CFRP 08-10

-Dunn – There should be a letter of commitment from Dr. Catron.

-Bird – Is there not an e-mail from Dr. Catron? Burnett – Yes, but it does not include any budget. San Gil – He is not being paid, he is in-kind. He will be a contractor. Berrens – Dr. Catron works for Daniel Stephens so will they not be paying him as a contractor? San Gil – Even though they are calling him a contractor, he may actually be a sub recipient. Dunn – In our discussions yesterday we went through some effort to clarify the RFA that requires there be a letter of support from any project partner who has a clear role in the project. I feel we are bound by that.

Proposal CFRP 27-10

-Dunn – The Weakness: A sample letter to the tribes is included, but no list of tribes is provided.

-Bird – Because the confirmation comes after the deadline is closed, does that change anything? Dunn – The RFA is clear on this. Burnett – Proposal 34-10 that we reviewed for consistency, we allowed the applicant to tell us that they

sent the letter to the tribes. It seems that to be consistent I would suggest that this Weakness be moved to Recommendations. Dunn – Let's look at CFRP 34-10. I suggest that we change the wording to "Identify the tribes that the letter was sent to" and put it under Recommendations and remove the Weakness.

9:03 a.m. Reuben – If you accept one letter of support, why will you not accept the other?

Dunn – We in this panel have to determine if we have minor administrative observations or substantive weakness. We have to determine whether we feel a missing letter from a major partner means the project may not move forward. If we are missing a letter of support from an entity that will not mean the project cannot move forward, then it was determined to be an Administrative Observation.

Proposal CFRP 33-10

9:06 a.m. Olivas and Archuleta recuses themselves.

9:06 a.m. Dunn – Anytime an item has a substantive weakness, it automatically puts the proposal into Category 2.

San Gil – Weakness: The proposal does not include a letter from the Forest Service describing their role in the NEPA process. The use of CFRP funds for this planning grant is the federal nexus that triggers NEPA. Weakness: The ecological and socio-economic monitoring plan does not address the specific objectives of the project. The monitoring and evaluation plan was not updated since the previous submittal. The plan includes old partners such as Bernalillo High School and the San Antonio De Las Huertas Land Grant.

-Dunn – We spent a great deal of time determining when we need to include a weakness when there is a missing letter. Bird – The 2nd weakness is insurmountable. The Forest Service is telling the proponent one thing and the Panel is telling them another. Dunn – This proposal is for CFRP funding for NEPA planning on a Land Grant. The responsible federal agency is the Forest Service. Because the Forest Service is the responsible federal agency that has to sign the NEPA decision, they are a project partner; there must be a letter from the Forest Service committing them to that role. Even if the DOD or some other federal agency were to do the NEPA, there would still need to be a letter from the responsible federal agency committing to that role. Burnett – The CRFP coordinator advised the applicant that they did not need a letter. They were misled. I feel it should be moved to a Recommendation.

-Bird – At some point in the future we should get some clarity from the Forest Service. Dunn – We will continue to clarify the methodology when CFRP grants will be doing the work with the Forest Service. Dunn – The Forest Service can adopt a decision document from another agency.

-San Gil – Should we consider in the RFA?

9:14 a.m. Olivas and Archuleta return.

9:15 a.m. -Dunn – The next step is to add up the Category "1"s.

-San Gil – There are 18 Proposals in Category 1. The total dollar amount is \$5,520,662. The available funding is \$4,010,237.00.

-Dunn – One way to do this is to go down the list and if there are projects that no one has any flags that go up, then we put that in a list to go forward. If flags go up, we put that into the matrix for further discussion. The projects that have no discussion would move forward and the ones that we have discussion on should possibly go into the matrix. The panel is open to make suggestions.

-Cooper – I feel each one should go into the matrix to treat them all fairly.

-San Gil – There are 4 projects that had no weaknesses and no discussion. You might want to take exception with these 4 and move them forward.

-Archuleta – As a senior panel member, the difference from past panels is that we haven't let projects with weaknesses move into Category 1 this year.

-Berrens – Some projects may be great and have some Recommendations. We have been very strict this year about Category 1. The easy path of going through and finding projects with no weaknesses is really gone. I feel we should use the matrix on all of them.

-Burnett – I feel that the way the Categories are written, it is really weakness based. I feel the matrix would look at the strengths.

