



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest  
Service

**Southwestern  
Region**

August 2010



# **Project Funding Recommendations and Proposed Evaluation Comments**

## **2010 Technical Advisory Panel Collaborative Forest Restoration Program**

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

June 2009

# Contents

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Proposal Review Process.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Proposals .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Evaluation Matrix .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Appendix A. Technical Advisory Panel Bylaws.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Appendix B. Technical Advisory Panel Members (2010-2012).....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Appendix C: Common Proposal Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>61</b>



# Executive Summary

The Collaborative Forest Restoration Program (CFRP) Technical Advisory Panel met in Albuquerque, New Mexico, July 19-23, 2010, to provide the USDA Forest Service with recommendations on which project proposals submitted for funding under the CFRP best met the objectives of the program. The Panel was chartered for two years as a Federal Advisory Committee on May 4, 2010 (DR 1042-138) pursuant to the Community Forest Restoration Act of 2000 (Title VI, Pub. L. No. 106-393). Twelve of the 15 Panel members attended the meeting. Danny Gomez, Lawrence Vincent, and Daniel Barrone were not available to attend due to prior commitments.

The Panel reviewed their responsibilities as a Federal Advisory Committee, approved Bylaws, reviewed 34 proposals requesting \$10,607,267 in Federal funding, provided recommendations for improving the Panel review process and Request for Applications (RFA), and outlined tasks for the CFRP Technical Advisory Panel Subcommittee for the review of Completed Multi-Party Assessments. The Panel recommended 14 of the 34 proposals for funding, totaling \$4,070,037, which corresponds with the funding available for CFRP grants in 2010.

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

This report includes: Strengths, weaknesses, and funding recommendations for each 2010 CFRP grant application; Recommendations for improving the proposal review process and the Request for Applications (RFA); and Tasks for the CFRP Technical Advisory Panel Subcommittee for the Review of Completed Multi-Party Assessments. This report, the Meeting Minutes (including the meeting agenda), and the Panel Charter can be obtained on the CFRP website (<http://www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/cfrp>) or by contacting Walter Dunn, USDA Forest Service, 333 Broadway Blvd. SE, Albuquerque, NM 87102, telephone (506) 842-3425.

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

08/06/2000  
Date



# Proposal Review Process

## Evaluation Criteria

The Panel evaluated each project proposal using the following criteria:

1. Does the proposed project meet the eligibility requirements of the program in Section III and follow the format described in Section IV of the Request for Proposals?
2. Will the proposed project reduce the threat of large, high intensity wildfires and the negative effects of excessive competition between trees by restoring ecosystem functions (including healthy watersheds), structures, and species composition, including the reduction of non-native species populations on Federal, Tribal, State, eligible Land Grant, County, and Municipal forest lands?
3. Will the proposed project re-establish fire regimes approximating those that shaped forest ecosystems prior to fire suppression?
4. Will the proposed project replant trees in deforested areas, if they exist, in the proposed project area?
5. How will the proposed project improve the use of, or add value to, small diameter trees? What kinds of markets are available to support the project? Where is the resource base? How much material will the project need to fulfill the project needs?
6. Will the proposed project include a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders as well as appropriate Federal, Tribal, State, County, Land Grant, and Municipal government representatives in the design and implementation of the project?
7. Does the proposal include a plan for a multiparty assessment that will:
  - a. Identify both the existing ecological condition of the proposed project area and the desired future condition; and
  - b. Monitor and report on the positive or negative impact and effectiveness of the project including improvements in local management skills and on the ground results?
8. Does the project proposal incorporate current scientific forest restoration information?
9. Will the proposed project preserve old and large trees? If so, how?
10. Will the proposed project create local employment or training opportunities within the context of accomplishing restoration objectives? Are these opportunities consistent with the purposes of the program? Are summer youth job programs, such as the Youth Conservation Corps, included where appropriate?
11. Have the proponents demonstrated the capability to successfully implement the proposed project?
  - a. Does the proponent have a viable business plan (if applicable)?
  - b. How has the proponent performed on past grant awards?
12. Does the proposal facilitate landscape-scale, multi-jurisdictional effort(s) (i.e., a landscape assessment or Community Wildfire Protection Plan)?
13. What would be the effect of the proposed project on long-term forest management?
14. Is the proposed activity in a priority area for hazardous fuel reduction?
15. Is the cost of the project reasonable and within the range of the fair market value for similar work?

## Categories of Decision

The Panel identified strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for each proposal based on the criteria above. In addition to noting the unique characteristics of each proposal, the Panel also drew from a list of common strengths, weaknesses and recommendations (Appendix C). The Panel then referred to the strengths and weaknesses to assign a category of decision to each proposal. The categories of decision were:

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

After reviewing all 34 proposals the Panel reexamined the category assigned to each one to assure consistency in their review and to respond, if necessary, to issues raised during the public comment periods. The Panel determined that 18 of the 34 proposals were in Category 1. The total federal request for all 18 proposals exceeded the funding available in 2010, so the Panel used a matrix to identify 14 of them which best met the program objectives within the available funding. The matrix criteria were:

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 the 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?

# Proposals

Proposal #	Project Title	Lead Organization	Fed. Req	Match	Recommended Funding	Approved Funding
CFRP 01-10	Cemetery Pines Forest Restoration	Picuris Pueblo	\$240,000	\$60,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 02-10 Rev. 1	Chimayo Conservation Corps Training Local Young Adults in Three Forest Types	Chimayo Conservation Corps.	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP 03-10	Planning to Reduce Wildfire Risk in Taos Ski Valley and the Upper Rio Hondo Watershed	Village of Taos Ski Valley	\$203,711	\$50,994	\$0	\$0
CFRP 04-10 Rev. 1	Cejita Restoration	El Greco Restoration	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 05-10	Questa/Lama WUI Multi-jurisdictional Forest Restoration	Rocky Mountain Youth Corps	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 06-10	Forest Restoration and Capacity Building in Black Lake, New Mexico	HR Vigil Small Products	\$182,815	\$45,703	\$182,815	182815
CFRP 07-10, Rev. 1	Quality Environment and Economic Sustainability Project	Jaramillo & Sons Forest Products	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$177,182	\$177,182
CFRP 08-10, Rev. 1	Multi-jurisdictional Water Supply Protection and Public and Youth Education Through Forest Restoration in the City of Raton Municipal Watershed	Raton Water Works	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 09-10, Rev. 1	Forest Business Establishment and Restoration in the El Ritito Area	Andy Chacon Forest Restoration Company	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP 10-10, Rev. 1	Navajo Dam Hazardous Fuel Reductio and Restoration Project	Cedar Valley Field Services	\$330,735	\$88,374	\$0	\$0
CFRP 11-10	Increased Forest Restoration and Utilization in the Cibola	Mt. Taylor Machine, LLC	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP 12-10, Rev. 1	San Antonio de las Huertas Collaborative Forest Restoration Planning Project	San Antonio de las Huertas Land Grant	\$108,845	\$27,211	\$0	\$0
CFRP 13-10	Multi-jurisdictional Collaborative Landscape Analysis	Alamo Navajo School Board, Inc.	\$344,096	\$86,024	\$0	\$0
CFRP 14-10	Resource and Restoration Management in the Albuquerque Bosque	Tree New Mexico	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 15-10	Cebollita Mesa Forest Restoration Project	Pueblo of Acoma	\$300,840	\$75,210	\$0	\$0
CFRP 16-10, Rev. 1	Gavilan Ridge Conservation and Forest Restoration	National Wild Turkey Federation	\$290,290	\$72,552	\$0	\$0