-Marosy – The matrix elements are:

#1 -Is the project part of a longer term and/or landscape level comprehensive collaborative forest restoration effort?

#2 -Does the project include an activity that is new and adds value to CFRP?

#3 -Will the project generate benefits after the grant period?

#4 -Are there diverse partners with clearly defined contributions?

#5 -Would the project add significant capacity for forest restoration?

-Berrens – Concerning, #1, we need to think about things like is a CWPP present, do we want to treat that? If we do, then we open up the door to everything in this category. Is this something beyond that? Is there a larger plan that is present?

-Matush – To me the key word is landscape. It just has to cover a certain landscape area. The key here is, can you adequately treat a landscape and walk away from it without any more CFRP funding.

-Burnett – I would be hesitant to set rules around the matrix. I feel like this is going back to the weakness base. Let's not focus in on things like this. We know from experience that a lot of the implementation grants are 200-400 acres. Are you making a huge impact on the landscape? We shouldn't be putting a barrier on this because over time they could be making a huge impact on the landscape. This doesn't mean we shouldn't be funding these small implementation projects that over time will lead to this.

-Dunn – You might have a project which over the years has cumulatively resulted in a large portion of land base being treated. They are building on what has happened in previous projects. Maybe a project does a particular piece of data collection that will contribute to a larger landscape effort. We need to envision the project being successfully implemented and what the contribution will be.

-Matush – There is not enough money unless CFRP wants to start prioritizing some of the watersheds. Until the Forest Service starts to step up and do their job with the NEPA and assist the CFRP program, this won't happen.

-Berrens – I would like to talk to the categories in a general way. When this has worked well has been when the panel has decided a project is really distinctive in one of the categories. All we can do as a group is try to figure out what are the best-of-the-best. You have to really be distinctive or we will not solve the task before us.

-Burnett – I feel #1 is putting an emphasis on the larger landscape planning projects. Where do the smaller, community implementation projects fit? We need to remember that individually the smaller projects may not be what we consider landscape level but they may accumulate to be something larger. Implementation costs more than planning. We shouldn't penalize the ones that are planning to do the work on the ground.

-Cooke – We have several proposals that are re-tooling their businesses which will allow them to use the different age classes. This will also improve the economies of the communities. There are more ways to implement a landscape area than through CFRP money.

-Matush – I don't think CFRP money should be used for planning, that is the Forest Service job. If I don't see more funding sources come in to help CFRP, I don't think it's collaborative.

-Gomez – Collaborative forest restoration effort is the key to #1.

-Burnett – I think our discussion is reflecting that all of the Proposals in Category 1 would go into #1 in the matrix.

-Matush - #2 – Can anyone give me an example of something that is new?

-Archuleta – It could be something that adds to utilization, a new collaboration, something that changes the way we do forest restoration.

-San Gil – It really needs to be distinctive in the project, or this matrix will not help.

-Cooke – To me “new” also includes retooling for creating new products. Taking the resources and learning a new way to use them.

-Berrens – I would agree that new utilization would fall into this category. It could also be a new group of people who come together to try to figure out rules for their interactions to try to move forward.

-Fisher – New could also be used as an innovative way to bring new people on board to learn about the Forest.

-Watson – It could bring together different groups of people who normally would not work together.

-Fisher – What about projects that are asking for funding to continue what they are doing.

-Archuleta – I think it needs to be case-by-case.

9:50 a.m.

Application Evaluation

CFRP 02-10

- 9:52 a.m. -Burnett recuses herself and leaves the room.
-Bird – 1?, 2 , 3X, 4X ,5?
-Fisher – I agree.