Proposals

<b>Proposal #</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Lead Organization</b>	<b>Fed. Req</b>	<b>Match</b>	<b>Recommended Funding</b>	<b>Approved Funding</b>
CFRP 17-10	Restoration Strategy and Payment for Ecosystem Services in the Rio Ruidoso Watershed	South Central Mountain Resource Conservation and Development Council, Inc.	\$176,305	\$44,077	\$176,305	\$176,305
CFRP 18-10	Integrating Woody Biomass with Solar Thermal and Photovoltaic Energy Systems	Murray Hotel, LLC	\$197,269	\$50,385	\$0	\$0
CFRP 19-10	The Wellness Coalition/Youth Conservation Corps Forest Restoration, Community Education, Member Development and the Forest as a Learning Laboratory Project	The Wellness Coalition	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 20-10, Rev. 1	Demonstration Site Development of Zerosion, an Engineered Composite Biomass Erosion Control Material, Using Low Value biomass Generated from Forest Treatment in Grant County, NM	Restoration Technologies, LLC	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 21-10	Collaborative Landscape NEPA Analysis for Forest Restoration in the Upper Mimbres Watershed	The Nature Conservancy	\$161,119	\$40,465	\$161,119	\$161,119
CFRP 22-10, Rev. 1	Non-Native Phreatophtye Gasification Feasibility	Sierra Soil and Water Conservation District	\$119,983	\$29,998	\$0	\$0
CFRP 23-10	Creating and Expanding Markets for Traditionally Non-Commercial Material Sustainably Harvested from Forest Restoration	Strain Firewood	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 24-10	Sheep Basin Revisited: Demonstrating the Benefits of Government Investment in Infrastructure	Kellar Logging, Inc.	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP 25-10	Advanced Manufacturing of Flooring from Small Diameter Timber	Old Wood LLC	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
CFRP 27-10	Developing Reference Conditions for Jemez Mixed Conifer Forests and Habitat for the Jemez Mountains Salamander	The Nature Conservancy	\$274,382	\$78,174	\$274,382	\$274,382
CFRP 28-10	Las Vegas (Gallinas) Municipal Watershed WUI Fuels Reduction Project	Griegos Logging LLC	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP 29-10	Box Canyon Grassland and Wildlife Restoration	Pueblo of Tesuque	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0

<b>Proposal #</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Lead Organization</b>	<b>Fed. Req</b>	<b>Match</b>	<b>Recommended Funding</b>	<b>Approved Funding</b>
CFRP 30-10, Rev. 1	Engaging Communities in Wildfire Prevention	Santa Fe County Fire Department	\$342,514	\$91,608	\$342,514	\$342,514
CFRP 31-10, Rev. 1	Walker Flats Watershed Improvement Project - Final Phase	Southwest Wood Products & Thinning	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP 32-10	Borrogo Mesa Restoration Project and Documentary Video	Aspen Forest Products	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP 33-10, Rev. 1	Merced del Pueblo Abiquiu Collaborative Forest Restoration Planning Project	Merced del Pueblo Abiquiu	\$92,514	\$23,129	\$0	\$0
CFRP 34-10	Rowe Mesa Landscape-Scale Assessment Planning for Fire-Focused Forest Restoration	Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona	\$235,720	\$58,930	\$235,720	\$235,720
CFRP 36-10	Caja del Rio Majada Coop Santa Fe River Restoration	Caja del Rio Majada Coop	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL:</b>			<b>\$10,081,138</b>	<b>\$2,542,834</b>	<b>\$4,070,037</b>	<b>\$4,070,037</b>



# Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations

<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	<b>CFRP 01-10</b>
ORGANIZATION:	Picuris Pueblo
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Cemetery Pines Forest Restoration
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$240,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$60,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$300,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	3

## STRENGTHS

1. Charcoal production is an innovative use for the residue coming off restoration treatments. Charcoal production could become a means of financing for the Pueblo Forestry Department.
2. The outreach by Picuris Pueblo to local communities demonstrates intent to collaborate on a larger scale.
3. The Pueblo land proposed for treatment borders the Forest Service Camino Real Ranger District where additional restoration treatments may occur.
4. The Table on page 10 shows how many people will be trained and what they will be trained in.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The project includes field trips for students and training for teachers.
7. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
8. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The monitoring plan includes current scientific information.
10. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
11. The proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
12. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
13. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
14. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
15. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
16. The tribe has a business plan approved by their Council.
17. Page 2 and 3 identifies the roles of the partners and their collaborators.
18. The proposal will fund jobs including 4 sawyers, a charcoal technician, and a forestry director.
19. The proposal leverages other funding sources.

## WEAKNESSES

1. Existing conditions are not adequately described. Since NEPA is complete on this project, the NEPA document would be a source to find such information.

## Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations

2. There are no definitive estimates of volumes to be removed or products to be developed.
3. Given 2007 CFRP experience and business plan, proposal does not state the expected amount of charcoal produced per acre from this thinning project and associated sales revenue.
4. It is not clear if the 33,000 lbs/year is an estimate from only this proposal.
5. Proponent did not demonstrate collaboration with a conservation group.
6. The monitoring plan is not multi-party.
7. The Forest Development Program on page 2 is not described in detail.
8. Soil sampling is not justified based on the objectives described in the project.
9. The social and economic information does not describe impact or benefits to the local community.
10. The letters of support do not describe the partners' roles in multi-party monitoring.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Show prior projects and future proposed project areas on maps.
2. The project could have been strengthened by describing how the project supports the business plan.
3. Provide greater detail on youth component.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- 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.
- No NEPA decision attached.

<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	<b>CFRP 02-10, Rev. 1</b>
ORGANIZATION:	Chimayo Conservation Corps
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Chimayo Conservation Corps Training Local Young Adults in Three Forest Types
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1

### **STRENGTHS**

1. The youth component engages youth for a period of time that is long enough to actually impact their lives, as it provides training and employment.
2. The youth component exposes Corps members to treatments in three different forest types
3. 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.

4. The project will complete cross-jurisdictional restoration across BLM, FS and Pueblo lands.
5. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
6. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
7. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
8. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
9. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
10. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
11. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
12. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
13. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
14. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
15. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
16. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
17. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
18. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
19. The project could lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
20. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
21. Cost per acre is one of the lowest compared to other proposals.
22. Excellent utilization of the material harvested.
23. Project describes the definitive conditions for both pre and post treatment.
24. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
25. The project will hire 16 young people.
26. As part of a utilization plan, the project stores, splits and distributes firewood to elderly and disabled residents of nearby communities.
27. The proposal and the monitoring plan discuss wildlife and their habitat requirements as well as management history, e.g. fire suppression.
28. They have a commitment from the Forest Service to follow up with prescribed burning in the treatment areas “within a reasonable timeframe”.
29. Provides local 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.
30. Applicant treats and monitors non-native species in the Bosque Salt Cedar and Russian Olive.
31. The Scope of Work, including treatment and education, is well defined and achievable.
32. The executive summary follows the example in the Request for Applications (RFA).

## **WEAKNESSES**

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Include township, range and section on the maps.
2. References for scientific assertions regarding p-j fire ecology would be helpful.

## ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:

- 424, Section E, 3rd year incorrect.
- Local Forest should request applicant's documents to determine indirect costs.
- Fringe benefits vary; they should be consistent.
- Determine whether personnel are sub recipients or contractors.

<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	<b>CFRP 03-10, Rev. 1</b>
ORGANIZATION:	Village of Taos Ski Valley
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Planning to Reduce Wildfire Risk in Taos Ski Valley and the Upper Rio Hondo Watershed
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$203,711
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$50,994
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$254,705
EVALUTATION CATEGORY:	1

## STRENGTHS

1. Proposal incorporates use of Firewise community wildfire risk assessment and community mitigation information and education.
2. Proposal incorporates planning for protection of a community water source.
3. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
4. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
5. Youth will assist in collecting monitoring data and doing Firewise education.
6. The project will identify fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
7. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
8. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
9. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
10. SWCA and RMYC have extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
11. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
12. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
13. The project will complete a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
14. Amigos Bravos letter of commitment to participate in the process is commendable.
15. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.

## WEAKNESSES

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Given 250,000 visits annually to the area, the project should fully consider the socio-economic issues in the CWPP (e.g. 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.)
2. Given that identifying “specific treatment areas on private lands” is listed as a “primary benefit” (page 6) 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.
3. Proponent should consider inviting Arroyo Hondo Arriba Land Grant and the grazing permittees in the area to participate in CWPP.
4. Include township, range and section in the maps to better identify project area.

## ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:

- SF 424 Sections D and E incorrect
- The relationship between the proponent, SWCA and RMYC needs to be clarified; it appears to be a subrecipient instead of a contract. Review OMB Circular A-133.

<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	<b>CFRP 04-10, Rev.1</b>
ORGANIZATION:	El Greco Restoration
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Cejita Restoration Treatment
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	3

## STRENGTHS

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. NEPA is complete.
4. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
5. The project includes a good youth component.
6. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
7. The project will increase the use of wildland fire and/or prescribed fire.
8. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
9. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
10. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
11. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
12. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.

13. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
14. The project will create new jobs.
15. Proponent has a history of successful completion of CFRP projects.
16. There is a discussion of past management history including overgrazing and fire suppression, and prescribed burning is included as an outcome.
17. 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.
18. The proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
19. Application includes revegetation in the proposed area.
20. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations, especially with respect to volume and value of estimated byproducts.

### **WEAKNESSES**

1. The detailed budget does not follow RFP budget format.
2. The budget does not appear to adequately support the work plan.
3. Unit costs in the budget do not add correctly.
4. The 424 budget includes construction costs which are not an allowable cost and are not listed in the detailed budget.
5. The entity responsible for collection of monitoring data was not identified.
6. Advisors for monitoring are identified in the text, a consultant is listed, but it is not clear what the roles of these partners/contractors will be. Letters of support do not clearly describe the roles of project partners in monitoring.
7. There is a contractor for monitoring in the budget, but who that will be is not identified.
8. What species would be replanted is not identified, and where the planting would take place is not identified.
9. Some of the letters of support reference a different project name.
10. The federal portion of the budget exceeds the allowable \$360,000.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Applicant is encouraged to include the grazing permittee as a partner in the application.
2. The proposal could be strengthened if the cattle grazing entity is committed to management to allow for controlled burns.
3. If the site is going to carry a fire, then the grazing permittee would need to agree to allow grass to grow high enough to carry fire.
4. Applicants need to address land use of the project area such as grazing.
5. The project could have been strengthened by describing how the project supports the business plan.
6. Piñon-juniper restoration objectives could be better addressed in the proposal.
7. Historic piñon-juniper conditions could be better described and justified.
8. In the letter of support from the Community Alliance, their mission statement should be explicitly stated.

**ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- 424A Section B (g) incorrect.
- Budget lacks detail on unit costs.
- CCR 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.

<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	<b>CFRP 05-10</b>
ORGANIZATION:	Rocky Mountain Youth Corps
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Questa/Lama WUI Multi-jurisdictional Forest Restoration
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1

**STRENGTHS**

1. The youth component of this application provides a meaningful and potentially life changing experience for participants.
2. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
3. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
5. Since NEPA is not done on the fish hatchery portion of the project, this offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
6. NEPA is complete on the Forest Service portion of the project.
7. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
8. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
10. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
11. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
12. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
13. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
14. Provides local 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.
15. The RMYC is trained to conduct monitoring.
16. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
17. The executive summary follows the example in the Request for Applications (RFA).
18. Benefits for wildlife are described on the top of page 5.
19. Proponent will utilize material to provide firewood to the elderly in the community.

20. The project helps to implement the Taos County Community Wildfire Protection Plan.

## **WEAKNESSES**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- Budget lacks detail on unit costs for benefits and travel.
- Indirect cost is off; it should be \$40,500, which would change the total amount for federal and non-federal. 10% was taken off the project total rather than the direct costs.

<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	<b>CFRP 06-10</b>
ORGANIZATION:	HR Vigil Small Products
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Forest Restoration and Capacity Building in Black Lake, New Mexico
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$182,815
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$45,703
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$228,518
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1

## **STRENGTHS**

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. Since NEPA is not done on 5,000 acres, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
6. NEPA is complete on 40 acres.
7. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
8. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
9. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
10. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
11. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
12. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
13. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments and prior treatment projects completed in the area.
14. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
15. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
16. Good budget detail and/or work plan.

17. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
18. The youth component will engage young people in collection of monitoring data and provide mentoring by university students.
19. Project will donate 75 cords of firewood to the elderly in Mora.
20. A strong letter of support from the Carson National Forest Supervisor is provided that commends the support of collaborators.
21. The project will build on partnerships with other local businesses, and the utilization plan builds on those partnerships.
22. Jim Norwick's letter clearly describes support from State Land Office for project.
23. A clear and concise budget was provided.
24. The proposal includes a clear and concise discussion of past management including fire suppression and overgrazing, and the scientific basis is well referenced.
25. The proposal has a clear commitment to prescribed burning.
26. The proposal addresses utilization, treatment, a fire plan and NEPA compliance.
27. The project maintains tree species diversity and removes dwarf mistletoe.

## **WEAKNESSES**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

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

### **PROJECT NUMBER:**

**CFRP 07-10, Rev. 1**

ORGANIZATION:

Jaramillo & Sons Forest Products

FOREST:

Carson

PROJECT TITLE:

Quality Environment and Economic Sustainability  
Project

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$90,000

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$450,000

EVALUATION CATEGORY:

1

## **STRENGTHS**

28. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
29. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
30. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
31. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
32. NEPA is complete.

33. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
34. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
35. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
36. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
37. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
38. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
39. The project will increase the use of wildland fire and/or prescribed fire.
40. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
41. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
42. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
43. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
44. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
45. The proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
46. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
47. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
48. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
49. The project will create new jobs.
50. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
51. The project will make road improvements to benefit the adjacent stream.
52. The application is in the Vallecitos Sustained Yield Unit created to benefit the local community and other industries within the unit.
53. 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.
54. The project includes a good youth component. High school students will assist in collection of monitoring data and integrate project into curriculum.
55. Letters of support are submitted by area grazing associations.
56. The proposal clearly states that it will prepare areas for prescribed fire and has the explicit support of the forest District Ranger.
57. Encourages increased watershed capacity around the drinking water and the high quality cold water fishery.
58. Map shows previous, current and proposed treatment areas on a landscape scale.

## **WEAKNESSES**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- 424A, page 2 missing.
- Budget lacks detail.

**PROJECT NUMBER:** CFRP 08-10, Rev. 1  
**ORGANIZATION:** Raton Water Works  
**FOREST:** Carson  
**PROJECT TITLE:** Multi-jurisdictional Water Supply Protection and Public and Youth Education through Forest Restoration in the City of Raton Municipal Watershed  
**FUNDING REQUESTED:** \$360,000  
**MATCHING FUNDS:** \$90,000  
**TOTAL BUDGET:** \$450,000  
**EVALUATION CATEGORY:** 2

### **STRENGTHS**

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. NEPA is complete.
5. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
6. The project includes a good youth component that includes hands on monitoring of how forest thinning will affect Red and Aberts Squirrel habitat.
7. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
8. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
9. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
10. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
11. The specific goals of the prescription include reintroduction of natural fire as well as provisions for returning the natural grass and forb understory.
12. The prescription also promulgates wildlife travel corridors and addresses the need of an individual vulnerable species (NM Jumping Mouse).
13. The applicant has clearly addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
14. The city is adding additional surveys for wild life species beyond the initial Biological Assessment.
15. Hands-on activities for students in Raton about fire triangle is a plus.

### **WEAKNESSES**

1. There should be a letter of commitment from Dr. Cartron because he has a described role in project implementation (page 5 of proposal and budget narrative).

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The proposal could be strengthened by a reference to safety of forest workers who will implement project.
2. Be clear and specific about water quality sampling and costs

**ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- Budget lacks detail.
- Clarify that the city will provide administration cost as part of match not shown in grant
- Indirect costs of the subrecipient should be included in consultation costs.

<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	<b>CFRP 09-10 Rev. 1</b>
ORGANIZATION:	Andy Chacon Forest Restoration Company
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Forest Business Establishment and Restoration in the El Ritito Area
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1

**STRENGTHS**

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component using Mesa Vista School students to gather and analyze data.
8. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
9. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
10. The proposal includes grazing associations as collaborators and commits to working with those collaborators on coordinating grazing with fire return.
11. The prescription specifically addresses the needs of a sensitive wildlife species associated with the forest type (Aberts Squirrel).
12. Treatment fills in the gaps between isolated previously treated blocks in the area, and may aid in the implementation of a prescribed broadcast burn by the Carson National Forest.
13. Proponent references monitoring data from two previous CFRP projects to come up with their new prescription.
14. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
15. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
16. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
17. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
18. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.

19. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
20. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
21. The proposal offers an opportunity to address the interaction between grazing and the re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
22. 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.
23. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
24. The application in the treatment discussion addresses Aspen regeneration.
25. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan and incorporates modeling data.
26. Letters of commitment for utilization of products from the CFRP project area are included in the proposal.

## **WEAKNESSES**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Verify that the log trailer to be 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 item; it should be shown as a separate other direct cost.
- Forest Guild rates should be consistent with the established rates.
- Clarify non-federal match related to student travel.

## **PROJECT NUMBER:**

**CFRP 10-10 Rev. 1**

**ORGANIZATION:**

Cedar Valley Field Services LLC

**FOREST:**

Carson

**PROJECT TITLE:**

Navajo Dam Hazardous Fuel Reduction & Restoration Project

**FUNDING REQUESTED:**

\$330,735.04

**MATCHING FUNDS:**

\$88,374.40

**TOTAL BUDGET:**

\$419,109.44

**EVALUATION CATEGORY:**

2

## **STRENGTHS**

1. The proposal treats non-native invasive species along with hazardous fuels, improves threatened and endangered species habitat.
2. The proposal ensures the safe application of herbicides.
3. The proposal describes the restoration of the project area in great detail.
4. The proposal includes a youth component to implement the project restoration.
5. The proposal is clear, concise and well organized.

6. The proposal included good budget detail with clear unit costs itemized.
7. The BLM has extensive experience in the proposed activities.
8. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations, especially with respect to the socio-economic monitoring.
9. The post-project monitoring to be done by the BLM, as described in the Environmental
10. Assessment exceeds program requirements.

### **WEAKNESSES**

1. The acreage figures in the proposal are inconsistent between the budget, the map, the text and the letters to tribes.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

2. Return of hydrologic integrity or mimicking natural hydrologic regime through management would be necessary for long-term restoration.
3. The proponent should ensure that any surveys either, (1) meet US Office of Management and Budget guidelines, or (2) do not use Federal dollars.
4. The Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and the Bureau of Reclamation should consider including this as one of the long-term CFRP monitoring sites to determine the success of non-native invasive eradication.
5. The proponent should clarify the number of acres to be treated before award.
6. The proponent should resend letters to the tribes with the correct number of acres.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- Non-Federal match is over 20%.
- Documentation that the outstanding federal debt is resolved should be provided to the agency.

<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	<b>CFRP 11-10</b>
ORGANIZATION:	Mt. Taylor Machine, LLC
FOREST:	Cibola
PROJECT TITLE:	Increased Forest Restoration and Utilization in the Cibola
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1

### **STRENGTHS**

1. The project will substantially increase capacity for small diameter utilization in the Cibola National Forest as well as private lands.
2. The focus on the marketing will increase the value of locally produced wood pellets.
3. The application tries to address the issue of transportation as it relates to a cost impeding successful utilization efforts and recognizes the distributed geography of the Cibola National Forest.

4. The proposal would use CFRP funds as seed money to create a market to sustain viable utilization industries.
5. The proposal will put the infrastructure in place to support future restoration projects in the area.
6. Application presents a unique opportunity for expansion of manufacturing capacity closer to a raw material source and a potentially large market.

## **WEAKNESSES**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The letters of support should confirm their role in multiparty monitoring team.
2. The proponent should remove the ecological monitoring component since the project does not involve treatment. The applicant is encouraged to work with other partners to improve the socio-economic monitoring plan.
3. Discussion should distinguish between providers of data and multiparty review of data.
4. Application should consider removing statements on page 1 and page 8 regarding education and outreach and monitoring that are not supported elsewhere in the proposal or in the budget.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- The totals for personnel, fringe benefits, and equipment expense in the budget category have math errors.
- Labor burden mentioned in travel per diem should be in personnel cost.
- Federal and non-federal costs should be evident in budget.

### **PROJECT NUMBER:**

**CFRP 12-10 Rev. 1**

ORGANIZATION:

San Antonio de Las Huertas Land Grant

FOREST:

Cibola

PROJECT TITLE:

San Antonio de Las Huertas Collaborative Forest  
Restoration Planning Project

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$108,845

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$27,211

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$136,056

EVALUATION CATEGORY:

2

## **STRENGTHS**

1. The multi party monitoring participants are identified clearly in the text and in the letters of support.
2. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a unique opportunity for collaboration.
3. The text on pages 2-4 has a good breakdown of the roles and responsibilities of each coordinator/partner.
4. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
5. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
6. The proposal includes strong letters of support.

7. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
8. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
9. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
10. The sub recipient Parametrix has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
11. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
12. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities. On page 6 the land grant expresses an interest in partnering with outside entities and experts in the field of forestry to promote joint learning.
13. Planning focus includes consideration of community drinking water supply.
14. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses and recommendations.
15. The project will lead to a potential reduction in the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
16. The NEPA compliance costs are well described in the Parametrix budget provided.
17. This project has potential in that it bridges the gap within the land grant community to acquire technical information to manage their land.

#### **WEAKNESSES**

1. The socio-economic monitoring plan on page 10 does not address the specific objectives on page 4 and 5. The monitoring plan appears to be designed to measure the eventual implementation of future treatments and utilization.
2. There is no letter of support from Bernalillo High School committing to participating in collection of baseline data.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The work plan could break out the tasks of NEPA compliance, e.g. timing of biological and cultural resource surveys, completion of draft Environmental Assessment, and public scoping period.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- No DUNS number, in process.

#### **PROJECT NUMBER:**

**CFRP 13-10**

ORGANIZATION:

Alamo Navajo School Board, Inc.

FOREST:

Cibola

PROJECT TITLE:

Multi-jurisdictional Collaborative Landscape Analysis

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$344,096.07

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$86,024.01

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$430,120.08

EVALUATION CATEGORY:

1

#### **STRENGTHS**

1. The initial analysis and monitoring will include threatened and endangered species as an important piece of the youth involvement.

2. The community work force youth will be trained in biological stand exam surveys.
3. The project includes cross-jurisdictional landscape scale activities including Forest Service, BLM and State Land Office lands.
4. The appendix describes outreach to private landowners to facilitate a larger landscape scale approach.
5. Strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
6. The youth component is described in the letter from the Alamo School Board.
7. Table 3 timeline outlines the Scope of Work clearly.
8. The project incorporates current scientific information outlined on page 5.
9. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
10. The project will lead to a reduction in the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
11. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
12. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
13. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
14. The proposal monitoring goes beyond the core CFRP ecological indicators.
15. The application monitoring goes beyond the core CFRP ecological indicators.
16. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
17. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
18. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
19. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
20. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
21. The proposal mentions the use of prescribed fire as a fuel reduction treatment and is supported by the BLM letter.
22. The applicant is only charging indirect costs at the 10% rate on their part of the grant.
23. Strong collaboration occurred beginning in 2006 well in advance of the submission of the application.
24. The project includes an adaptive approach to restoration in an annual evaluation of monitoring data which is used to collaboratively refine prescriptions.

## **WEAKNESSES**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- SWCA is really a subrecipient and subject to Cost Principles and Uniform Requirements.
- Indirect cost rate should be updated with the most current rate.

**PROJECT NUMBER:**                      **CFRP 14-10**  
**ORGANIZATION:**                        Tree New Mexico  
**FOREST:**                                      Cibola

PROJECT TITLE:	Resource & Restoration Management in the Albuquerque Bosque
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	3

### **STRENGTHS**

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
3. NEPA is complete.
4. The project includes a good youth component.
5. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
6. The project will create new jobs.
7. Proposal creates a partnership fund managed by Tree New Mexico and Albuquerque Open Space Division with proceeds from sale of harvested wood to go directly to operating the nursery and restoring the Bosque.
8. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.