CFRP 03-10

- 9:54 a.m. -Cooke - 1?, 2, 3X, 4X, 5?
9:55 a.m. -Burnett returns.
-Matush, Fisher – Agree
-Bird – How does it add significant capacity?
-Watson – It contributes to an overall landscape. I suggest adding #2.
-Archuleta – Wouldn't that be captured better in #1 instead of #5?
-Watson – I think it adds additional value to an existing program.
-Matush – I agree with Ann. Because of the huge exposure this area gets, if it is done right, it would definitely add to the value and capacity. The public would recognize that CFRP was the kind of program that they could benefit from.
-Archuleta – Is the project really new and adds value?
-Matush – Is this new to CFRP or new to landscape restoration?
-Watson – I'm looking at new and what adds value as two separate items.
-Matush – I think it adds value to CFRP. I don't think there is such a thing as new when it comes to restoration projects and collaboration. It could add a huge amount of value to the CFRP program if the project was done right.
-San Gil – The intent behind the word “new” was new to CFRP.
-Archuleta – We would have to rely on the Forest Service staff that has been with CFRP to let us know what a new project is. We are dealing with Proposals that are all in Category 1 so they will all add value. In my mind this does not qualify for #2.
-Cooke – This is a planning proposal, in the planning proposals there are lots of CWPPs out there. This is not a new thing. The active planning would not add capacity to this. I think you should take out #2 and #5.
-Matush – When you do a project like this, the public will read about it. It will add capacity because it will be advertised by Taos Ski Valley and will educate the public on CFRP.
-Archuleta – Not sure you're going to get that much bang for your buck from tourists. This would all take place after the planning stage.
-Watson – I agree with what Archuleta says, right now it is not adding capacity.
-Berrens – I agree with Mike. This is critical in facilitating the ability to do other things. This is a high use area with mixed landowners. It is a fairly unique set of circumstances that will add capacity.

-Matush – I know Walter is trying to help but I also sense bias.

1?, 2 , 3X, 4?, 5?

CFRP 05-10

10:13 a.m. -Burnett recuses herself from the discussion.

-Pohlman – This does have long-term landscape level comprehensive collaborative forest restoration efforts. There is a great variance of partners and I especially like the youth component and the strong element of training youth. In that element it adds to forest restoration. I would suggest #4, 5.

-Cooper – At this rate, this is not going to be a useful process. We need to make sure the proposal is really distinctive.

-Matush – I agree with Pohlman, but I'm not sure it meets the capacity standard.
Bird – I agree.

-Cooper – I don't really think any of the previous projects add significant capacity for forest restoration.

-Archuleta – I would argue that the significant capacity for the youth would do it. You are targeting youth at a young age.

-Fisher – When it says significant capacity, Rocky Mountain Youth Corps will be incorporating 8 youth a year. Is that a significant capacity?

-Archuleta – If you look at that long-term, that is 27 youth who could possibly be contractors or do work in forest restoration.

-Watson – I think if it wasn't for the grantees doing this work, it would not get done. How can you say this would not be adding capacity to forest restoration?

-Matush – Not sure those 27 youth make a significant capacity compared to the Taos Ski Valley.

-Matush – I think significant is the amount of dollars that come into New Mexico at this time. The amount of dollars that could be generated in the Taos Ski Valley could be largely significant.

-Cooper – I think training and educating 27 youth is a significant amount.

-Archuleta – I would like to add that the way I'm looking at this is to look at the proposal and how the funding is being used.

-Matush – I am confident that if Taos Ski Valley burned down and we lost that revenue, funding would come out of the legislature.

-Fisher – I don't think the tourists provide a lasting effect.

-Pohlman – The length of exposure to the kids in the program could one day really benefit the program. This could be just the jump-start that they need. I have a lot of enthusiasm for the Youth Corps proposals because of what I feel it could bring.

-Berrens – I look at projects that allow us to get out and scale-out on forest restoration. The problem I have with the Taos Ski Valley is that their diverse partners were not clearly defined.

-Cooke – A lot of what we’re talking about is speculation in regards to the youth. Because the youth might grow up and become restoration experts does not add significant capacity in my mind.

-Matush – EPA used to have tons of money to train youth and their experience did not pay off well.

-Archuleta – In regards to Berrens’ comments, I would agree to take out #4 on Proposal CFRP 03-10 and also on CFRP 05-10.

-Marosy – I would remind the Panel that these items need to be “clearly” defined.

-Berrens – One of the ways this has worked is people would put up a proposal in a category and then see if anyone has any questions?

-Fisher – On Rocky Mountain Youth Corps, they just completed a huge grant project. Is this going to continue to need CFRP funding?

-Olivas – On CFRP 03-10, a large amount of this is in a Wilderness Area. I propose to take out #5.

-Cooke – The intent of the training youth element is to train people to do forest restoration, learn new skills, and train the unemployed and then the youth component.

-Payne – The process in the past has been, go through this quickly. If anyone has a problem, do not put an “X” in the matrix.