### **WEAKNESSES**

9. Ground water monitoring to show a static level would be nice to see prior to planting, such as the information included by the BEMP program.
10. It is unclear what types of treatments will take place within the project areas. The areas are mapped, but specific restoration design is not provided.
11. It is not clear why acres included in the 2007 CFRP are being retreated.
12. The RFA format was not followed, e.g. information on project history is included the executive summary.
13. The project was difficult to read due to organization.
14. The NEPA Decision document is not attached to the application.
15. The maps lack specificity of treatment and don't include township, range and section.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. On page 11, 7 areas are identified; the type of treatment should have been included for each area.
2. Proponent should follow RFA format for project narrative.
3. Return of hydrologic integrity or mimicking natural hydrologic regime through management would be necessary for long-term restoration.
4. The proposal should specify which of the specific 513 acres will have treatment, harvesting, monitoring and restoration activities.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- Some of the costs are in the wrong category. (Accounting is shown under personnel and should be described as either subrecipient or contractor. Rico Designs is described as personnel – either they are employees or contractors.)
- Travel to CFRP workshops \$4500 for three people appears excessive. Verify that all costs provided are reasonable.

**PROJECT NUMBER:**                    **CFRP 15-10**  
**ORGANIZATION:**                    Pueblo of Acoma  
**FOREST:**                                Cibola  
**PROJECT TITLE:**                    Cebollita Mesa Forest Restoration Project  
**FUNDING REQUESTED:**            \$300,840  
**MATCHING FUNDS:**                \$75,210  
**TOTAL BUDGET:**                    \$376,050  
**EVALUATION CATEGORY:**        4

**STRENGTHS**

5. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
6. The project will increase the use of wildland fire and/or prescribed fire.
7. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
8. The project will hire 4 tribal members as crew to do thinning.
9. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
10. The budget is very detailed, unit costs are clear.

**WEAKNESSES**

1. No documentation of letter to adjacent tribes.
2. The prescription does not reflect scientific restoration such as the piñon-juniper restoration guidelines.
3. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided. Maps are hard to read.
4. The proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
5. The youth component lacks detail.
6. Monitoring plan lacks detail and does not include the core CFRP ecological indicators.
7. The executive summary is not consistent with the body of the proposal. The exec summary states that 100 acres will be treated but later references 120 acres. 100 cords of removal is estimated in exec summary and 400 cords is estimated later in the text.
8. The work plan does not flow with the project details and there is redundancy in the work plan.
9. There is no multiparty monitoring.
10. To understand proposal's effectiveness, more information is needed on the site-specific existing conditions and proposed activities.
11. 30 x30 or 9x9 spacing is not a restoration treatment, which would normally include clumps for wildlife.

12. Timber stand improvement, range improvement and enhancing forage for livestock are not CFRP program objectives.
13. The educational component is vague.
14. Costs for lop and scatter of slash appear excessive.
15. There was no mention of attending the CFRP workshop.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Project could be improved by consultation or collaboration with area businesses.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- No NEPA attached; but it is referenced in BIA letter
- Program income must be used to further the project's objectives or be used as non-federal match.

<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	<b>CFRP 16-10</b>
ORGANIZATION:	National Wild Turkey Federation
FOREST:	Lincoln
PROJECT TITLE:	Gavilan Ridge Conservation and Forest Restoration
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$290,290
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$72,552
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$362,842
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	3

## **STRENGTHS**

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. NEPA is complete.
4. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
5. The project includes a good youth component.
6. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
7. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
8. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
9. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
10. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
11. The project may lead to the use of prescribed fire, in particular broadcast burns.
12. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
13. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
14. The proposal discusses grazing in relation to restoration and wildlife, page 2.
15. The proposal monitoring goes beyond the core CFRP ecological indicators looking at bird, elk and deer populations.

16. The proposal is supported by the Greater Ruidoso CWPP and is part of a greater landscape plan.
17. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
18. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
19. Good detailed work plan.
20. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
21. The Lincoln National Forest Supervisor's letter allows all material to be hauled off site at no cost to the contractor.
22. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments and collaboration in the area.
23. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
24. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.

### **WEAKNESSES**

1. Program income reported in the SF424 is not reflected in the total budget detail or the project narrative.
2. No documentation of letter to Pueblo of Isleta and Ysleta del Sur Pueblo.
3. A letter of collaboration from EcoServants that verifies the non-federal match in the budget is not included.
4. The panel's prior weaknesses and recommendations were not addressed.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The proposal maps would be enhanced by identification of the interpretative trail and check dam locations.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

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

### **PROJECT NUMBER:**

**CFRP 17-10**

### **ORGANIZATION:**

South Central Mountain Resource Conservation and Development Council, Inc.

### **FOREST:**

Lincoln

### **PROJECT TITLE:**

Restoration Strategy & Payment for Ecosystem Services in the Rio Ruidoso Watershed

### **FUNDING REQUESTED:**

\$176,305

### **MATCHING FUNDS:**

\$44,077

### **TOTAL BUDGET:**

\$220,382

### **EVALUATION CATEGORY:**

1

### **STRENGTHS**

1. Collaboration for the proposal began more than a year prior to project submission

2. Unique attempt to sustain watershed restoration efforts through a collaborative design for payment for ecosystem services funding mechanism.
3. Innovative approach to building support for watershed restoration.
4. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
5. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
6. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
7. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
8. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
9. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
10. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
11. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
12. \$30,000 cash match provided by the Village of Ruidoso demonstrates confidence.
13. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for additional collaboration.
14. The results of technical approaches listed in the proposal have long term benefits to various entities.
15. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan.
16. Proposal has potential for sustaining restoration efforts post project within the watershed
17. Proposal incorporates current environmental economic information, e.g. calibrating the willingness to pay function with varying ecosystem service levels.
18. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
19. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities on Forest Service, Tribal and Municipal forest land.

## **WEAKNESSES**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The connection between the project and ENMU Natural Resources Program could be better described.
2. The proponent should ensure that any surveys either, (1) meet 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.
- Parametrix should be identified as lead technical collaborator.

## **PROJECT NUMBER:**

**CFRP 18-10**

ORGANIZATION:

Murray Hotel, LLC

FOREST:

Gila

PROJECT TITLE:

Integrating Woody Biomass with Solar Thermal and Photovoltaic Systems

FUNDING REQUESTED: \$197,269  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$50,385  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$247,654  
EVALUATION CATEGORY: 4

### **STRENGTHS**

1. Creative plan to evaluate feasibility of available technology on biomass boilers to commercial and residential scales.
2. Advance focus of BTU content of firewood (as opposed to volume or weight) for extending market demand.

### **WEAKNESSES**

1. There was no letter of endorsement from the relevant land management agency.
2. The letter from the District Ranger, which was read as public comment, does not demonstrate collaboration with the Agency.
3. The breadth of collaboration and the feasibility/monitoring component could be strengthened.
4. Entities such as Forest Products Laboratory, Town of Silver City, and SW New Mexico Home builders have been mentioned, but have not been actively incorporated into the collaboration.
5. The wood supply is not described in the proposal.
6. There is a conflict of interest (financial benefit to non-profit Board member) in that Gordon West is on the board of the non-profit, Gila Woodnet, and proposal plans to install a boiler in his private residence.
7. The benefit to the public of installing a boiler in a for-profit hotel and a private residence is questionable.
8. There is no indication in the proposal that there were letters sent to the tribe.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Monitoring plans should consider the demonstration component of the proposed project.
2. We strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised proposal next year with the recommendations and weaknesses addressed.

### **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.

**PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 19-10**

**ORGANIZATION: The Wellness Coalition**

## Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations

FOREST: Gila  
PROJECT TITLE: The Wellness Coalition/Youth Conservation Corps  
Forest Restoration, Community Education, Member  
Development and the Forest as a “Learning Laboratory”  
Project  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$360,000  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$90,000  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$450,000  
EVALUATION CATEGORY: 2

### STRENGTHS

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
4. NEPA is complete.
5. The project includes a good youth component including fire training and certification.
6. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
7. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
8. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
9. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
10. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
11. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
12. Proposal provides comprehensive description of the training for Corps members on page 6.
13. The description of project challenges on page 5 is insightful.
14. Budget specifies detailed unit costs.
15. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
16. The project will create new jobs.
17. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.

### WEAKNESSES

1. The monitoring plan does not measure indicators related to utilization and value of small diameter, productivity of the woodshop.
2. The application does not answer all of the questions proposed in the RFA related to monitoring, for example existing and desired conditions are not adequately described.
3. There is a conflict between the utilization and the monitored project objectives. Leaving 70% of the material on the ground without describing how it they would be disposed of does not appear to reduce the hazardous fuels on the site.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Use size classes instead of description terms like small, medium and large trees.

2. The proponent should ensure that trained individuals will do the actual measurements in the field.
3. Please define the monitoring protocol used to identify the existing ecological condition.
4. Project area could have more definitive description of densities or volumes.
5. The proponent is encouraged to use a monitoring plan table to clearly describe the existing conditions, desired conditions and the indicator to be measured that show the change.

**ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- Cost comparison between purchasing a used vehicle vs. renting a vehicle should be considered.
- The costs of classroom supplies monitoring seem excessive.
- Donna Stevens daily rate is confusing - \$240 or \$320?
- Verify the salary rate for Donna Stevens, a teacher at Aldo Leopold High School.
- Other category includes items that should be moved to supplies and personnel.
- Construction amount in 424 – move to item h other.
- No letter from NM State Forestry and they are mentioned in the proposal.
- 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 could be addressed in the budget.

**PROJECT NUMBER:**

**CFRP 20-10 Rev. 1**

ORGANIZATION:

Restoration Technologies, LLC

FOREST:

Gila

PROJECT TITLE:

Demonstration Site development of Zerosion, an Engineered Composite Biomass Erosion Control Material, using Low Value Biomass Generated from Forest Treatment in Grant County, New Mexico

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$90,000

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$450,000

EVALUATION CATEGORY:

3

**STRENGTHS**

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
3. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
4. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
5. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.

6. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
7. The project leverages a Small Business Innovation Research grant.
8. The proposed project would be an activity that is new and adds value to CFRP.
9. The proposal has a detailed monitoring plan with indicators and how they will be measured.
10. Detail on treatments is provided in the letter from Summit Technical.
11. The proponent partners with local businesses to complete the project.
12. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.

### **WEAKNESSES**

1. It is unclear that the costs for the total project are justified.
2. The budget narrative does not clearly justify costs such as personnel, travel and treatment. Federal request is \$117,000 for personnel cost and technology exchange cost is \$1000. This seems excessive for the explanation provided.
3. Application does not fully explain the treatment design

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Proposal could provide more detail about treatment of demonstration sites. Treatment design information would be helpful.
2. It would be useful to determine how Zerosion will compare to other soil erosion reduction technologies

### **ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- No explanation of costs for “fully loaded with taxes, benefits, and workers compensation.
- Provide explanation of “Technology Exchange Travel” costs.
- Cost comparison between purchasing a used vehicle vs. renting a vehicle should be considered.
- No explanation of condition of material transfer trailer. Is \$53,000 current market value?
- Budget needs more description of unit costs (Soil moisture units is not specific).
- GCEC amount in budget does not match amount in Commitment Letter.
- Budget lacks computations for travel, e.g. how many days at Santa Fe Hotel?
- Truck maintenance should be listed under other, not supplies.
- A subcontract under an award is not allowed if there is a conflict of interest involved. Reference 7CFR 3019.42 and 3019.43.
- Label of year 1 budget is identified twice.
- Personnel year 3 budget computations are off for Gordon West and Z. Brooks.
- Descriptions of the computations do not match the budget figures.

**PROJECT NUMBER:**

**CFRP 21-10**

**ORGANIZATION:**

The Nature Conservancy

**FOREST:**

Gila

PROJECT TITLE: Collaboration Landscape NEPA Analysis for Forest  
Restoration in the Upper Mimbres Watershed  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$161,119  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$40,465  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$201,584  
EVALUATION CATEGORY: 1

### **STRENGTHS**

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
5. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
6. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
7. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
8. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
9. The project will increase the use of wildland fire and/or prescribed fire.
10. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
11. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
12. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
13. The proposal offers an opportunity to address the interaction between grazing and the re-establishment of natural fire regimes.

### **WEAKNESSES**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Identify the 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 20 students for a field trip not an allowable cost.
- Aldo Leo High School – no justification for students being paid.
- Budget calculations for ecologist on page 2 are incorrect.
- Conservation by Design costs lacks detail on unit costs, and there is no cost breakdown in the letter of support.
- There are no letters of support from Grant County, National Wild Turkey Federation, and the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, but the project can go forward as written.

**PROJECT NUMBER:** CFRP 22-10 Rev.1  
**ORGANIZATION:** Sierra Soil and Water Conservation District  
**FOREST:** Gila  
**PROJECT TITLE:** Non-Native Phreatophyte Gasification Feasibility  
**FUNDING REQUESTED:** \$119,983  
**MATCHING FUNDS:** \$29,998  
**TOTAL BUDGET:** \$149,981  
**EVALUATION CATEGORY:** 2

### **STRENGTHS**

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
9. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
10. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
11. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
12. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
13. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
14. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
15. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
16. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
17. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
18. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
19. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).

### **WEAKNESSES**

1. The 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**

1. More detail about the specifics of the methods, such as the source of the planting stock in the narrative would be helpful.

2. The proposal should monitor all core indicators referenced in the RFA including the mortality or survival of all species planted. The Multiparty Monitoring Handbook referenced in the RFA provides useful information on monitoring.
3. The proposal would be strengthened by removing the value of the firewood from the text because it is confusing.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS**

- Applicant used outdated version of Standard Form 424.
- In the budget it states 30 acres are to be treated. On page 7 it states 35 NEPA ready acres of treatment.
- Some of the cost items are in the wrong category, i.e. the project coordinator will be hired as a contractor, not listed as personnel.
- Fringe benefits should be listed separately in Part B of the budget, not lumped together with salary rates.
- In other costs there is office space, and it should have been under indirect.
- The letter from Hot Springs High School does not commit to the specific in-kind contribution.

<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	<b>CFRP 23-10</b>
ORGANIZATION:	Strain Firewood
FOREST:	Gila
PROJECT TITLE:	Creating and Expanding Markets for Traditionally Non-Commercial Material Sustainably Harvested From Forest Restoration Project
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1

#### **STRENGTHS**

1. The project donates 10% of the firewood to low income families.
2. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
3. NEPA is complete.
4. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
5. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
6. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
7. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
8. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to
9. matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
10. The project includes a good youth component provided by the Wellness Coalition and Aldo Leopold High School.
11. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.

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 proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
18. The project will create new jobs.
19. The project includes an adaptive approach to restoration in an annual evaluation of monitoring data which is used to collaboratively refine prescriptions.
20. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
21. The proposal identifies new potential products that could add value to small diameter trees.
22. Project history sequence of events as written is informative.

## **WEAKNESSES**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The proponent should ensure that trained individuals will do the actual measurements in the field and clarify what the budget for monitoring supplies will include.
2. The proponent should resend letters to the tribes with the correct number of acres.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- The CPA and Gila Tree Thinners are listed as other costs. Budget should be clearly identified them as either contractors or sub recipients.
- 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 High School.
- If program income will be generated, it should be identified in the budget.
- The proponent should seek letters from the permittees listed as collaborators in the table.

<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	<b>CFRP 24-10</b>
ORGANIZATION:	Kellar Logging, Inc.
FOREST:	Gila
PROJECT TITLE:	Sheep Basin Revisited: Demonstrating the Benefits of Government Investment in Infrastructure
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1

## **STRENGTHS**

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

3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. NEPA is complete.
5. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
6. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
7. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
8. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
9. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
10. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
11. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
12. The project includes a good youth component providing education to Reserve High School students.
13. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
14. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
15. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
16. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
17. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
18. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
19. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
20. The proponent has a track record of successful completion of CFRP projects.
21. Project represents significant per acre reduction in forest treatment costs.

## **WEAKNESSES**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activities to account for wildlife needs.
2. The proposal could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups in project design, implementation and monitoring.
3. To better identify the location of project area, should include a map with township, range and section.
4. Identify the 732 treatment acres on the map.

## **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 identified in budget needs more detail to determine if costs are reasonable, allowable and allocable.

<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	<b>CFRP 25-10</b>
ORGANIZATION:	Old Wood LLC
FOREST:	Santa Fe
PROJECT TITLE:	Advanced Manufacturing of Flooring from Small Diameter Timber
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	2

### **STRENGTHS**

5. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
6. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
7. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
8. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
9. The proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
10. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
11. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
12. The project will create new jobs.
13. Good work plan.
14. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
15. Safety program is strong and ongoing.