1?, 2 ,3X, 4X, 5?

CFRP 06-10

10:39 a.m. 1?,2 , 3X, 4?, ,5

CFRP 07-10

10:40 a.m. 1?,2 ?, 3X, 4X, 5?

CFRP 09-10

10:45 a.m. 1?,2 ?, 3X, 4X, 5X

CFRP 11-10

10:49 a.m. 1?,2 ?,3 ?,4 ?, 5X

CFRP 13-10

10:51 a.m. 1?,2 ?, 3X, 4X, 5?

10:51 a.m. -Burnett recuses herself from the discussion.

CFRP 17-10

10:54 a.m. -Cooke recuses himself from the discussion.

1X, 2X, 3X, 4?, 5?

CFRP 21-10

10:56 a.m. -Cooper recuses herself from the discussion.

1X,2 , 3X, 4X, 5?

CFRP 23-10

10:59 a.m. 1?, 2 , 3X, 4?,5 ?

CFRP 24-10

11:00 a.m. 1X, 2?, 3X , 4?, 5X

CFRP 27-10

11:03 a.m. 1?,2 ?,3 ?, 4X, 5?

-Cooper recuses herself from the discussion.

CFRP 28-10

11:04 a.m. 1X,2?, 3X, 4X, 5X

CFRP 30-10

11:05 a.m. 1?, 2?, 3X, 4X, 5?

11:05 a.m. -Bird recuses himself from the discussion.

CFRP 31-10

11: 07 a.m. -Bird and Olivas recuse themselves from the discussion and leave the room.

11:07 a.m. 1?, 2 , 3X, 4X, 5?

CFRP 32-10

11:08 a.m. -Fisher recuses herself from the discussion.

-Bird and Olivas return.

11:09 a.m. 1?,2 ?, 3X, 4X, 5?

CFRP 34-10

11:10 a.m. -Bird and Cooper recuse themselves from the discussion.

11:11 a.m. 1?, 2?, 3X, 4X, 5?

11:44 a.m. -Pohlman – Maybe there is a different way we could look at this. Coleman did some math and figured out what the average request was, just over \$300,000. There are 13 proposals that we would have enough funding for. Could each Panel member choose their top 13, then we would see where the greatest group consensus was, then look at that and try to decide which ones could be funded. We would look for consensus and try to identify some proposals that the group could agree upon.

-Dunn – I would suggest that if you do it this way that you use dots.

-San Gil – I can do it on the screen.

-Burnett – We need to have a way to gauge which proposals have the most support.

-Berrens – I think this is a reasonable way to try to accomplish something. We are not all going to agree. I am fine with it but I would slightly lower the number of proposals.

11:53 a.m. -Bird has left and will not return to the meeting. Cooper will act as his proxy.

- 11:54 a.m. -Dunn – The group has to reach consensus.
- Berrens – Would people like to consider a moment of advocacy?
- Archuleta – Let’s settle on a number of proposals that are in our top.
- Dunn – The one thing I do need to remind you of is that you need to stay within the process in the RFA. We might want to say which ones best meet the criteria in the matrix. We cannot pick favorites. If you are going to pick the ones that best meet the matrix criteria, then that is O.K.
- Archuleta – We are not getting away from the matrix. We will use these to come up with our top proposals.
- Cooper – What about the proposals that a Panel member may have a stake in? Is this a conflict of interest?
- Payne – I think that is a really good reason to use a smaller number of proposals. You will need to recuse yourself if you have an interest in a project.
- Archuleta – You cannot rank a project that you have been involved in. I think we should do our top 8.
- Burnett – What I would like to do is use the matrix to help me make an informed decision. Then just ask how many people had each proposal in their top 8.
- Archuleta – Then if we need to advocate for any proposal, we can do that.
- 12:04 p.m. Marosy – Each Panel member will have 10 minutes to identify their top 8 proposals. We will then take a look at the results, discuss as necessary and use the consensus process.
- 12:16 p.m. **CFRP 02-10 - 8 Panel members had in their top 8**
- CFRP 03-10 - 2 Panel members had in their top 8**
- CFRP 05-10 - 5 Panel members had in their top 8**
- CFRP 06-10- 5 Panel members had in their top 8**
- CFRP 07-10 - 5 Panel members had in their top 8**
- CFRP 09-10 - 7 Panel members had in their top 8**
- CFRP 11-10 - 6 Panel members had in their top 8**
- CFRP 13-10 - 2 Panel members had in their top 8**
- CFRP 17-10 - 5 Panel members had in their top 8**
- CFRP 21 -10 - 6 Panel members had in their top 8**
- CFRP 23-10 - 3 Panel members had in their top 8**
- CFRP 24-10 - 5 Panel members had in their top 8**
- CFRP 27-10 - 6 Panel members had in their top 8**
- CFRP 28-10 - 10 Panel members had in their top 8**
- CFRP 30-10 - 4 Panel members had in their top 8**
- CFRP 31-10 - 9 Panel members had in their top 8**

CFRP 32-10 - 6 Panel members had in their top 8

CFRP 34-10 - 5 Panel members had in their top 8

- 12:16 p.m. -Archuleta – Lets go with the ones that have the most panel member votes.
- 12:26 p.m. -Berrens – I recommend that we recommend CFRP 28-10 for funding. All agree.
- Archuleta – I recommend that we recommend CFRP 31-10 for funding. All agree.
- Archuleta – I recommend that we recommend CFRP 02-10 for funding. All agree.
- Berrens – I recommend that we recommend CFRP 09-10 for funding. All agree.
- Pohlman – I recommend that we recommend CFRP 11-10 for funding. All agree.
- Watson – I recommend that we recommend CFRP 21-10 for funding. All agree.
- Berrens _- I recommend that we recommend CFRP 27-10 for funding. All agree.
- Berrens – I recommend that we recommend CFRP 32-10 for funding. All agree.
- Berrens – Could San Gil please add up all the Proposals that had 5 Panel member votes and see what the dollar amount is? If you fund all of the “5”s you are over funded by \$260,104.00.
- Berrens – I think now we need to open the floor up to all proposals.
- Cooke – I think we should only look at the projects that received at least 5 votes from the Panel members.
- Pohlman – I propose we look at all of the projects left. Gomez – I concur.
- Archuleta – I understand that as an issue, but the proposals that received 5 should be reviewed and debated. Let’s start with the “5”s.
- Burnett – I feel we should be able to look at all of the proposals now.
- Marosy – When this type of a tool is used, when you are asked to choose your top 8, that does not translate into we are only selecting the top 8.
- Watson – I think we should consider everything.
- Payne – How are you going to move forward? Start with the “5”s and discuss them and then go from there. This might help determine if you need to go past those proposals.
- Archuleta – I don’t think we need to go back and debate all of the proposals again.
- Gomez – We could go back and from the remaining proposals, choose our top 5 from there.
- Berrens – I agree with what Gomez said. I think we should go through the proposals and now choose our top 5 proposals.
- Cooke – I don’t agree, now you’re going to throw out part of your initial sort. I think we should stick with the “5”s that are remaining.

- Fisher – I agree with Cooke.
- Archuleta – I agree with Gomez – I think that is a good idea to go back and choose your top 4 proposals.
- 12:54 p.m. Re-rank your top 4 proposals from the remaining 10 that are in Category 1.
- 1:01 p.m. **CFRP 03-10- 2 Panel members had in their top 4**
CFRP 05-10- 5 Panel members had in their top 4
CFRP 06-10- 5 Panel members had in their top 4
CFRP 07-10- 4 Panel members had in their top 4
CFRP 13-10- 2 Panel members had in their top 4
CFRP 17-10- 8 Panel members had in their top 4
CFRP 23-10- 2 Panel members had in their top 4
CFRP 24-10- 5 Panel members had in their top 4
CFRP 30-10- 6 Panel members had in their top 4
CFRP 34-10- 5 Panel members had in their top 4
- 1:06 p.m. -Archuleta – I recommend that we recommend CFRP 17-10 for funding. All agree.
- Olivas - I recommend that we recommend CFRP 30-10 for funding. All agree.
- 1:16 p.m. -Cooke – Of the remaining 4 proposals, I would like to discuss them in relation to the matrix.
- Cooke – CFRP 24-10 is the epitome of what a proposal should be. It is going to create jobs, reforest. To me it is one of the top proposals and meets all of the criteria.
- Cooper – I agree.
- Matush – I agree, I think this proposal is what the CFRP is all about.
- Archuleta – I recommend that we recommend CFRP 24-10 for funding. All agree.
- Berrens – I think we need to look at the other proposals prior to recommending any funding. I would like to argue for CFRP 34-10. I think this offers a real opportunity. It is an opportunity to push the idea of landscape assessment. I thought it was one of the best planning proposals.
- Watson – I agree with Berrens.
- Olivas – I would like to discuss CFRP 06-10. This was a treatment grant and a funding grant for NEPA. It includes expanding NEPA to 5,000 acres and would open the landscape for additional treatment. I advocate because it is both a treatment and planning proposal.
- Matush – CFRP 06-10 is predominately state lands. They also did not include their soil types.
- Gomez – CFRP 34-10 has a very low cost per acre.