### **WEAKNESSES**

1. Proposal presents a vague monitoring plan. Ecological monitoring is mentioned, but it does not seem applicable to this proposal.
2. 3 organizations (NMFWR, Forest Guild, Lloyd Irland, Las Vegas Peace and Justice Center) are listed to monitor social and ecological impacts, but the proposal does not indicate what they are going to measure or how they will coordinate activities.
3. The letter of support from Dr. Irland does not confirm the role described in the work plan for either him or the Yale students.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The proponent may want to add local New Mexico installers in future collaborations.
2. Monitoring methods and multiparty monitoring coordination could be better described.
3. In the body of the proposal, explain what the maps are identifying.
4. The proposal would be strengthened by commitment or support letters from each area identified in the maps similar to the Alamo Navajo commitment letter.

**ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- Computations (unit costs) not shown in budget.
- It is not clear who will administer the agreement.
- Provide detail for travel for Dr. Irland.
- Forest Guild should be listed as sub-recipient instead of contractor and their established salary rates will apply.
- Where Yale University is mentioned in the budget, it should be Irland Consulting Group.

**PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 27-10**

ORGANIZATION: The Nature Conservancy  
FOREST: Santa Fe  
PROJECT TITLE: Developing Reference Conditions for Jemez Mixed  
Conifer Forests and Habitat for the Jemez Mountains  
Salamander  
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$274,382  
MATCHING FUNDS: \$78,174  
TOTAL BUDGET: \$352,556  
EVALUATION CATEGORY: 1

**STRENGTHS**

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
3. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
4. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
5. The project may lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
6. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
7. The proposal monitoring considers novel indicator species that will be absolutely crucial to the reintroduction of fire to the Jemez Mountains.
8. The project includes a good youth component that trains youth to perform some fairly intricate surveys.
9. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
10. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
11. Good budget detail and work plan; there is a very good description of the need for this project described on page 2.
12. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
13. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
14. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
15. The project will create new jobs.

16. 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 if funded.
17. With respect to a threatened, endangered and sensitive species issue and the reintroduction of fire, the project represents a unique collaboration to “facilitate forest restoration” between multiple land management agencies, land regulatory agencies, state agency, pueblo and an academic institute.
18. This is not research but collaboration to enhance restoration and thus, it is an appropriate fit for CFRP.

## **WEAKNESSES**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Maps should include the various neighboring landowners that might benefit from the data collected.
2. Identify the tribes that the letter was sent to.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- Non-federal match exceeds 20%.
- Travel costs for crews – if they are contractual move to contractual.
- 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.

## **PROJECT NUMBER:**

**CFRP 28-10**

ORGANIZATION:

Griegos Logging, Inc.

FOREST:

Santa Fe

PROJECT TITLE:

Las Vegas (Gallinas) Municipal Watershed WUI Fuels Reduction Project

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$90,000

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$450,000

EVALUATION CATEGORY:

1

## **STRENGTHS**

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
7. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
8. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.

9. The proposal includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product.
10. The project will create new jobs.
11. The project includes a good youth component encompassing approximately 120 youth in the Las Vegas area.
12. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
13. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments and other grant accomplishment and partnerships with businesses.
14. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
15. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List and with a critical municipal water source.
16. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
17. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
18. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
19. The project will increase the use of wildland fire and/or prescribed fire.
20. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
21. The scientific basis in the proposal is well supported and referenced.
22. In the proposal there will be a training demonstration of purchased equipment to partners and interested parties, which is new and adds value to CFRP.
23. There is a strong letter from the Santa Fe National Forest stating they will participate in the multiparty monitoring.
24. Project history sequence of events as written is informative.
25. A business plan is in place and describes plans for a revision with assistance from Luna Community College.
26. The monitoring plan table clearly describes desired future conditions, targets, and specific sample measurements.
27. The proposal includes collaborator interest forms.
28. The proposal has a chart that crosswalks RFA purposes and objectives to proposal objectives.
29. The proposal includes yearly attendance for forest worker safety certification.
30. In the monitoring and evaluation plan on page 9, it states that specific wildlife mitigations will be adhered to and monitored for this proposal.

## **WEAKNESSES**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

31. The program income mentioned on page 6 should be clarified.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS**

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

## Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations

- Page 2 of the budget, under telephone says the total is \$469, but computations show \$704. Indirect costs are off.
- Adalente RC&D should be listed as a sub-recipient instead of a contractor.

<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	<b>CFRP 29-10</b>
ORGANIZATION:	Pueblo of Tesuque
FOREST:	Santa Fe
PROJECT TITLE:	Box Canyon Grassland and Wildlife Restoration
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	3

### STRENGTHS

1. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
3. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
4. The project includes a good youth component, including Tesuque Pueblo students, Santo Fe Indian School students and NMSU students in monitoring and evaluation.
5. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
6. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
7. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
8. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
9. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
10. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
11. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
12. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
13. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
14. Project addresses improving habitat for important tribal hunting species for the tribe.
15. The proposal monitoring goes beyond the core CFRP ecological indicators to include culturally and biologically important wildlife.
16. Project includes Firewise outreach efforts to adjacent residences.
17. Project distributes firewood for winter heating to tribal community.
18. The project demonstrates strong collaboration among three pueblos which will share lessons learned related to wildlife reintroductions and forest restoration treatments.
19. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
20. Commitment to the proposal is supported by the acquisition of additional funds to expand the proposal.

### WEAKNESSES

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Include letter from Tesuque Education Department.
2. To better identify location of the project area, include township, range and section on the maps.
3. The proponent should clarify that the objective is forest restoration rather than restoring desert grasslands.
4. Piñon-juniper restoration objectives could be better addressed in the proposal and historical piñon-juniper conditions could be better described and justified.
5. Collaboration Forest Restoration objectives should be better addressed.
6. We strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised proposal next year with the recommendations and weaknesses addressed.

**ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- NEPA compliance is not completed, but is planned to complete in Year 1.
- Indirect cost rate is expired, so need to verify current rate.
- Proposed start and end date needs to be filled out in 424.

<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	<b>CFRP 30-10, Rev. 1</b>
ORGANIZATION:	Santa Fe County Fire Department
FOREST:	Santa Fe
PROJECT TITLE:	Engaging Communities in Wildfire Prevention
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$342,514
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$91,608
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$434,122
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1

**STRENGTHS**

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes many strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
6. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
8. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.

9. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
10. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
11. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
12. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
13. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
14. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
15. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
16. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
17. Good work plan.
18. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
19. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
20. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
21. Proposal includes Firewise education and outreach in combination with WUI risk assessment.
22. Proposal includes detailed socio-economic assessment and monitoring that is integrated with ecological monitoring.
23. On pages 7-9 of proposal, current forest type conditions, statement of work and outcomes of each area is well written and easy to follow.

## **WEAKNESSES**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Proponent should seek letters from NM State Forestry and the other four homeowners associations clarifying their interest.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- Non-federal match exceeds 20% on SF424.
- Section B, 424 A 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. Budget should use monthly use rates and mileage.
- All costs need to be analyzed and renegotiated. (Personal protective gear, etc.)

## **PROJECT NUMBER:**

**CFRP 31-10**

**ORGANIZATION:**

Southwest Wood Products & Thinning

**FOREST:**

Santa Fe

**PROJECT TITLE:**

Walker Flats Watershed Improvement Project-Final  
Phase

**FUNDING REQUESTED:**

\$360,000

**MATCHING FUNDS:**

\$90,000

**TOTAL BUDGET:**

\$450,000

EVALUATION CATEGORY: 1

### **STRENGTHS**

1. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
2. NEPA is complete.
3. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
4. The project includes a good youth component.
5. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
6. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
7. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
8. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
9. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
10. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
11. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
12. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
13. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
14. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
15. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
16. The project 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.
17. The proposal has a strong socio-economic component including description of current and future desired conditions.
18. The proposal connects two previous treatments.

### **WEAKNESSES**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Include estimate of the amount of forest products removed from the project site.
2. Include a better description of treatment activities.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- Clarify match. Mora County lists \$25,000 support in letter, 1st year budget indicated \$23,000.
- Corporate liability insurance under other and NMGR tax, verify if appropriate to pay taxes with federal funds.

**PROJECT NUMBER:**                    **CFRP 32-10**  
**ORGANIZATION:**                    Aspen Forest Products  
**FOREST:**                                Santa Fe  
**PROJECT TITLE:**                    Borrego Mesa Restoration Project and Documentary  
    Video  
**FUNDING REQUESTED:**               \$360,000  
**MATCHING FUNDS:**                   \$90,000  
**TOTAL BUDGET:**                     \$450,000  
**EVALUATION CATEGORY:**            1

**STRENGTHS**

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
4. The proposal includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the proposal.
5. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
6. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
7. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
8. The project will increase the use of wildland fire and/or prescribed fire.
9. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
10. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
11. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
12. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
13. The project will create new jobs.
14. The project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
15. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
16. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
17. Outreach with videos innovative.

**WEAKNESSES**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The maps should include acreage figures.

**ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

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

**PROJECT NUMBER:** **CFRP 33-10**  
**ORGANIZATION:** Merced del Pueblo Abiquiu  
**FOREST:** Santa Fe  
**PROJECT TITLE:** Merced del Pueblo Abiquiu Collaborative Forest  
Restoration Planning Project  
**FUNDING REQUESTED:** \$92,514  
**MATCHING FUNDS:** \$23,129  
**TOTAL BUDGET:** \$115,643  
**EVALUATION CATEGORY:** 2

### **STRENGTHS**

1. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
3. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
4. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
5. The project includes a good youth component.
6. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
7. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
8. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
9. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
10. The proposal includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
11. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
12. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
13. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
14. The applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
15. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
16. The proposal monitoring goes beyond the core CFRP ecological indicators.
17. This proposal is a cost-effective way to bridge the gap between the Forest Service and land grant issues.

### **WEAKNESSES**

1. The ecological and socio-economic monitoring plan does not address the specific objectives of the project.
2. The monitoring and evaluation plan was not updated since the previous submittal.
3. The plan includes old partners such as Bernalillo High School and the San Antonio De Las Huertas Land Grant.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The proposal would be strengthened by including more detail on the youth component.
2. The proposal would have been strengthened by including a discussion of safety.

3. The multiparty monitoring process should be described in the text.
4. The proposal should 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.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS**

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

<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	<b>CFRP 34-10</b>
ORGANIZATION:	Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona
FOREST:	Santa Fe
PROJECT TITLE:	Rowe Mesa Landscape-Scale Assessment: Planning for Fire-Focused Forest Restoration
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$235,720
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$58,930
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	1
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$294,650

#### **STRENGTHS**

1. Excellent example of use of landscape scale assessment and planning efforts to strategically target cost effective restoration efforts and move towards natural fire regimes.
2. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of proposal.
3. The proposal includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
4. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
5. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
6. The proposal includes strong letters of support.
7. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
8. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
9. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
10. The project includes an adaptive approach to restoration in an annual evaluation of monitoring data which is used to collaboratively refine prescriptions.
11. The proposal offers an opportunity to address the interaction between grazing and the re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
12. The proposal will preserve old and large trees.
13. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
14. The proposal is clear, concise, and well organized.
15. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.

#### **WEAKNESSES**

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. When the difference between allowed IDC rate and organization IDC rate is used a cost share match, a copy or link to the organization's audited IDC rate should be included. Please provide.
2. Identify the tribes that the letter was sent to.

**ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:** None found.

<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	<b>CFRP 36-10</b>
ORGANIZATION:	Caja Del Rio Majada Coop
FOREST:	Santa Fe
PROJECT TITLE:	Caja del Rio Majada Coop Santa Fe River Restoration
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$450,000
EVALUATION CATEGORY:	4

## STRENGTHS

1. The project replants trees in deforested areas.
2. The proposal attempts to address the interaction between grazing and the re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
3. The legend on the map identifies the location of treatments.

## WEAKNESSES

1. NEPA is not complete on proposed treatment acres, and NEPA is not part of the proposal. The proposal includes a letter from the BLM that states their non-support due to the absence of NEPA and cites higher priorities for BLM resources than the proposed project.
2. Trailhead closures and prevention of the erosion of hazardous materials are not CFRP objectives.
3. Thinning to increase water quantity is not a CFRP objective and is not based upon the best available science.
4. Socio-economic monitoring plan is not included.
5. Proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with a conservation group in design, implementation, and monitoring. Audubon Society is referenced on page 3, but no letter from them is included.
6. The work plan lacks detail and is confusing.
7. Placing slash in gulleys tends to increase rather than decrease erosion.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The proposal should display land ownerships on the map to increase clarity.
2. The applicant should seek committed collaboration from Museum of Natural History UNM (Dr. Esteban Muldavin), Wildearth Guardians, and the BLM.

**ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:**

- The federal portion of year 1 totals \$123,399 and the total is shown as \$120,000.
- The letter of support from the Santa Domingo tribe is in reference to a previous Wildearth Guardians proposal from 2009, not CFRP 36-10.

# Evaluation Matrix

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, U of A	?	?	x	x	?	5	5	6
CFRP 05-10	Questa/Lama WUI Multi-jurisdictional Forest Restoration	?		x	x	?	5	5	5
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	

**Recommendations for Improving the Panel Evaluation Process**

1. Use past performance, if applicable, to help narrow down list on Friday.
2. Delete Weakness #27 from boilerplate list.
3. Define a weakness as something that will be a bump in the project.

**Recommendations for Improving the 2011 CFRP Request for Applications (RFA)**

1. On Page 11, fix the error on Item 19 regarding “B” vs “C”.
2. Include definition of “Conservation Organization”.
3. Include direction to include township and range in the guidance for preparing maps.
4. Improve the description of what is required regarding tribal letters.
5. Include direction to first address the core objectives clearly up-front.

**Tasks for CFRP Sub Committee for the Review of Completed Multi-Party Assessments:**

1. Review Multi-Party Assessments submitted by CFRP grantees upon project completion and provide comments to the Panel on what those assessments indicate regarding program effectiveness.
2. Include fire behavior in the 15-year monitoring.
3. Do results of a project open up the door for subsequent projects?
4. Address the need to address socio-economic factors, monitoring in restoration treatment, utilization vs. planning, and NEPA compliance projects.
5. Discuss how the Panel should evaluate the 3 different types of funding proposals: planning, treatment and utilization.

# Appendix A. Technical Advisory Panel Bylaws

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 Southwest Regional Internet Website at: [www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/community](http://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) or his delegate:** 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**

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

## Appendix B. Technical Advisory Panel Members (2010-2012)

Interest	Name, Organization
State Natural Resources Official	Mike Matush, NMED-Surface Water Quality Bureau
Federal Land Management Agency	Danny Gomez, USDI Bureau of Indian Affairs
Federal Land Management Agency	Timothy Pohlman, U.S. Forest Service
Tribal	Ann Watson, Kewa Tribe
Independent Scientist	Robert Berrens, PhD, University of New Mexico
Independent Scientist	Lawrence Vincent, PhD, UNM-Taos Academy of Science and Environmental Studies
Conservation	Bryan Bird, Wild Earth Guardians
Conservation	Martha S. Cooper, The Nature Conservancy
Conservation	John Olivas, NM Wilderness Alliance
Local Community	Dick Cooke, Village of Ruidoso
Local Community	Candido A. Archuleta, Mexicano Land Education & Conservation Trust
Local Community	Shaun Fisher, NM Legislature
Commodity	Daniel Barrone, Olguins, Inc.
Commodity	Brent Racher, Restoration Solutions, LLC.
Commodity	Coleman Burnett, SWCA Environmental Consultants
Asst. Designated Federal Officer	Walter Dunn, USDA Forest Service, Southwestern Region



# Appendix C: Common Proposal Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations

## Strengths:

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

33. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.

### **Weaknesses:**

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

30. Piñon-juniper restoration objectives are not adequately addressed in the proposal.
31. NEPA is not complete on proposed treatment acres, with NEPA not part of the proposal.
32. The project does not include a socio-economic component in either the goals or the monitoring plan.
33. The proposal and budget do not address anticipated program income.

### **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)