-Pohlman – I concur with CFRP 34-10. CFRP 05-10 is a combination of an implementation and a planning proposal and is multi-jurisdiction. It also includes a Firewise component and a youth component.

-Archuleta – CFRP 07-10 is a restoration project that I really like. It was a community land grant that lost their common lands. I see this building on long-term relationships. The more funding and programs that do treatments will actually help build the relationship between the Forest Service and the community.

-Archuleta – One of the objectives of the CFRP is to introduce prescribed fire regimes back into the forests.

-Cooke – I recommend that we recommend CFRP 24-10 for funding.

-Gomez – I concur with funding CFRP 24-10.

-Olivas – I recommend that we recommend CFRP 06-10 for funding.

-Matush – I disagree because of the State lands within CFRP 06-10.

-Cooper – I hear Matush’s perspective on this, but that issue is not part of the matrix.

-Archuleta – Although the public may not have access, it is by definition public land and I’m sure there would be some type of benefit.

-Olivas – I would like to show support for CFRP 05-10. I think it will reduce hazardous fuels in the area and provide youth to do the work.

-Berrens – I would like to show my support for CFRP 34-10.

-Matush – Is CFRP 34-10 applicant here? Can you and will you use the soils in your planning and maximize your post profiles to go find fuels in this project?
Proponent – Yes we will. It was omitted only to shorten the proposal.

-Matush – I would show my support for CFRP 34-10 then.

1:33p.m.

-Berrens – Lets go through the process one more time and pick your top 2.

CFRP 05-10- 5 Panel members had in their top 2

CFRP 06-10- 6 Panel members had in their top 2

CFRP 07-10- 5 Panel members had in their top 2

CFRP 34-10- 6 Panel members had in their top 2

-Olivas – I recommend that we recommend CFRP 06-10 and CFRP 34-10 for funding.

1:33p.m

-Archuleta – Can we take the remaining 2 proposals back to the Forest Service to go back and see if these 2 proposals can accomplish anything with the remaining \$117,382.

-Dunn – You can also recommend partial funding.

-Fisher – I propose for the panel to consider CFRP 33-10 be recommended for funding.

-Archuleta – I recuse myself from the discussion.

-Burnett – There are other projects in Category 2 that fall within that funding level. If we are going to go back and look at all the proposals, we need to be able to review all of them.

-San Gil – You can choose to fund a project in its entirety or you can choose to partially fund a project.

-Burnett – There are 3 projects to consider that would fall within the \$117,382 funding.

-Matush – I would lean towards CFRP 22-10.

-Cooper – I think we have gone through a process to find the best proposals. I feel that the last two proposals we choose could probably both use partial funding.

-Burnett – I agree with Cooper. I think we need to look at the two proposals for partial funding. The proposals that fall within the funding include weaknesses.

-Fisher – I want to stick to my proposal. I would rather see one proposal completely funded rather than partially funding a proposal.

-Archuleta – Let's rank the two that could receive partial funding. Each Panel member would pick their top 1.

-Dunn – Partial funding gets messy, because then you essentially have a different proposal. In the absence of clearly defined pieces, it's problematic.

-Payne – The only time I would tell you it was appropriate would be in a project that is long-term and you could just fund the first year.

-Archuleta – We could actually fund just one year on either of the projects. CFRP 05-10 and CFRP 07-10.

-Olivas – I am in favor of funding CFRP 33-10.

-Burnett – We need to select one that gets partial funding. We can select one of the remaining three as the 3rd option.

-Dunn – Come up with projects that meet the funding and then give me two in-pocket projects.

-Watson – I would support funding CFRP 33-10.

-Archuleta – Let's prioritize the two on the table and go from there.

-Matush – I agree with funding CFRP 33-10.

-Archuleta – It is not a problem if a CFRP proposal comes back for another grant next year.

-Fisher – Can we ask for a vote on this?

-Archuleta – I suggest we pick the top 1 of the ones that remain on the table and rank them.

-Cooke – I concur with Archuleta.

-Gomez – If we are doing this, then we need to bring in all of the projects that are within this funding level.

- Payne – The Projects in Category 2 have a weakness that would need to be addressed.
- 2:04 p.m. Vote on whether the Panel wishes to partially fund a project – 6
Vote on whether the Panel wishes to fully fund a project - 4
- 2:07 p.m. Burnett recuses herself from the discussion.
This will be the poll to determine the partial funding.
CFRP 05-10- 4 Panel members had this as their top priority.
CFRP 07-10- 5 Panel members had this as their top priority.
- 2:10 p.m. **Panel – Recommends CFRP 07-10 for partial funding.**
-Dunn - Every other year we have had a subcommittee to look at the multiparty assessments that have been completed for previously funded CFRP projects. I can see if, at a later date, if any of the Panel members would serve on this subcommittee. The subcommittee then reports back to this committee what they have found in the multiparty assessments.
-Dunn – The Panel members could also send me any ideas they may have that would improve the RFA process and the Application Evaluation Process.
-Matush – I find it very hard to be on this Panel without individuals getting irritated. I need to be able to express my opinions in order to be able to continue on this Panel.
-Fisher – I feel sometimes individuals try to shut some of the Panel members down. It is also intimidating.
-Dunn – The Panel has the alternative to choose another Chairman. There are several committees who do not like the idea of me being the Chairman of this committee.
- 2:17 p.m. - Fisher to Dunn – Your knowledge on this Panel is invaluable.
-Berrens – I appreciate everyone’s passion and we just completed a very difficult task.
-Dunn – Another task for the subcommittee would be to discuss the option of discussing the 3 different types of funding proposals: planning, treatment and utilizations.
- 2:28 p.m. -Dunn – The Secretary of Agriculture has to approve your recommendations. The Deadline is August 22, 2010. I have not heard back on the Decision Memo on the delegation of authority. My job will be take ensure that all of your recommendations get funded. The minute I know about that, I will send you all an e-mail.
-Dunn – If anyone has any items to bring forward to the 2010 Annual CFRP workshop, please let me know.
- 2:32 p.m. Meeting adjourned.

Appendix 1 - Suggestions for Improvement

- Include fire behavior in the 15-year monitoring
- Subcommittee process: Do results of a project open up the door for subsequent projects?
- Use past performance, if applicable, to help narrow down list on Friday.
- On Page 11 of the RFA, fix the error on Item 19 regarding “B” vs “C”.
- Delete Weakness #27 from boilerplate list.
- Include definition of “Conservation Organization” in the RFA.
- In the RFA guidance for preparing maps, include direction to include township and range.
- In the RFA, address the need to address socio-economic factors, monitoring in restoration treatment, utilization vs. planning, and NEPA compliance projects.
- Improve the description in the RFA of what is required regarding tribal letters.
- Include direction to first address the core objectives clearly up-front.
- Define a weakness as something that will be a bump in the project.

Appendix 2 – Boilerplate Strengths

Which of the following strengths does the proposal demonstrate?

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.

Appendix 3- Boilerplate Weaknesses

Which of the following weaknesses does the proposal demonstrate?

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. Pinon-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.

Appendix 4 – Boilerplate 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).

Appendix 5 - Consistency Check Items Identified

Focus on the proposals that are presently rated as 1's or 2's.

Weakness: A letter of commitment from partners or collaborators is missing. Is the missing letter from a partner with an active role, such as a non-federal match? Can the project go forward as written, without the consent/contribution of this partner presented in a letter?

Administrative observation: Missing letter of support from a potential project participant who is not critical to project implementation.

Check to see if administrative observations or recommendations are not actually weaknesses.

Weakness: The NEPA Decision Document is not attached for an implementation project that depends upon that Decision Document.

Weakness: The youth component is proposed as an objective but is not clearly described and monitored. Note: Proposals without youth component should not be penalized.

Strength: Training/Youth component is included and clearly explained.

Weakness: For proposed projects on traditional lands a letter from or to the affected tribes or pueblos was not included. The list of affected tribes is presented on page 29 of the RFP. It is acceptable to include a sample letter with a list of the tribes or pueblos who it was sent to.

Appendix 6 – Table and Summary of Matrix Process

Proposal #	Lead Organization	Is the project part of a longer term and/or landscape level comprehensive collaborative forest restoration effort?	Does the project include an activity that is new and adds value to CFRP?	Will the project generate benefits after the grant period?	Are there diverse partners with clearly defined contributions?	Would the project add significant capacity for forest restoration?	1st tier # in top 8 of 18	2nd tier # in top 4 of 10	3rd tier # in top 2 of 4
CFRP 28-10	Griegos Logging LLC	X	?	X	X	X	10		
CFRP 31-10, Rev. 1	Southwest Wood Products & Thinning	?		X	X	?	9		
CFRP 02-10 Rev. 1	Chimayo Conservation Corps.	?		x	x	?	8		
CFRP 09-10, Rev. 1	Andy Chacon Forest Restoration Company	?	?	X	X	X	7		
CFRP 11-10	Mt. Taylor Machine, LLC	?	?	?	?	X	6		
CFRP 21-10	The Nature Conservancy	x		x	x	?	6		
CFRP 27-10	The Nature Conservancy	?	?	?	X	?	6		
CFRP 32-10	Aspen Forest Products	?	?	x	x	?	6		
CFRP 17-10	South Central Mountain Resource Conservation and Development Council, Inc.	X	X	X	?	?	5	8	
CFRP 30-10, Rev. 1	Santa Fe County Fire Department	?	?	X	X	?	4	6	
CFRP 24-10	Kellar Logging, Inc.	x	?	x	?	x	5	5	
CFRP 06-10	HR Vigil Small Products	?		x	?		5	5	6
CFRP 34-10	Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona	?	?	x	x	?	5	5	6
CFRP 05-10	Questa/Lama WUI Multi-jurisdictional Forest	?		x	x	?	5	5	5

Appendix 6 – Table and Summary of Matrix Process

Proposal #	Lead Organization	Is the project part of a longer term and/or landscape level comprehensive collaborative forest restoration effort?	Does the project include an activity that is new and adds value to CFRP?	Will the project generate benefits after the grant period?	Are there diverse partners with clearly defined contributions?	Would the project add significant capacity for forest restoration?	1st tier # in top 8 of 18	2nd tier # in top 4 of 10	3rd tier # in top 2 of 4
	Restoration								
CFRP 07-10, Rev. 1	Rocky Mountain Youth Corps	?	?	X	X	?	5	4	5
CFRP 23-10	Jaramillo & Sons Forest Products	?		x	?	?	3	2	
CFRP 03-10	Village of Taos Ski Valley	?		x	?	?	2	2	
CFRP 13-10	Alamo Navajo School Board, Inc.	?	?	X	X	?	2	2	

Summary of Matrix Process followed by panel:

The Panel ranked 18 of the 34 proposals in Category 1. They decided to review all 18 using the 5 matrix criteria. They reviewed each proposal individually.

If **all** agreed, the proposal received an "x" in the criteria. If **all** agreed, a proposal received "no x" in the criteria. If **anyone** disagreed the proposal received a "?" in the criteria.

Then the panel discussed and decided to individually prioritize their top 8 proposals. They tabulated their priorities and ranked the proposals. That number is shown in above table under column titled "1st tier - # in top 8 of 18". They funded the top 8 proposals ranked this way. (28,31,02,09,11,21,27 and 32)

Then they decided to individually prioritize their top 4 of the remaining 10 proposals. They tabulated that number and it is shown in column titled "2nd tier # in top 4 of 10". Then they funded 3 of the top 4 proposals ranked this way. (17,30 and 24)

At that point they had funds remaining for perhaps two more, so they prioritized the top 2 of the 4 highest-priority remaining proposals. (See column titled 3rd tier - top 2 of 4) They funded the top two and then the remaining two were considered "in the pocket" since they could not be funded. (06 and 34)

Then they decided to use the remaining funds to partially fund one of these two projects. They then prioritized number 5 over number 7, recommended number 5 for partial funding and put number 7 in the pocket.